

# House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 146 • NUMBER 262 • 1st SESSION • 41st PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT (HANSARD)

Tuesday, June 4, 2013

Speaker: The Honourable Andrew Scheer

# CONTENTS

(Table of Contents appears at back of this issue.)

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, June 4, 2013

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

# **ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

**●** (1005)

[English]

#### GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Tom Lukiwski (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, CPC): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the Government's response to 13 petitions.

\* \* \*

#### COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mr. Greg Kerr (West Nova, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 11th report of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs, entitled "Depleted Uranium and Canadian Veterans".

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### MANDATORY DISCLOSURE OF DRUG SHORTAGES ACT

**Mrs. Djaouida Sellah (Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert, NDP)** moved for leave to introduce C-523, An Act to amend the Department of Health Act (disclosure of drug shortages).

She said: Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to introduce a bill concerning the disclosure of drug shortages.

Drug shortages are a major public health issue, one that is not limited to within Canada's borders. Canada has yet to require mandatory disclosure, even though it exists in other parts of the world such as the United States, New Zealand and the European Union. It has been called for by various groups, including the College of Family Physicians of Canada in a letter to the Prime Minister in 2011, and the Ordre des pharmaciens du Québec. Even officials at Health Canada have recommended to the minister that it be required.

I am very pleased to give the government the opportunity to do what must be done and pass the mandatory disclosure of drug shortages. I am asking the government to support this bill to make work easier for health care professionals, to avoid additional costs to the health care system and, above all, for the health and safety of Canadians.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)

\* \* \*

[English]

#### CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.):** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-524, An Act to amend the Canada Elections Act (election advertising).

He said: Mr. Speaker, the time has come for us to look at the way political advertising is done in this country. I will make it very clear that this is not about censorship. Any political party can have any type of advertising it wants, whether it is during or outside of the election period.

What this amendment to the Canada Elections Act would do is obligate the leaders of the respective political parties to authorize that they are aware of the content of the advertisements and that they are comfortable with it. This is something Canadians would like to see. It is taking responsibility.

An ad on TV, on the radio or in newsprint would have to be authorized and approved by the leader of that political party. We have seen it in the United States. What it would do is ensure there is more accountability and transparency so the viewer, the listener or the reader clearly knows that the leader of the political party is taking responsibility and has approved of the content of the ad.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)

^ ^

[Translation]

# **PETITIONS**

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

**Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition signed by 32 people from Prince Edward Island.

This is in addition to all of the other petitions that have been presented in the House in opposition to employment insurance reform. The petitioners are calling on the government to reverse its decision on employment insurance reform.

[English]

#### DEVELOPMENT AND PEACE

Ms. Isabelle Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to present two petitions this morning.

The first petition is from citizens from the Canadian Catholic Organization for Development and Peace. The petitioners call upon the government to demonstrate its international responsibility by recommitting Canada to contribute 0.7% of GDP to overseas development assistance.

[Translation]

#### WEST ISLAND RAIL LINE

Ms. Isabelle Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the second petition was signed by the people of the West Island. They are calling on the federal government to recognize the importance of the West Island rail line and its contribution to Montreal's economy. They are also asking for funding from the federal government.

[English]

#### GENETICALLY MODIFIED ORGANISMS

Mr. Frank Valeriote (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am rising to present a petition adding to the voices of the thousands who have signed petitions already presented in this House. They are concerned that the licensing and release of genetically modified organisms has a potentially negative impact on all aspects of the Canadian agricultural sector, from transportation to trade and production to whether or not GM crops can co-exist with non-GM crops or organic crops.

The petitioners request a moratorium on the release of further GMOs and request an independent review of existing GMOs.

• (1010)

#### MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY

**Ms. Olivia Chow (Trinity—Spadina, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions to present, and the first is from petitioners from the city of Toronto.

As summer is upon us and a lot of people are on their bikes and walking on the street, the petitioners are concerned about street safety.

The petitioners want to see the federal government make sure that heavy trucks and trailers have side guards installed, which is good for the environment and saves lives of cyclists and pedestrians. They note that Jenna Morrison's life might have been saved had the truck had a side guard.

Before any more senseless death occurs, the petitioners urge the federal government to introduce legislated regulations under the Motor Vehicle Safety Act to require aerodynamic side guards for trucks and trailers.

#### PARKS CANADA

Ms. Olivia Chow (Trinity—Spadina, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the second petition is from Canadians all across Canada who are urging the federal government to instruct the Parks Canada Agency, which is responsible for the operation of the Rideau Canal and the Trent-

Severn Waterway, not to reduce the hours of operation or shorten the season of operation and to return service to 2011 levels.

The petitioners call upon the government to provide Parks Canada with the necessary funding for both the Rideau Canal and the Trent-Severn Waterway to return to 2011 operating hours and length of season, so that Canadians and visitors can safely enjoy these waterways.

#### GENETICALLY MODIFIED ALFALFA

Mr. Larry Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have in front of me a petition from a number of my constituents who are asking the government to put a moratorium on GM alfalfa.

\* \* \*

#### QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Tom Lukiwski (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

**The Speaker:** Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

# **GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[Translation]

# FAMILY HOMES ON RESERVES AND MATRIMONIAL INTERESTS OR RIGHTS ACT

BILL S-2—TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, CPC) moved:

That, in relation to Bill S-2, An Act respecting family homes situated on First Nation reserves and matrimonial interests or rights in or to structures and lands situated on those reserves, not more than five further hours shall be allotted to the consideration of the third reading stage of the bill; and

that, at the expiry of the five hours provided for the consideration of the third reading stage of the said bill, any proceedings before the House shall be interrupted, if required for the purpose of this order, and, in turn, every question necessary for the disposal of the said stage of the bill shall be put forthwith and successively, without further debate or amendment.

[English]

**The Speaker:** Under Standing Order 67.1, there will now be a 30-minute question period.

Questions, the hon. member for Skeena—Bulkley Valley.

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I was commenting to my friend across the way that the government might need a more efficient system for signing all of these orders into the House because it does it so often. It must just change the name of the bill, photocopy it, change whatever stage it is at and ram it through.

My question is very simple. We have heard from first nations groups who have said this legislation is wrong and it will not help the situation. It is not what they need.

Further to that, the government at some point in time is going to have to learn how to do sincere consultation. Consultation does not mean ramming things down throats. Consultation does not mean imposing time limits on every debate. Consultation does not mean eroding the very foundations of our democratic institutions, which is what the government is doing here today.

We have a process question. The government is invoking the power it has as a majority government to shut down debate on a bill that is opposed by the very people it would affect. The government is somehow saying Big Brother knows best. The Conservatives are just going to tell first nations how things are going to be done, as if that is going to help the situation that has been bad for so many years.

The minister has been on his feet a number of times on this very same issue. Has he better talking points today as to why his government is so perfect when it writes these bills that it does not need to listen to the opposition or to the very first nations groups upon whom it is going to impose this legislation?

**●** (1015)

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that this issue has been before this Parliament for many years now. My colleague referred to the majority government. All those families living on reserve in Canada will thank Canadians for having elected a majority government.

This is the fourth iteration of this bill before Parliament. The first bill was introduced as Bill C-47 on March 4, 2008, in a minority Parliament and was debated at second reading and referred to committee. It died on the order paper on September 7, 2008. In all of those months, when the opposition and everybody had a chance to debate the bill, it did not happen.

I will continue with the next question, but the member is going to get the same answer as to why it is time we acted.

[Translation]

Mr. Matthew Dubé (Chambly—Borduas, NDP): Mr. Speaker, that is amusing, because he is talking about the bill having been introduced in Parliament several times, yet it seems that the Conservatives have not learned their lesson. We still hear the same comments from first nations, and the Conservatives are still using the same paternalistic approach. Since this government has a majority, it wants to impose its own way of doing things.

The problems here do not just affect the first nations. The bill also raises important issues for Quebec, which is governed by the civil code and has certain unique aspects that are not taken into consideration in this piece of legislation. By shutting down the debate, the Conservatives are preventing the members from discussing these problems. Then, they say that this does not matter, that the bill was introduced two or three times during previous sessions. Since they have had three tries before, it seems to me that the fourth should be the charm, but unfortunately this is still not the case today.

The first time the Conservatives adopted a time allocation motion, they said that it was important for the economy. Did they use the same reason for all the other bills for which they moved a time allocation motion?

#### Government Orders

**Hon. Bernard Valcourt:** Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to me that the importance of the issue escapes the hon. member. He is talking about the economy, but we are talking about fundamental rights here.

Why do families who live on reserve in Canada not enjoy the same rights as all other Canadians and children living off reserve?

Anyone who watches the procedures of the House of Commons knows that if we do not limit debate on the bill, then it once again risks not being passed by the House of Commons. With a majority government, we can ensure, once and for all, that Canadian families living on reserve, women and children, enjoy the same protections as other Canadians. That seems to me like a fundamental, valid and justifiable reason to limit debate and ensure that these people will finally have the same level of protection as other Canadians.

**●** (1020)

[English]

Mrs. Kelly Block (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the minister for bringing forward this very important piece of legislation. We know that aboriginal women are almost three times more likely than other Canadian women to experience violent crime, including spousal violence.

According to the General Social Survey in 2009, approximately 15% of aboriginal women in a marriage, or who had a common-law partner, reported that they had experienced spousal violence in the previous five years. Of those who had been victimized, 58% reported that they had sustained an injury, compared to 41% of non-aboriginal women. Further, 48% reported that they had been sexually assaulted, beaten, choked, or threatened with a knife or gun and 52% reported that they feared for their life.

We know that emergency protection orders save lives. Could the minister describe how Bill S-2 would enhance the protection of aboriginal women and children living on reserve?

**Hon. Bernard Valcourt:** Mr. Speaker, currently, aboriginal women in our country cannot go to court and seek exclusive occupation of the family home or apply for emergency protection orders while living in a family home on a reserve. The bill extends this basic protection to individuals living on reserve. In situations of family violence, which is what the member referred to, a spouse would be able to apply for an emergency order to stay in the family home at the exclusion of the other spouse for a period of up to 90 days, with the possibility of extension.

An emergency protection order is quick. It follows a simple process and is recognized by child and family justice advocates as being one of the most significant means of preventing family violence. Violations of these orders can result in fines or jail time, hence the importance of the bill.

[Translation]

**Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault (Sherbrooke, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, once again, I am very disappointed to rise to speak to a time allocation motion.

This is the 40th time the government has moved a time allocation motion to limit debate on a bill. What is more, this bill does not have the unanimous support of the House, civil society or aboriginal communities

My question is quite simple. I am not going to get into a discussion of the minister's competence today. Did the minister consult with first nations, including women's groups that were opposed to the bill and still are? If so, why did he decide to introduce the bill in its current form, which does not have the unanimous support of aboriginal communities?

**Hon. Bernard Valcourt:** Mr. Speaker, in short, the department consulted extensively with aboriginal nations across the country.

We began these extensive consultations in 2006. About 100 meetings were held in 76 locations across Canada, which allowed us to improve the bill at that time. A number of changes were made specifically to address the concerns of certain stakeholders, the first nations and others about the implementation of this bill. We had to ensure that its real objective of protecting aboriginal families living on reserves across Canada would be attained.

Consultations were held and changes were made such that, today, the bill passes the test and achieves its objective.

**●** (1025)

Ms. Isabelle Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the minister told us that 100 meetings were held and that there were consultations. I am wondering why the results of these consultations are not reflected in the bill before us. Consulting the people is a good thing, but it is not enough to go somewhere, say that the people have been consulted, but not listen to what they had to say. I believe that consultation means taking into consideration what was said.

Had that been the case, the Native Women's Association of Canada and the Assembly of First Nations would be able to support this bill. They are not. This means that they were not consulted to the extent required to make amendments and for the minister to know what would have secured their support for the bill.

I wonder why the minister consulted people without listening to them and without amending the bill he has introduced.

**Hon. Bernard Valcourt:** Mr. Speaker, once again, I totally reject the unsubstantiated and far-fetched allegations made by the member. As I said earlier, consultations were conducted.

This is the fourth iteration of this bill. On several occasions, and every time that it has been introduced in the House of Commons, numerous Canadians and aboriginals—in the first nations and across Canada—were consulted, and a number of amendments were made to improve the bill.

In fact, contrary to what the member stated, amendments were made. The result: the bill responds to the challenge Canada faces of guaranteeing the same rights to all its citizens. Most notably, it will ensure that women, children, and couples living on reserve are not treated like second-class citizens.

[English]

Mrs. Joy Smith (Kildonan—St. Paul, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the minister for this bill. I have worked extensively with the aboriginal community and have to say that every woman wants the same rights as every other woman in the country.

In addition to providing access to emergency protection orders, Bill S-2 would allow the courts to consider these factors and provide extended exclusive occupation access to the family home. Emergency protection orders are often provided in the initial procedures in a relationship breakup, which would be followed by an application for exclusive occupation and valuation.

During the time period of the emergency protection order, the spouse or common-law partner could apply for exclusive occupation of the family home. In cases where the need for this protection is extended and where there are children involved, having access or extended access to the family home is very important.

Could the minister please describe the importance of providing access?

**Hon. Bernard Valcourt:** Mr. Speaker, as the member knows, the federal provisional rules in Bill S-2 would enable the courts to provide short-long to long-term occupancy of the family home to the exclusion of a spouse or common-law partner. The duration of this order could range from a determined number of days to a longer period, such as until dependent children reach the age of majority.

What is important to add is that the bill contemplates that with the extension of such period of time, the judge would take the advice of the First Nations Leadership Council chiefs about the implications this has on the community. Therefore, this provision in the bill would help ensure that spouses or common-law partners who are primary caregivers would have access to housing for their children and/or dependent adults. As has been demonstrated by witnesses during the debate at committee, this would really be an added value to our set of laws for aboriginal people in Canada.

Mr. Claude Gravelle (Nickel Belt, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I received an email from Chief Marianna Couchie of the Nipissing First Nation last night. I would like to quote from her email. She stated:

There are some certainties that NFN would like to ensure. We already have our own Matrimonial Rights Property policy in place, that occured quite a few years ago around 2004. (I am concerned about) Will this new Bill have an impact on our Existing MRP Policy?

When we enacted our MRP two matters were of precedent:

- 1. The safe guarding of the right to preserve for ever our Land.
- In our Policy/Act the children if they have status own the family home and which ever parent is prepared to raise the children in the family home can do so.

I have two questions on behalf of the chief. If this bill is enacted, will it affect the policy that they already have in place, and would this new bill have an impact on their existing MRP policy? The second question from the chief is this. Does the Conservative government still view first nations as a problem?

• (1030)

**Hon. Bernard Valcourt:** Mr. Speaker, on the last question from the chief, the member may tell her that, indeed, the aboriginal presence in Canada enriches this great country of ours. We are attempting to work co-operatively with all chiefs and councils and first nations members in communities all across Canada in trying to reconcile aboriginal rights with Canada exercising its sovereignty.

I will read an important quote in answering the question. I will quote representatives of the Congress of Aboriginal Peoples who testified before the committee in November 2011. They stated:

The MRP Act has more significance than meets the eye, because it goes to the heart of the issue— dignity of the person.... For many years, we've been calling for an effective Matrimonial Real Property regime to protect spouses who are forced to leave a reserve.... Promoting the dignity of the person does not erode Treaty or Aboriginal Rights.

[Translation]

Mr. Pierre Jacob (Brome—Missisquoi, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Bill S-2 is the fourth iteration of a bad piece of legislation. Will the Conservatives sit down with the first nations once and for all and address concerns regarding the recognition of first nations jurisdiction, access to justice and conflict resolution, for example?

**Hon. Bernard Valcourt:** Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to remind the member of something. Were he the slightest bit familiar with this issue, he would know that the first nations have already obtained the right to self-government and that they are part of a comprehensive agreement. These first nations already have legislation that addresses these issues.

The bill targets first nations that do not benefit from such a system. It is designed to enable these first nations to pass their own legislation that focuses on their own communities and on the cultural values of those first nations. They will have one year to do this, then the legislation will come into effect. Until this is achieved, even provisionally, federal rules and regulations will remain in effect. The bill was, therefore, developed to fully respect self-government, comprehensive agreements, and, most notably, the rights and treaties that are currently in force.

[English]

Mrs. Susan Truppe (Parliamentary Secretary for Status of Women, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I heard two members opposite say that maybe it is a bad bill. I find it interesting that they would say maybe it is a bad bill, when it would help women on reserve with emergency protection orders and also give them the same rights that I have standing here.

Critics of Bill S-2 have said that allowing courts to address interests and rights to the matrimonial home on reserve is just too complicated for judges and places too much of a burden on the individual, but these critics want to deny aboriginal women the same rights and protections that many of them take for granted themselves. The fact is that Bill S-2 would simplify the process involved in the breakdown of a marriage or common-law relationship. It would provide individuals living on reserves with access to the legal tools and protections they need.

Could the minister please explain how this bill would aid judges in enforcing matrimonial real property laws on reserves and how it would ease the so-called burden on individuals?

• (1035)

**Hon. Bernard Valcourt:** Mr. Speaker, as the member knows, there is no legal protection available to couples living in first nation communities that are governed by the Indian Act. This is what we are attempting to correct here. I would argue that nothing should be considered so complicated or burdensome as to justify not extending these basic rights and protections to one segment of the population.

Throughout the country, judges already deal with the division of matrimonial property off reserve. As part of our implementation plan, we are committed to ensuring that judges will receive

#### Government Orders

educational materials to help them better understand the legislation and the social context in which these matrimonial real property issues arise in first nation communities.

In closing, I would also argue that Bill S-2 does not place too much of a burden on the individual, rather it is the complete opposite.

[Translation]

Mrs. Djaouida Sellah (Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives make it seem as though they are passing legislation in support of the rights of aboriginal women, when in fact they disregard what these women have to say. They are trying to push through legislation without addressing the real, relevant, non-legal problems faced by aboriginal women and their families.

Why are the Conservatives trying to ram through this legislation, despite a great deal of testimony stating that in order to resolve matrimonial real property issues with something more than interim rules, there first needs to be a more comprehensive response by first nations leadership?

**Hon. Bernard Valcourt:** Mr. Speaker, you would really have to be on the other side of the House, in the New Democratic Party, to seriously contend that the bill is being rammed through, six years after its introduction in Parliament.

The member's proposal would enable the opposition to delay, if not completely block, a fundamental initiative under which families living on reserve in Canada would have the same rights enjoyed by other Canadians.

I know that the New Democratic Party would like to see the rights of women and children on reserve remain inferior to the rights enjoyed by every other Canadian. We, however, believe that it is time to act, and that is what the motion seeks to achieve.

[English]

**Mr. Mike Sullivan (York South—Weston, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I find it quite ironic that we are here debating ending debate, and what we hear from the Conservatives is debate on the bill, not on ending debate.

It is yet another example of the disdain the government has for our parliamentary democracy. It is the 40th time in just over two years, that is one every seven sitting days, that we have had to end debate. We have had to shut the mouths of the parliamentarians. We heard from the Conservative backbenchers how much they liked having their mouths shut, when they complained about the fact that they could not be heard on issues that were of importance to them.

Let us look at the other abuses of parliamentary democracy that we have had in the House of Commons. We have had omnibus bills on the budget that had nothing to do with matters that were raised in the budget, that raised all kinds of other things, yet this was supposedly part of the government's plan, which was never mentioned in their plan.

Instead of a revered chamber of sober second thought, the Senate has become a place for cracks, hacks and flaks who are doing nothing to make this parliamentary democracy work for us.

#### **●** (1040)

**Hon. Bernard Valcourt:** Mr. Speaker, the abuse of parliamentary democracy is the opposition. It is the opposition members using every means they can to prevent the House from adopting a bill that will give equal rights to families living on reserve. That is an abuse of democracy. That is an abuse of parliamentary democracy. The member may gesture with his head as he wishes, but I do not think that is parliamentary.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

**The Speaker:** Order, please. There are three minutes left in this question period, so I am going to ask members to keep their questions very short so we can accommodate all the members who have been standing since the beginning.

I will go first to the hon. member for Calgary Centre.

**Ms. Joan Crockatt (Calgary Centre, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, aboriginal women, as you well know, have been waiting for this legislation for a very long time. In fact, this morning at breakfast I spoke to Sophie Pierre, the Chief Commissioner for the B.C. Treaty Commission, who said that aboriginal women desperately want to see the legislation passed.

I would like the minister to please explain how time allocation will finally bring this important legislation to aboriginal women.

Hon. Bernard Valcourt: Mr. Speaker, time allocation, as I just indicated, will allow another five hours of debate at third reading. Finally, after 25 years of a matrimonial property regime in this country that excludes aboriginal women, children, husbands and common-law partners on reserve, this allocation will solve an injustice that has been taking place in this country for much too long. Hopefully, the NDP and the Liberals will wake up to the necessity of ensuring equal rights for all Canadians.

[Translation]

Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the member for Madawaska—Restigouche, who is the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development, that it was the Conservatives who abused their power when they appointed senators to fundraise on behalf of the Conservatives. That is an abuse of the institution of democracy.

I have a question for the minister. If he knows, could he tell us why aboriginal women and chiefs are against his bill? Does he at least know why? Why are aboriginal people opposed to his bill?

The government is trying to get the legislation passed quickly, but the reason the bill has not been passed is that the Conservatives prorogued Parliament and called elections. The bill was not defeated as the result of a democratic debate in the House.

**Hon. Bernard Valcourt:** Mr. Speaker, true to form, the member brought absolutely nothing to the debate, except for once again making a remark that I cannot repeat because it would be unparliamentary.

One thing is certain: Parliament will be called upon to vote on an injustice that has been perpetuated for far too long. I would invite the member for Acadie—Bathurst to continue, in the tradition of the NDP, to deny the right of first nations members living on reserve to enjoy the same rights as other Canadians.

[English]

**Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Mr. Speaker, I rise in this abbreviated time for debate to raise one point.

It is not enough for Conservative members of Parliament in this place to say that aboriginal women should have the same rights that each of us have. The issue is constitutional. It is about the requirement from numerous Supreme Court decisions that decisions that affect first nation rights must have prior, full, constitutionally mandated consultation. That has not occurred and that makes me fear that the hon. minister is asking us to pass a bill that will be ruled unconstitutional later.

**Hon. Bernard Valcourt:** Mr. Speaker, the member is totally wrong. There have been consultations.

**The Speaker:** It is my duty to interrupt the proceedings at this time and put forthwith the question on the motion now before the House.

• (1045

The question is on the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

**The Speaker:** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

**The Speaker:** Call in the members.

• (1125)

Chisu

Clarke

Daniel

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 711) YEAS

Chong

Crockatt

Davidson

#### Members Adams Aglukkaq Albas Albrecht Alexander Allison Allen (Tobique-Mactaquac) Ambler Ambrose Anders Andersor Armstrong Bateman Aspin Bernier Bergen Bezan Blaney Block Boughen Breitkreuz Braid Brown (Leeds-Grenville) Brown (Newmarket—Aurora) Brown (Barrie) Bruinooge Calandra Butt Calkins Carmichael Carrie

Del Mastro Dreeshen Devolin Duncan (Vancouver Island North) Dykstra Findlay (Delta-Richmond East) Fletcher Galipeau Gallant Gill Goguen Goodyear Gosal Gourde Grewal Harris (Cariboo-Prince George) Hawn Hiebert Holder Hillver James Kamp (Pitt Meadows-Maple Ridge-Mission) Keddy (South Shore-St. Margaret's) Kent Kerr

James Jean
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission) Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kent Kert
Komamicki Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Lake Lauzon
Leitch Lemieux
Lizon

Lobb Lukiwski MacKenzie Lunney Mayes McColeman McLeod Menegakis Menzies Merrifield Miller Moore (Fundy Royal) Nicholson Norlock O'Connor Obhrai O'Neill Gordon Oliver Opitz O'Toole Preston

 Payne
 Preston

 Raitt
 Rajotte

 Rathgeber
 Reid

 Rempel
 Richards

 Rickford
 Ritz

 Saxton
 Schellenberger

 Seeback
 Shea

 Shipley
 Shory

 Smith
 Sopuck

 Stanton
 Storseth

 Strahl
 Sweet

 Tilson
 Toet

 Trost
 Trottier

 Truppe
 Tweed

 Uppal
 Valcourt

 Van Kesteren
 Van Loan

 Vellacott
 Wallace

Warawa Warkentin

Watson Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)

Weston (Saint John) Wilks
Williamson Wong
Woodworth Yelich

Young (Oakville) Young (Vancouver South)

Zimmer- — 145

#### NAYS

#### Members

Allen (Welland) Andrews Ashton Angus Atamanenko Aubin Avala Bélanger Bennett Blanchette Blanchette-Lamothe Boutin-Sweet Boulerice Brison Brosseau Caron Byrne Casev Cash Chicoine Chisholm Choquette Chow Christopherson Cleary Comartin Côté Cotler Cullen Crowder Cuzner Day Dewar Dion Dionne Labelle Donnelly

Doré Lefebvre Dubé
Duncan (Etobicoke North) Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)

Dusseault Easter
Eyking Foote
Fortin Freeman
Garneau Garrison

Genest Genest-Jourdain
Giguère Godin
Goodale Gravelle
Groguhé Harris (Scarborough Southwest)

Harris (St. John's East) Hsu
Hughes Jacob
Julian Karygiannis
Kellway Lamoureux
Lapointe Latendresse
Laverdière LeBlanc (Beauséjour)

 LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)
 Leslie

 Liu
 MacAulay

 Mai
 Marston

 Martin
 Masse

 Mathyssen
 May

 McCallum
 McGuinty

 McKav (Scarboroush—Guildwood)
 Michaud

Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue) Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine) Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)

Mourani Nash Nicholls Nunez-Melo Pacetti Papillon Patry Péclet Perreault Pilon Plamondon Ouach Rafferty Rae Rankin Ravignat Raynault Regan Rousseau Saganash Sandhu Scarpaleggia Scott Sellah

Sgro Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)

 Sims (Newton—North Delta)
 Sitsabaiesan

 St-Denis
 Stewart

 Stoffer
 Sullivan

 Toone
 Tremblay

 Trudeau
 Valeriote— 126

**PAIRED** 

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

# THIRD READING

The House resumed from May 27 consideration of the motion that Bill S-2, An Act respecting family homes situated on First Nation reserves and matrimonial interests or rights in or to structures and lands situated on those reserves, be read the third time and passed.

**Mr. Jim Hillyer (Lethbridge, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the hon. Minister for Status of Women. I hope the House will forgive me for using my laptop for my notes, but I cannot stand up and I will lose my pages if I try to.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak today in support of Bill S-2, the Family Homes on Reserves and Matrimonial Interests or Rights Act. The bill would provide the courts with a mechanism, where there currently is none, to apply matrimonial real property laws on reserves.

What does that mean? Right now, if the conjugal relationship of a couple living on reserve breaks down, one of the spouses—it is almost always the woman, who is often accompanied by children—is left completely defenceless. The spouse can be forced from the home and there is no legal recourse to protect her if the house is sold and her spouse retains all of the proceeds. The second spouse—usually the woman, as I said—is left without any financial compensation. Financial devastation is commonly, if not always, the outcome.

The spouse has little protection through the band council and no recourse through Canadian law. As a result, these women and children are often left homeless and impoverished.

This has created an unacceptable situation with first nations communities. We live in a society where most of us take the protection of our rights and property for granted. We do not even think about it. We believe that the current situation on reserve cannot continue. The time has come for action.

Of course, the biggest criticism to this bill is not its content, the problem it solves or the solution it provides. The false accusation is that there has been insufficient consultation or debate. Just this morning, the House leader of the official opposition said this bill was being shoved down people's throats. He suggested that somehow the hours, days, weeks, months and years of extensive consultation held throughout the country with first nations leaders and countless individuals do not count as consultation. For some reason, it seems that consultation only counts if someone other than the Conservative Party passes the legislation that results from that consultation.

Consultation has been held. Extensive research has been conducted, and countless hours of parliamentary discourse and debate have been extended. This is not a case of Big Brother handing down a paternalistic non-solution. This bill is a long-overdue response to an oppressed people, perhaps the most vulnerable people in the world, after generations of abuse and abandonment of women and children who, through a technical loophole, have been left unprotected by our Constitution and Charter of Rights and Freedoms. To ignore this situation is nothing but shameful hypocrisy.

Let me briefly review the comprehensive and inclusive process by which Bill S-2—

● (1130)

## SUSPENSION OF SITTING

**The Speaker:** The sitting is suspended to the call of the Chair. (The sitting of the House was suspended at 11:32 a.m.)

**●** (1150)

#### SITTING RESUMED

(The House resumed at 11:53 a.m.)

The House resumed from May 27 consideration of the motion that Bill S-2, An Act respecting family homes situated on First Nation reserves and matrimonial interests or rights in or to structures and lands situated on those reserves, be read the third time and passed.

**The Speaker:** The hon, member for Lethbridge has six and a half minutes to conclude his remarks.

Mr. Jim Hillyer (Lethbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I was about to share some information about how much consultation had been conducted on this issue and how much debate had been held in the House of Commons and in the Senate.

Starting in June 2006, the government appointed a ministerial representative on matrimonial real property issues on reserves to start discussions with first nations communities to produce a report on the consultation process and ultimately to provide legislative options to address the issues.

Of course, she did not do this alone. The Assembly of First Nations and the Native Women's Association of Canada collaborated in the consultation process. Dozens of meetings were held to map out the direction and priorities that would take shape during the consultation phase. We had meetings to discuss how we would conduct the meetings. It sounds like a government project.

The Native Women's Association of Canada and the Assembly of First Nations each received \$2.7 million to consult not just with leaders, but with the residents of first nations and to record their opinions on the issue. The government also made a total of \$11 million available to many other first nation organizations and councils, both national and regional, to provide input into the process. These organizations included, among others, the Congress of Aboriginal Peoples, the Indigenous Bar Association, the National Association of Friendship Centres and the National Aboriginal Circle Against Family Violence.

Following the process, the ministerial representative created a comprehensive 500-page report detailing the massive problems that resulted from the lack of proper on-reserve property rights for married couples, especially for women. The report made many recommendations, which now are held within the legislation before

I will skip a lot of this because I only have four minutes now, but the point is this. This is not the first time a bill like this has been created. Over the years, since 2006, the bill has been recreated and re-debated many times, with many first nations groups included and many expert witnesses. The legislation contains all the improvements, all the recommendations, that have been included in the debate and research.

This is the point. Process is important. In fact, how we do things is almost as important as what we do, but eventually something must be done.

As I said before in my speech, and it bears repeating, the plight of first nations in our country is our great hypocrisy. It is no secret, even though we do not often face it, that our country shoulders a collective shame for what was done to the first ancestors, then the grandparents and even the parents of first nations. Even though we did not kick them off their land as is often said, our forebearers did, and the posterity of those who were kicked off their lands still lives on the reserves into which they were corralled.

It does not matter much now who caused the countless problems that still plagues our first nations, but they are not only our friends now and our neighbours, they are fellow citizens and even our brothers and our sisters. I for one will not and cannot standby to let petty politics still hold some of these downtrodden hostage. It is not enough to visit the prisoners, the prisoners must be set free. This may sound dramatic and like so much rhetoric that is often said in politics, it will be just rhetoric unless something is done. This bill must be passed to help protect the women and children in first nations communities.

We talk about this collective shame, about how people were kicked off their land and put into bondage, and we try to solve that problem. At the same time, if we let the people who were in bondage be held in bondage even further because for some reason the Charter of Rights and the Constitution does not apply to them, as I said over and over again, that is hypocrisy and our collective shame and it must stop.

Great effort has been made to include all people involved in the consultation process. This is a great solution for people. We cannot wait until everyone agrees that it will be to their political advantage to pass this law. It is for the people who are repressed.

I am proud to stand in favour of Bill S-2. I encourage all my colleagues in the House to support Bill S-2 and set the prisoners free.

• (1155)

- (1100)

[Translation]

Mr. Matthew Dubé (Chambly—Borduas, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his speech. He did a good job of catching up despite the fact that we had to leave right in the middle of it.

He stated that it was the third time this bill has been introduced because of elections and minority governments. The fact remains that a number of associations that testified identified problems. For example, the bill does nothing to solve the resource shortage, which makes it difficult for women to access the legal aid provided for under this bill. Furthermore, Quebec's Civil Code is different from the law elsewhere in Canada. This lack of consistency is a problem.

I would like the member to tell me why, despite three attempts, the bill still has major flaws that make it impossible for us to support it.

Mr. Jim Hillyer: Mr. Speaker, there are differences between the Quebec Civil Code and the common law system used in the rest of Canada. However, this problem cannot be solved with a single bill, even if it has been introduced three times. This problem has been around since the beginning of Canada's history. We have tried to address the differences between the two systems, but that is not the issue here. The real problem is that women and their children are being left homeless and out in the cold. We need to focus on this problem before we deal with the one between Quebec and the rest of Canada.

**(1200)** 

[English]

Mrs. Susan Truppe (Parliamentary Secretary for Status of Women, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it has been 25 long years that onreserve residents, particularly aboriginal women, have been deprived of basic rights and protections simply because of where they live. This is unacceptable.

The aboriginal women, international associations and even the Manitoba NDP agree that the current situation must change and change now.

#### Government Orders

Bill S-2, the family homes on reserves and matrimonial interests or rights act, is currently the fourth iteration of this bill to come before Parliament. The bill has appeared both in the House and the Senate in a number of different forms and has been the focus of extensive consultations. It addresses the issues that were raised with its predecessors, while providing aboriginal women on reserve with the same rights that other women in Canada have.

Would my colleague provide the House with information regarding the extensive consultation process that was undertaken for this bill?

**Mr. Jim Hillyer:** Mr. Speaker, my colleague answered some of the question in posing it and I answered some of it in my speech, although I did skip over a lot of the consultation process because I wanted to focus on the results. However, the process of consultation has been included. Over 103 consultation sessions were held in 76 sites across Canada with many different associations.

Furthermore, the legislation does not put an end to the ability of any of the first nations to include their own matrimonial laws, as long as they are consistent with the Constitution and the Charter of Rights of Canada.

[Translation]

Ms. Élaine Michaud (Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I find it strange to hear my colleague talk about consultations. A number of consultations were held, but they were not about Bill S-2, at least not this version of it. A number of consultations may have been held in the past, but the Native Women's Association of Canada and the Assembly of First Nations openly voiced their complaints and said in committee that the government did not take into account the problems they raised with the bill.

I would like to know what my colleague has to say to these associations with regard to the government's lack of interest in their opinions and demands.

[English]

**Mr. Jim Hillyer:** Mr. Speaker, we talk about the consultations and our system of Parliament. Every time an election is called or Parliament is prorogued, we reset the clock on all legislation. However, it does not erase the consultations conducted in the past nor our ability to refer to, think about and make wise decisions based on those.

As I said in my speech, as important as this process is, ultimately something must be done. We cannot wait until every problem is resolved, while women and children wait in the cold. This bill does not stop problems that have not been addressed from being solved in the future, but it does address a problem that is long overdue from being resolved.

Hon. Rona Ambrose (Minister of Public Works and Government Services and Minister for Status of Women, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin my remarks with the words of Betty Ann Lavallée, the national chief of the Congress of Aboriginal Peoples. She has said that Bill S-2 is:

—addressing the real human issue of an Aboriginal person, sometimes often taken for granted by other Canadians. A spouse within an Aboriginal relationship should not be denied or put out on the street alone and without any recourse because of a family or marital breakdown.

I agree with her completely. Her words are truly informed by her knowledge of the often harsh realities of the day-to-day life faced by many women residents of first nation communities.

At the end of the day, this bill is about one very simple thing, and that is equal rights.

As members know, in 1921, women in Canada were first given the right to vote in the 1921 federal election. However, that did not mean all women in Canada. In fact, aboriginal women, covered by the Indian Act, could not vote for band councils until 1951 and could not vote in federal elections until 1960.

Today, we are seeking to eliminate another unacceptable human rights issue. Through Bill S-2, we will finally be extending the same basic rights and protections to aboriginal women that all other Canadians already enjoy. I urge the opposition to stop denying aboriginal women equal rights and vote in favour of Bill S-2.

As my colleague said already, it has been over 25 years since the Supreme Court of Canada identified this legal gap that exists today on reserve and our government would finally close it with this bill. Bill S-2 proposes an effective solution to this injustice and we are proud to be the government to bring an end to it by providing women and children on reserve with legal protection.

As Minister for Status of Women, I feel strongly that the proposed legislation will provide options to women and children living on reserve who are experiencing family violence. Wives, spouses or common law partners who are living on reserve today face the reality that in the event of separation, divorce or death, the law currently does not protect their matrimonial real property interests or rights.

This is now our government's fourth attempt to pass this legislation. Clearly, as my colleague said before me, it is time to move forward with the bill.

Bill S-2, as proposed, will guarantee the matrimonial real property rights and interests of women who live on reserve and will protect spouses from violent domestic situations.

Statistics show that aboriginal women are almost three times more likely than non-aboriginal women to report being a victim of a violent crime, including spousal violence. Among victims of spousal violence, six to ten aboriginal women reported being injured. For comparison, the proportion was four in ten among non-aboriginal women.

According to the 2009 Statistics Canada "Women in Canada" report, 15% of all aboriginal women who were married or in a common law relationship had experienced spousal violence in the previous five years. In that same report, the rate among non-aboriginal women was 6%.

Nearly half of all aboriginal women who experienced spousal violence reported that they had been sexually assaulted, beaten, choked or threatened with a gun or a knife. A similar proportion reported that there were many times they feared for their lives.

This legislation is about eliminating an injustice by giving onreserve women access to the options that are available to all other Canadian women to date. However, most important, the bill would provide emergency protection orders to aboriginal women and children who are experiencing violence in the home.

Emergency protection orders clearly save lives. They are recognized by child and family justice advocates as one, if not the most significant, means for preventing family violence.

Several witnesses before the Standing Committee on the Status of Women acknowledged the need for matrimonial real property legislation.

A member of a first nation in Ontario, Rolanda Manitowabi, described how she and her common law partner had built a home together. She invested her life savings into that home and to protect here interests, she got the band to issue her a document naming her as the owner of the property. However, when she and her partner split up, she was evicted from her home. It was at that time she found out that the document in fact had absolutely no legal foundation. Bill S-2 would change that. About the bill, she stated, "I hope it's available to help other women and children on reserves".

#### ● (1205)

Jennifer Courchene, a member of a first nation in Manitoba, also appeared before the Standing Committee on the Status of Women. Jennifer and her children became homeless after her abusive partner forced them out of their home. She said, "if there had been something [like this] to help us, we would have taken it, rather than be homeless, that's for sure".

Aboriginal women on reserve who are not able to stay in the family home are forced to flee the reserve with their children, sometimes with nothing more than the clothes on their back, to a shelter or, even worse, somewhere homeless. Currently, a woman living on reserve who is a victim of violence has no legal protection other than pressing criminal charges. There is no mechanism to allow a parent and her children exclusive access to a family home.

I repeat the importance of using emergency protection orders to save lives. In the case of domestic violence and physical abuse, a court cannot order the spouse who holds the interest in the reserve home, which is almost always the male, to leave the home, even on a temporary basis. When a woman and her children are evicted from a family home on reserve, no judge currently has the power to intervene.

Extending the same rights that women off reserve have to aboriginal women living on reserve would address this dire situation. If emergency protection orders were enforced, abusers could be removed, allowing the women and children to find safety in the comfort of their own homes.

If aboriginal women were granted the ability to remain in the family home on reserve, they could escape situations of domestic violence, while the perpetrator was taken from the home, and they could stay to continue to care for their children and also maintain that vital access to the support in their own communities.

In addition to the protections provided by these orders, Bill S-2 would also provide for the granting of temporary exclusive occupation of the family home. This protection is important for two reasons. First, in situations of family violence, women could be granted temporary exclusive occupation of the home for a period of time extending past the emergency occupation.

Second, in the case of the death of a spouse or common law partner, the surviving spouse would be allowed to stay in the home for 180 days. During that time, the surviving spouse could apply for exclusive occupation of the family home for a period of time to be determined by the courts.

As my colleagues have said in the House many times, there has been a need for the bill for more than a quarter century. Our government has brought this issue before Parliament four times now, debating this issue in both chambers and in committee for more than 60 hours, and this includes more than 25 hours of debate on this particular iteration of the bill alone.

Yet after spending \$8 million on 103 consultation sessions in 76 different communities across Canada, even after the Supreme Court of Canada has identified this legal gap and the United Nations Human Rights Council has identified this as a gap for aboriginal women in Canada, after countless reports and studies going back a quarter of a century, the opposition continues to propose that we need more talk. We have said clearly that we have had enough talk and it is time to act.

Some first nations have established matrimonial property rights, and I applaud them. However, similar legal regimes are not yet in place in hundreds of on-reserve communities across Canada. It is time that aboriginal women living on reserve shared the same rights as all other Canadian women.

As the Minister for Status of Women, I work very closely with my colleagues to address violence against aboriginal women, and we do this by supporting many projects that address this issue in a very comprehensive manner, the projects that build economic security and develop the leadership skills that prepare women to successfully escape violent domestic situations.

Since 2009, through the women's program, we have provided a great deal of funding in support of projects that helped to empower and protect aboriginal women and girls. For instance, the La Loche Friendship Centre Corporation is addressing violence against aboriginal women and girls living in northern Saskatchewan. With the support of community stakeholders—men, women, youth and elders—they will be able to better address violence faced by aboriginal women.

Actions taken by this government to end violence against women and girls include increasing funding to the women's program to its highest level in Canadian history. We have now funded more than 600 projects in Canada from coast to coast since 2007.

We have also launched a comprehensive national action plan to combat human trafficking to ensure the safety and security of women and girls across Canada who are being targeted for sexual exploitation by violent traffickers.

#### Government Orders

We are moving ahead with Bill S-2, which would give aboriginal women equal rights and access to their matrimonial property rights and, most important, emergency protection orders to protect them in cases of domestic violence.

**(1210)** 

[Translation]

**Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault (Sherbrooke, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for her speech. She mentioned that consultations were held. It is therefore surprising that the government then introduced a bill that does not have the unanimous support of aboriginal communities.

The Native Women's Association of Canada severely criticized the bill for a number of reasons, including the lack of funding to support first nations governments and the additional obstacles this could create for first nations members who are seeking justice. The association also criticized the 12-month transition period.

The Assembly of First Nations and the national aboriginal women's summit also expressed a number of criticisms of this bill.

If the government really held consultations, why are members of aboriginal communities who truly understand the situation criticizing the bill? Why did the government not listen to them and why were these criticisms not taken into account when the current bill was drafted?

**●** (1215)

[English]

**Hon. Rona Ambrose:** Mr. Speaker, in fact, the proposed legislation would actually meet 30 of the 33 recommendations of the groups we work with and the ministerial representative who did a lot of the consultations across the country with aboriginal women and with a number of first nations. There are challenges with enacting a new right, if they want to look at it that way. However, that is definitely not a reason to not move forward with giving aboriginal women equal rights.

We put in place funding associated with this bill. We would provide training for all of those front-line workers, like prosecutors and others who deal with this issue, to support them. We understand the challenges of transitioning to a whole new legal framework, and we have all the means in place to ensure the training happens and those support mechanisms are in place.

Again, that is the responsible way to do this, but any challenges that face us should never be a reason not to move forward with giving aboriginal women the protection they deserve and the equal rights that all of us in Canada have and that aboriginal women are denied today.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is important that we recognize that there are numerous pieces of legislation, and this is but one of those pieces, which the government has brought in with the idea of passing through the House. On the other side, there has not been the type of consultation that has led to consensus building to try to resolve a number of issues that are there within first nations communities. It is in good part an issue of respect also, and the government has not clearly had the support of the majority of the people whom this would affect.

I wonder if the minister can provide comment. Can she incorporate Bill S-2 into this in terms of the obligation she feels to work with first nations leadership in trying to build toward consensus in bringing legislation that would ultimately pass with the support of all political entities inside the chamber, and have wider support outside the House of Commons?

**Hon. Rona Ambrose:** Mr. Speaker, the member knows this is the fourth iteration of the bill and that close to \$10 million has been spent on consultations in 67 different communities. I could go on, and the member knows that, but as I said, those challenges should never stop us from giving aboriginal women the protection they deserve on reserve, the same protection that all of us in this room are afforded.

The member talks about respect, and I ask him to think about the respect these women deserve from Parliament. It has been more than 25 years since the Supreme Court identified a legal gap that needs to be closed. This framework would at least be, I hope, the beginning of what needs to be addressed on reserve. It is one piece of a larger issue, but it is a piece that has to be addressed. For the member to suggest we should go on and continue to deny aboriginal women this legal protection on reserve, to me, is just unconscionable.

I agree with the member that there are some chiefs who have moved forward to give women on reserve this legal protection, and I applaud them. However, there are many chiefs who are fighting this because they do not want to share property, and that is unacceptable. I, for one, will continue to advocate to ensure aboriginal women have access to the support they need to use this legislation.

[Translation]

Ms. Élaine Michaud (Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, NDP): Mr. Speaker, before beginning my speech I would like to mention that I will share my time with my colleague, the member for Chambly—Borduas.

I am pleased to rise today to speak on Bill S-2, An Act respecting family homes situated on First Nation reserves and matrimonial interests or rights in or to structures and lands situated on those reserves.

This concerns matrimonial real property, which is the subject of this bill. At least there is some effort to resolve some problems, a certain form of discrimination against women that currently exists on reserves. This is the issue that Bill S-2 seeks to address. "Matrimonial real property" means lands and structures affixed to those lands. In this case, it would apply equally to couples in a conjugal relationship and those living common-law.

As has been mentioned, there is now a certain legal vacuum on reserves concerning matrimonial real property. This legal vacuum exists as a result of the current Constitution and the division of powers it provides for. The provinces and territories are responsible for property rights and civil rights in their respective territory. The federal government is constitutionally responsible for legislation regarding Indians and lands reserved for Indians.

Bill S-2 seeks to grant equal property rights to both spouses in a relationship. Regrettably, unlike what the government continues to say in the House, it is impossible to implement Bill S-2 as it stands. There are several reasons for this, and they have been repeatedly

raised by various stakeholders who work either directly in aboriginal communities or closely with them.

Many members stood in the House and bragged about the large number of government consultations that took place before this document was produced. What they forget to mention is that there was no consultation on Bill S-2 specifically, on the most recently introduced version. There were a number of consultations that, in one way or another, broached the topic that we are discussing today—that of matrimonial real property—but aboriginal communities were not directly consulted on the content of the updated version of the bill. Off the top of my head, I believe this is the fourth or fifth version of a flawed bill that the Conservatives have been trying to pass in the House since 2008.

Certain groups and organizations were consulted in the past, and they were called before the committee to study Bill S-2. They raised the same concerns and issues that they had years before. Take a look at the testimony from the Standing Committee on the Status of Women and it becomes clear that the problems previously brought to light were not taken into consideration by the government when it wrote this bill. I am thinking, for example, about testimony from the Assembly of First Nations.

Again today I am giving a speech within the context of another time allocation motion imposed by the government.

A number of people have complained that the government did not listen to them and did not take their opinions into consideration. The government is trying to restrict our ability as members to represent the people who want their views expressed in the House and to try, once again, to amend the bill or at least ensure that it is not passed now, without the necessary consultations.

If the proposed measures in the bill are imposed, we will completely overrule the rights of first nations communities. I feel that is disrespectful.

**●** (1220)

In addition to the work of the committee and the various stakeholders who have spoken out publicly and who appeared before the committee on this matter, a number of reports drafted over the years raise the same problems that have been raised from the outset, whether it be issues with funding to implement the measures that would be set out in a bill of this nature or issues with a lack of funding to enable aboriginal women to take advantage of any new measures that may be put in place to help them.

All of these issues have already been raised many times. Unfortunately, once again, they cannot be found in the document before us today and on which we will soon have to vote. This government is staying true to the new tradition for which it is so well known and it is doing whatever it can to restrict the right of opposition members to reflect the views of the citizens they represent.

Ever since the beginning of this debate, I have heard a number of members say that it is the opposition parties that are being undemocratic and are trying their best to limit debate. I find this absolutely ridiculous. I do not know if they have had an opportunity to listen to what they are saying or to read their speeches before they give them, but when I hear comments like these, I am appalled. Every day, I am surprised at what we can hear in the House from the party in power. It is just amazing.

Earlier I was talking about the very important problems and issues raised by the Assembly of First Nations. It has determined that three main principles are key to addressing matrimonial interests or rights on reserves.

The first of these three principles is the recognition of first nations jurisdiction. The government did not consult or even ask for their opinion or their support for Bill S-2, which is currently before us, so I find it rather odd to even think that we might be able to recognize their jurisdiction and respect their fundamental rights. In any case, when the government asks for their support or their opinion, it is not taken into consideration at all. I think this is one of the major problems we have with recognizing the first principle identified by the Assembly of First Nations.

The second principle is access to justice, dispute resolution and remedies. Here again, there is a chronic lack of funding for certain communities. I am thinking of the northern communities that are far from major centres, which will now have to appeal to the provincial courts more regularly, without necessarily having the financial resources to get there and exercise their rights.

Finally, the third principle identified is to address underlying issues, such as access to housing and economic security. I am also thinking of access to safe drinking water, another major issue that the House will soon have to deal with and take concrete action to resolve.

Coming back to this principle, we see that on reserves there are still many issues that prevent the full implementation of the measures in Bill S-2. These measures would make it possible to protect women on reserves who are unfortunately experiencing family violence.

Other problems noted by the NDP prevent it from supporting this bill. First, the bill includes a one-year transitional period to allow first nation communities to enact new laws. This one-year period is too short for many communities that want to resolve a number of outstanding issues that are not being addressed here.

Quebec is a prime example of some of the problems this bill will create. According to lawyer David Schulze, Bill S-2 overlooks the specificities of Quebec. Under the Civil Code, common-law partners do not have property rights, but they would under Bill S-2. For example, a first nations member would have rights to his Innu spouse's home on the Uashat reserve, but she would have no rights to his home across the street in Sept-Îles.

Clearly the bill does not exactly resolve the problems of discrimination that the women are experiencing when it comes to matrimonial real property.

● (1225)

We still have a lot of work to do to ensure that their rights are respected. That is why the NDP will continue to oppose Bill S-2, which does nothing tangible to give first nations women the help they really need.

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault (Sherbrooke, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier for her excellent speech. I wanted to ask her more or less the same question that I just asked the Minister for Status of Women, who did not provide a specific answer to my question regarding the consultations.

Many aboriginal groups, such as the Assembly of First Nations, the Native Women's Association of Canada and the national aboriginal women's summit, have been very critical of the Conservative government's consultation process and the manner in which it passes bills.

Had the government held serious and effective consultations and had it listened to and respected what aboriginal stakeholders had to say, would we still be dealing with the bill in its current form?

(1230)

**Ms. Élaine Michaud:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his excellent question.

In my opinion, the bill would be altogether different. Quebec Native Women is another group that opposes the current version of the bill. This group, which the government is trying to protect, clearly said:

...Bill S-2 in its current form does not meet all the concerns expressed repeatedly to the government by FAQ, particularly with respect to access to justice and capacity building of our governments and communities.

It is very clear: women who should usually feel that the government provides them with the means to stand up for themselves are telling us, their representatives, that this is not the case. Bill S-2 does not meet their needs and does not really give them access to all the legal avenues that they should have. Unfortunately, this bill does not contain any measures to address the systemic violence experienced by women in their communities.

Had the government truly considered their proposals, briefs and testimony, it would have introduced a completely different and much more effective bill.

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, given the fact that many first nations across Canada are watching how this debate is evolving, there is a great deal of frustration and a sense that the government did not go out of its way whatsoever to have legitimate, genuine consultation even though court rulings have directed the government to work with first nations.

My question is related to what the member started to talk about: the idea of the government bringing in time allocation on the bill, which is adding insult to injury. Could the member provide a perspective as to how that will be received by our first nations communities?

[Translation]

**Ms. Élaine Michaud:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question, which is similar to that of my colleague from Sherbrooke and which will allow me to speak more about the lack of respect for democracy that this government shows on a daily basis.

This is even more obvious now that we are approaching the end of the session. There are two or even three time allocation motions every day. Every time, we have to fight for our right to speak, a right stemming from our mandate.

I sincerely believe that first nations communities will be very disappointed with the government's attitude, which is once again reflected in the way in which the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development manages his file and speaks with first nations groups.

How he manages the file is symptomatic of how this government manages all issues that affect first nations. It does not consult very much, it does not really focus on coming up with real solutions to first nations' problems and it does not even address systemic problems. I have the feeling that the communities will be very disappointed with the results of the study of today's bill.

**Mr. Matthew Dubé (Chambly—Borduas, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier for sharing her time with me.

I want to begin by saying that I already know what to expect as criticism from the government in terms of our position on the bill. It is easy, because we have often heard it during question period and statements by members. The government accuses us of not giving any consideration to the rights of women on reserves.

I must admit that I think expressing that view is intellectually dishonest. The issue is much more complex than one where everything is either black or white: if you are against the bill, you are against women's rights, and if you support the bill, you support women's rights. This is ridiculous, and I think the members of the government are intelligent enough to understand the issue. At least I hope they are. It is a question of rights and legislation. We must therefore recognize the complexity that lies behind our opposition.

I would like to go back to the debate that we had earlier with the minister when the time allocation motion was adopted. I do not even know anymore how many time allocation motions there have been over the past few days, there have been so many. The number of gag orders and time allocation motions has been particularly high.

The minister answered one of my questions, and I heard other Conservative members reiterate the point that this is the third or fourth version of the bill, given the various versions that died on the order paper because of elections and so on.

Even though this is the third or fourth draft, what puzzles me is that the government still has not managed to strike the right note and achieve a result that reflects the consultations that were actually held. There were consultations held in the early 2000s. Things have changed a great deal since then.

A variety of reports have been tabled, and consultations were held in 2003, in 2005 and more recently in 2008. In reality, the situation is

constantly changing. I think we should hold consultations on a more regular basis, especially on this bill specifically.

The government is bringing in a bill. However, according to the presentations made by the first nations during the consultations, the bill falls short of its goals. It is therefore rather difficult to see it as the result of the work that was done. The people who were consulted are telling us that it is not.

Of course, this causes huge problems. In addition, it is representative of a failure to listen and a lack of rigour by the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development, as well as his troubling incompetence in this issue, as in so many others. We are aware of the major problems faced by first nations communities.

I would now like to come back to the issue of complexity. Frankly, I must say that I am offended, just as my colleagues must be, to be told every day, by a government that does absolutely nothing for women that we are opposed to women's rights just because we are opposed to the bill. I have to say it, especially in this very complicated context.

We in the NDP are very proud of the record number of women sitting in the House. Our caucus is made up of women who are very dynamic and very aware of the issues. Ever since I have been involved with this party, I have had the pleasure of learning a great deal about these issues.

The idea is that the bill proposes changes that will fill the legal void in the area of matrimonial rights. We need only look at the provincial civil codes and the federal government's responsibility to the first nations to appreciate this void.

For example, an aboriginal couple who are going through a divorce will not be able to properly deal with the situation or manage it from a legal standpoint. By introducing this bill, the government is making it look like it is doing something to address the problem but, at the end of the day, the bill is nothing but a talking point for press conferences, and does almost nothing concrete to help women in difficulty.

To begin with, there is no funding attached to the changes proposed in the bill, despite the fact that funding would give these people access to the legal resources they need to benefit from the changes proposed in the bill.

• (1235)

If the court is located too far from a reserve, it creates an additional financial burden. People who are unable to get assistance from a lawyer, or some form of legal aid, will need money to make the trip. They will need access to resources, and the bill does nothing in that regard. That is the first problem.

The other problem, which was raised on a number of occasions, pertains to determining the symptoms of the problem. In theory, the bill changes the act. However, in addition to the lack of resources, combatting violence against women is outside intended scope of the

First nations communities are experiencing poverty and shameful third world conditions. Obviously, we need to start somewhere, which is probably the intent of this bill. However, since it does nothing to achieve concrete results, provide adequate resources, or address related problems, it is difficult for us to support it.

We must not forget that the communities themselves appeared before the committee and made this observation. The Native Women's Association of Canada stressed that the problems I just listed are not going to go away and that, in certain cases, they may get worse. This bill is a way for the government to say that it has addressed the problem and that it has taken action. The government will, in all likelihood, use the bill as a pretext for taking no further action when, in fact, we know full well that there is still a great deal of work to be done, work that this government, unfortunately, does not seem prepared to do.

I would like to address another issue that I have already raised a number of times today in the House. It concerns the lack of resources and what the bill claims, in theory, to do. A number of aboriginal communities in Quebec have an important place in the Quebec nation. We are trying to work with them, and maintain a good relationship with them.

However, the Quebec Civil Code is very different from the common law system used in the other provinces. Lawyers testified in committee, and elsewhere, that the bill does not take this difference into account. In the provinces, especially in Quebec where the differences are substantial, procedures and rules already exist. The bill is a way of imposing the Conservative government's vision, and it does not take into consideration all of the issues I have mentioned. This creates a multitude of problems, and is a demonstration of bad faith.

I would like to conclude on this point. I talked about the minister's incompetence in this file. This is a common problem with this government, which has very fractious relationships with the provinces. Indeed, the Prime Minister never meets with the provincial premiers to talk about such issues as the economy.

However, this government has adopted the same attitude in its dealings with first nations. It does little things here and there so it can boast about it in front of the cameras, yet, according to testimony and what we see on the ground, these measures actually lead to very few concrete changes. My colleagues whose ridings include reserves are in a better position to testify to this than I am.

The government then has the nerve to show contempt for the people who organize to protest this paternalistic attitude. Take for example the minister's recent comments, which I will not repeat because of his unparliamentary language. His general approach and the way he treated some of my colleagues on the committee, including the member for Churchill, when discussing this issue show a certain contempt that does nothing to encourage good relations with communities that have gone through very difficult situations. The government should be bending over backwards to work better with them, but instead it is content to engage in public relations.

This is really unfortunate. There are too many problems in this bill for us to support it. We want to see more tangible, meaningful action. The government must recognize that this issue is much more

#### Government Orders

complex. We want the Conservatives to stop insulting us by saying that we do not respect women's rights. This is utterly false.

(1240)

This is why we oppose this bill.

[English]

Mrs. Susan Truppe (Parliamentary Secretary for Status of Women, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Bill S-2 is, first and foremost, about protecting women, men and children who live on reserve. Providing them with basic protections for matrimonial real property interests and rights is something that needs to be done now.

They can spin this any way they want, but the fact is that women on reserve need to have the same rights that he has, that his colleagues have and that I have. It is shameful that the members of the opposition would vote against rights to protect women and children in situations of family violence.

Why does the member think that aboriginal women should have less protection than his colleagues and we on this side of the House have?

**●** (1245)

[Translation]

**Mr. Matthew Dubé:** Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset, I was expecting these sorts of comments, which we have been hearing since this debate began.

We all agree on this issue. The government and the opposition parties agree that something must be done to improve the lives of aboriginal women. I find it reprehensible that the government is saying that we do not believe in women's rights simply because we want to have a debate on the complexities of changing the law. That kind of comment is completely unacceptable.

To respond to my colleague's question—for which I thank her—and to reiterate what I said in my speech, it is all well and good to change the law in theory, but the fact of the matter is that the resources are not there to allow women to benefit from these changes. It takes resources to hire a lawyer, use legal aid, go to court and make the legal challenges required to benefit from these laws—resources that these communities do not have.

That is what we heard from witnesses. It is not coming from me. That is what people from the communities and the members who represent them told us. We also heard it from the various associations that testified in committee and in public forums. That is why we have no qualms about opposing this bill.

Mr. François Lapointe (Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is rather disarming to see my colleague take the time to explain at length how unacceptable it is to be accused of not supporting women's rights because we disagree with the approach to this bill and the lack of resources to go with it. It is a bit like the regiments needing tanks and the government buying them minivans instead. We would vote against that because we would be buying minivans for soldiers who need tanks. The Conservatives would tell us that we are against the army. This tactic has gone so far and it is so low that I am sure that historians will look back on this in 10 or 15 years and remark how harmful this was to democratic debate.

I would like my young colleague to elaborate because he is a fine example of the future of democracy and parliamentary work in this country.

**Mr. Matthew Dubé:** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague. He described the problem perfectly. We have asked questions in the House on other issues affecting aboriginal communities and the answer we got from the various ministers concerned was that we did not respect women. That is nothing but rhetoric and demagoguery.

Based on the consultations we held and the testimony we heard from the people affected by the changes, we see that there are problems with the bill. We therefore come to the House to tell the government that the bill does not go far enough. We want to achieve the same objective that the government says it wants to achieve, except that we know that this bill will not help us do that. We want to propose better measures that will truly make life better for aboriginal women. This government has some nerve telling us that we are against women's rights, especially aboriginal women's rights.

We have seen this government's inaction and the contempt this minister has for the communities he is supposed to represent. We have no lessons to learn from this government.

I want to thank my colleague for his comments.

[English]

Hon. Leona Aglukkaq (Minister of Health, Minister of the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency and Minister for the Arctic Council, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the hon. member for Mississauga South.

As an aboriginal woman, I am pleased to have the opportunity today to speak about the importance of Bill S-2, the family homes on reserves and matrimonial interests or rights act.

The basic principle behind the legislation is very simple. It is about the equality of non-aboriginal people and aboriginal people when it comes to matrimonial rights. It is about access to the same basic legal protection for those living on and off reserve. Everywhere else in Canada there is a legal protection when a marriage or common law relationship breaks down or a spouse or a common law partner dies, except on reserves. Provincial legislation ensures that matrimonial real property assets are distributed equitably, for instance, and that children and spouses are protected, but there are no similar family laws to speak of in first nation communities.

Aboriginal women have been waiting for this legislation for a long time. It is simply appalling that this legislative gap still exists in Canada in 2013. They deserve to have the same rights as non-aboriginal people in Canada. Our government believes that Canadians should not be denied access to basic rights and protection simply because of where they live.

That is why our government is responding to the call of aboriginal women. Parliamentary committees, international bodies, even the Manitoba NDP, have called for urgent action to finally eliminate the long-standing legislative gaps that have caused much pain and indignity. As hon. members of the House must recognize, Bill S-2 does not simply speak to the principles of fairness, equality and respect. It will also have a direct and positive impact on people's day-to-day lives during a family crisis.

Bill S-2 would protect the right of married or common law couples living on reserve in the event of the breakup of their relationship or a death. It would provide an equitable division of matrimonial real property assets, and in the case of violent and abusive relationships, it would protect the spouse and children by authorizing the court to grant an individual spouse exclusive occupation of the family home. Until an appropriate matrimonial rights and interests law is in place, spouses or common law partners living on most reserves in Canada will have no legal protection and rights in the event of separation, a divorce, death or domestic violence.

In our great country, it is outrageous that there are still individuals, mostly women, who do not have the legal means to defend themselves in situations of spousal violence and who have limited rights when it comes to protecting their matrimonial real property and interests in the event of a marital breakdown.

As parliamentarians, we cannot and must not allow this state of affairs to continue any longer. Now is the time to act, because innocent women and children have suffered long enough and because we do not want this legislative gap to claim any more victims. Every day that goes by leaves thousands of aboriginal men, women and children across our country vulnerable and without the same protection as anyone else in the House takes for granted.

More than 25 years have passed since the 1986 landmark ruling in two cases: Paul v. Paul and Derrickson v. Derrickson. The Supreme Court of Canada ruled that provincial family law cannot be applied to homes and real estate on reserves. It is shameful that the opposition does not share this same sense of urgency in supporting legislation that would give these same rights and protections to aboriginal women and children who might otherwise be left homeless and poverty-stricken.

**●** (1250)

Consider that in a first nations community, when a marriage or a common-law relationship breaks down and an individual, usually a woman who is often accompanied by children, is forced from the home, she has no legal recourse. If the house is sold and the spouse retains all the proceeds, no court can help her.

Jennifer Courchene, a first nations woman, is one of those women who have suffered as a result of this legislative gap. She was evicted, with her children, from the family home by her husband. She told the standing committee on status of women that a judge wanted to help but his hands were tied. She lost the family home. Jennifer and her children needed, and rightly deserved, legal protection similar to what the law affords women who live off reserve.

Bill S-2 is designed to ensure that Canadians who live on reserve have similar matrimonial rights and protections to those who live off reserve. It would promote the safety of children and caregivers who experience family violence. It would give these women the same legal tools that help other Canadian women prevent and combat abuse and violence from spouses or common-law partners. Along with matrimonial real property rights, the bill would ensure continued access to the family home for women and their children after a marital breakup. Legal instruments, such as emergency protection orders and exclusive occupation orders, would also be available.

Parliament has spent ample time reviewing, amending and debating Bill S-2 and its previous legislation. The time for study and delay has passed. Now is the time to act.

The fact is that no one disputes the need for this legislation or criticizes the bill for what it does, which is finally filling a legislative gap that has existed for more than 25 years. It would provide individuals living on reserves with the same basic rights and protections as all other Canadians, yet instead of getting behind this bill, the opposition continues to oppose equality for all Canadian women, whether they be aboriginal or non-aboriginal. It continues to oppose the bill.

I would respectfully urge the members opposite to recognize the urgency of this situation, and to vote in support of this bill and for extending basic equal rights to thousands and thousands of aboriginal women, men and children.

**●** (1255)

[Translation]

**Ms. Élaine Michaud (Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I was very disappointed with the Minister of Health's attitude while my colleague from Chambly—Borduas and others were speaking.

The various disparaging remarks make me wonder if she really understands our overall position. I would like to know if she took that same attitude with the communities and the aboriginal women who wrote to the government and who appeared before the committee to say that this bill does not meet their needs and that it does not take into account the discrimination faced by the women in these communities.

I want to know if she was that closed-minded towards the women who are calling on the government to truly help them.

[English]

Hon. Leona Aglukkaq: Mr. Speaker, a great day in history in Canada was in 1921, when Canadian women were able to vote in federal elections. Unfortunately, that did not apply to aboriginal people. In 1960, under a Conservative government, the Prime Minister introduced the legislation that would allow all aboriginal people to be able to vote.

I find it very hard to believe that today I stand in this House as an aboriginal person debating the rights of aboriginal women and non-aboriginal women. I find it absolutely shocking to be debating this issue with a fellow woman. We need to pass this legislation and address the gap between non-aboriginal women and aboriginal women when it comes to matrimonial rights and property.

#### Government Orders

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I do not question that this is, indeed, an important issue. Having said that, I would have loved the opportunity to ask the minister a wide variety of questions on health care, given that she is the Minister of Health.

**(1300)** 

Hon. Leona Aglukkaq: By all means.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: That is a tough one to resist, but I will.

The issue before us is one in which the government has brought forward pieces of legislation that ultimately have a significant impact on first nations. We have seen court rulings that have indicated that there is an obligation for the government to work with our first nations in trying to build consensus. Could the member provide assurances to the House that a majority of first nations are supporting the initiative that the government is now proposing?

**Hon. Leona Aglukkaq:** Mr. Speaker, as I stated earlier in my comments, this bill is very simple. It would make matrimonial law applicable to aboriginal people as it is to non-aboriginal people.

Members can cloud the issue with all the excuses they want, whether it be infrastructure or not enough resources here and there. They can cloud the issue with all kinds of excuses, but the fact of the matter is that this is about aboriginal women having the same matrimonial rights as non-aboriginal women. I urge NDP members, their leader, and Liberal Party members to vote in support of addressing the gap between aboriginal women and non-aboriginal Canadians on the issue of matrimonial rights.

The bill is very simple. Opposition members need to stop coming up with excuses for why they cannot support the rights of aboriginal women and support this legislation immediately.

**Mrs. Stella Ambler (Mississauga South, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege today to speak in support of Bill S-2, the family homes on reserves and matrimonial interests or rights act.

The legislation before us has been crafted to meet the specific challenges presented by the fact that over two decades ago the Supreme Court ruled that provincial or territorial matrimonial real property does not apply to first nations reserve lands.

I feel particularly proud as a member of both the parliamentary Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development and the Standing Committee on the Status of Women. That is the committee that was fortunate enough to hear about this bill in detail and to hear from some of the victims and those people who supported the bill. We also heard from those in opposition to the bill. I want to address some of those comments, which I am hearing today from the opposition as well.

I find it shameful that there are people in this House who would not vote for this bill. It addresses a long-standing legislative gap with regard to matrimonial property rights. As the Minister of Health just stated, this is long overdue.

I want to talk about a mechanism in the bill that would provide for courts of law to apply matrimonial real property laws on reserve where there are none.

Specifically, I want to talk about the fact that first nations could develop their own laws if they so wish. They could do that while meeting the specific needs of their communities. First nations could determine the content themselves with the help of their councils and leadership. What they would need to do is earn the majority support among eligible members in a public vote. This process is public and out in the open. That is a very important provision in the bill.

Another important provision is the 12-month transition period that was added in direct response to a request from first nations to have it built in. We know that many first nations are quite advanced in developing their own laws, so this allows them a 12-month period to do so before the provisional federal rules would take place. If that is the case, 12 months after Bill S-2 comes into force, the provisional federal rules would come into effect so that those communities that had yet to enact a law of their own under Bill S-2 or some other legislation such as the First Nations Land Management Act would also have a law on this subject. All first nations citizens would have access to the same protections and rights as I and other Canadians have, regardless of where they live in Canada. This is the right thing for us to do.

It is important to recognize that Bill S-2 would not require first nations to enact laws that are identical to the federal rules. To do so would essentially defeat much of the collaborative work that has gone into the proposed legislation, which is years of analysis, consultation and engagement.

Through these collaborative efforts, a clear consensus emerged that first nations must be able to develop their own laws on the issue if they so wish. It is impossible to overestimate the value of this provision. First nations could enact laws tailored to their needs and cultural traditions. As an example of how a first nation could personalize the law, it could grant a role to a council of elders to resolve disputes.

In the case where a first nation does not pass its own laws related to matrimonial real property, the bill would provide for the application of provisional federal rules. That would be fine too. First and foremost, these federal rules are designed to protect individuals who have far too often been victimized by the lack of relevant law, particularly women and children. The federal rules would provide spouses or common-law partners with an equal entitlement to occupy the family home. Should the relationship end, each spouse or partner would be entitled to equal shares of the value of all matrimonial interests and rights, including the family home. The rules would also ensure that the family home could not be sold or remortgaged without the consent of both spouses or partners.

**•** (1305)

These provisions would prevent a scenario that has become all too common in recent years: one partner or spouse sells the family home and keeps the proceeds, leaving the other partner or spouse impoverished and homeless.

We heard this situation time and again in the status of women committee. It was heartbreaking to hear these women. Their lives will never be the same. Some of them are still paying their fair share of this family home that they have been thrown out of by their former partners. It is shocking. It really is. I want to talk about two other provisions in the bill that would do much to protect family members when there is violence as well.

The first involves emergency protection orders. We have heard the Minister for Status of Women talk about these provisions often, because she knows how effective they would be in dealing with this issue. Specifically, the order would be issued by a court and would be enforceable by police or peace officers. It would exclude a spouse or common-law partner from the family home for up to 90 days, with the possibility of an extension if necessary. The orders would be made in urgent situations when violence has occurred or is imminent.

A second and similar instrument would be the exclusive occupation order, also in the bill. This would again be fully a enforceable court order that excludes a spouse or partner from the family home for a specified term.

In both cases, the excluded spouse or common-law partner would be able to contest the order in court.

Also, the federal rules proposed in Bill S-2 would address the often difficult issue of who can occupy the family home after a spouse or common-law partner passes away. As unfair as it seems, there have been cases in which a widower has been forced out of the home upon the death of his wife. Therefore, under this proposed federal regime, the surviving spouse or common-law partner could remain in the home for at least 180 days.

The government believes that what has been proposed would also balance individual rights and interests with collective rights of first nations. Bill S-2 stipulates that a first nation would have the right to make representation to the court on its collective rights on its reserve land as well as on any relevant cultural, social or legal matters not relevant to a case heard under the federal rules. This provision would not apply, however, in cases involving emergency or confidentiality orders, which I believe is entirely appropriate, given that emergency orders can sometimes involve life-threatening situations.

I believe that there is built into this bill respect for the collective rights of first nations. For example, non-members would not be allowed to acquire permanent interests in reserve land, nor would they be able to benefit from the value or appreciation of that land.

There would be one exception, which is that if a non-member has contributed to the improvement of the land that he or she held together with a former spouse, that person may be entitled to some compensation. That entitlement would apply only to improvements, not to the original value of the land.

Finally, this is the fourth version of a bill that has come before Parliament on this issue. Bill S-2 includes amendments, making the previous bills even better, and of course extensive consultation took place.

I echo the words of the Minister of Health when I say that it is time to stop debating this issue and time to take action. It is time to pass this bill.

The legislative gap has hurt families and entire communities, and there have been individuals on first nations for more than 25 years without the same rights that I and other members enjoy. Let us stop the pain and suffering caused by this legislative gap. This pain and suffering can often lead to homelessness and poverty. Again, this measure is long overdue. I urge my colleagues on all sides of the House to join me in supporting this legislation, Bill S-2.

**●** (1310)

[Translation]

Ms. Isabelle Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to my colleague's speech.

After boasting that this is the fourth version of the bill, and that it has been improved, she ended her speech by saying that it is time to stop debating this bill.

If this is the fourth time that this bill has been improved, it must not have been very good to begin with, and additional improvements may be needed.

The Conservatives say that they consulted extensively. However, I do not think that they listened to people. I do not believe that they used these consultations to improve the bill enough. A number of aboriginal groups still do not support it because it does not really apply to their situation.

I am wondering how the member can say that this is the fourth time they have introduced this bill, that they have continually improved it and that they now have to hurry up, stop the debate and pass it as quickly as possible. This approach does not make much sense to me.

Can my colleague explain her position? I do not understand it. [English]

**Mrs. Stella Ambler:** Mr. Speaker, I think 20 or 25 years to debate an issue like this one, which would grant aboriginal women the same rights that I and the member opposite have and take for granted, is too long.

That said, there has been a lot of consultation on the bill. I could tell members about the consultation that began in 2005 and consisted of four phases, including national consultation, consensus-building and engagement on draft legislation. Organizations were provided with over \$8 million in total to conduct these consultations, but more important, I think, is that many people on reserve—many first nations leaders and many aboriginal men and women—support the legislation. I will tell members more about them if I get a chance to answer the next question.

Mr. David Sweet (Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—West-dale, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have a specific technical question for the member.

Bill S-2 seeks to extend matrimonial real property rights and interests and access to emergency protection orders and occupation orders to individuals living on reserve.

While some have called the bill paternalistic, it would provide first nations with the ability to enact legislation on the topic of matrimonial real property rights that could be legally upheld in court.

#### Government Orders

Would you please provide us with more information about how Bill S-2 would enable first nations to enact their own laws on the topic of on-reserve matrimonial property rights?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): I will not provide that to the hon. member, but perhaps the hon. member for Mississauga South would.

**Mrs. Stella Ambler:** Mr. Speaker, I know we have talked about this and I know how much the member cares about the issue and wants it to be resolved. I am so pleased that he will be supporting the bill

I want to thank him for that question because I want to say that this is about respect. It is respect for first nations to be able to develop their own laws on this subject.

However, it also means that this government, through this bill, is respecting cultural differences and respecting any social traditions or cultural traditions that first nations want to incorporate into their own legislation. It does that as well. It is because we recognize that there is diversity among first nations that we would have this 12-month transition period, for example, so that they can do exactly that and implement the best law for their own communities.

However, I mainly want to tell the member about Rolanda Manitowabi, who came to the status of women committee and said:

...my son and I were thrown out of the house. I had no place to go. I was in a crisis. ... This legislation would have helped...and it would have considered the impacts on my son. I hope it's available to help other women and children on reserves.

• (1315)

[Translation]

**Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault (Sherbrooke, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I would first of all like to say that I will be sharing my time with the brilliant, the incomparable and the irreplaceable member for Nickel Belt. He will have half of my speaking time.

Bill S-2 comes from the Senate, hence the "S" before the bill number. This means that the process was started in the Senate. I will not be spending too much time talking about the Senate and whether or not it has a role to play here. I think everybody already knows the NDP's position on this issue.

I think that it is the elected officials in the House of Commons who should put forward bills as often as possible. This bill has already appeared in other forms in previous Parliaments. The Senate took it up again, probably at the request of the government, for reasons that I have not yet figured out. In my view, it is the right of elected officials to introduce bills.

Unfortunately, there is an additional process. We always have to send our bills to the Senate, which spends thousands—if not millions—of dollars to do just about the same job as we do here, that is, to study bills.

Frequently, the other chamber hears the same witnesses and conducts the same studies as we do. I will not elaborate much on this, because I know it is not the point today. However, I would simply like to point out that every time we consider a bill that starts with the letter "S", it means that it was introduced in the Senate.

As I was saying earlier, this is the fourth version of a piece of legislation that the Conservatives have been trying to get through Parliament since 2008. The NDP has opposed each one of these bills when they have come up for debate. This is nothing new.

The Conservatives are showing their ideological blindness. They seem to hide behind their ideology and they do not seem to understand common sense, the truth or the arguments that we put forward. They seem to be caught in their own ideology and cannot get out of it, unfortunately, even though we try to make them see reason with our speeches.

Today, the point of my speech is to show the government the many flaws in the bill and help the government understand why parliamentarians should not vote in favour of the bill in its current form.

A number of people have already spoken about the bill, primarily in committee or here in the House of Commons. As I said earlier, these are essentially the same people who go to the Senate to present their point of view.

Opinion on the bill is far from unanimous. It seems that the objective of the bill is a good and laudable one. All members in the House are in favour of equal rights for women, whether they live on reserves or elsewhere. No one opposes that laudable objective. However, since the present bill is flawed, it will improve the situation only slightly, if at all. That is why a number of people, a number of experts who live in these aboriginal communities every day, made presentations and came out against the bill.

When the government wants to propose legislation and make decisions, it absolutely has to initiate negotiations or hold consultations. The government did hold a few consultations regarding earlier bills, but unfortunately, no consultations were held regarding Bill S-2, which we are discussing today, although it is very similar to the earlier bills.

In spite of all the consultations, it seems that the testimony of the people who expressed their views has not been taken into consideration. In committee, they said the bill had problems and they therefore could not support it. I will come back to the more specific positions taken by certain witnesses later.

#### (1320)

Another somewhat more technical thing caught my attention. In this version, the bill concerning first nations matrimonial real property has a lower ratification threshold. In the previous bills that tried to do the same thing as Bill S-2, a majority of band members had to vote for the law, that is, 50% plus one. In the present version, Bill S-2, the law must be approved by a simple majority of those who voted, with a participation rate of at least 25% of eligible voters. This is a slight change and is relatively difficult to find, but it is rather important. The ratification threshold has been lowered from 50% to 25%. That is really quite surprising. Is it because the Conservatives are afraid of the results? Are they afraid of what the

first nations will be deciding in their own democratic bodies? I offer that as a possibility.

There are other reasons why the NDP opposes this bill. In fact, all of the leading first nations organizations, whose members will be affected by this bill, do not support it because they do not think it will succeed in protecting women against violence. It also infringes on the inherent rights of female first nations members. I am not the one saying that; first nations organizations are saying it.

Those organizations oppose this bill for several reasons. We could mention the lack of financial resources to help first nations governments implement the law or the lack of funding for lawyers or to take into account limited access to provincial courts, for geographic reasons. That is an important point, because aboriginal communities are often in remote areas and what the bill is trying to do is not as simple as the government might think. Sometimes, it seems to be a simplistic solution to a much more complex problem, particularly for aboriginal communities in very remote areas.

We could also talk about the lack of housing on the reserves and the lack of the land that would be needed to provide both spouses with separate houses on the reserves. We could talk about the lack of capacity to implement the law, particularly in remote areas, as I was saying. We can also see the lack of provincial courts that are capable of managing the complexity of the reserves' land codes and the lack of funding to help women who have to buy their shares back from their partners when they are given access to the house. There is also the lack of resources for alternative dispute resolution mechanisms and the lack of extra housing on the reserves.

I have listed several reasons why first nations organizations have criticized Bill S-2. They are also reasons why we, as a party and as the official opposition in the House of Commons, have to oppose this bill.

Once again, the Conservatives are taking a paternalistic, confrontational approach to impose their legislative agenda. That is why the NDP will not support any bill concerning matrimonial real property unless it is accompanied by non-legislative measures to solve these serious problems. What needs to be done includes providing speedy access to remedies; ending violence against aboriginal women by developing a national action plan; managing the housing crisis on reserves and funding shelters for women; providing better access to justice, including increased funding for legal aid; increasing financial resources to help first nations governments enforce the law; and providing better access to alternative dispute resolution methods.

These are all reasons why we cannot support this bill. Legislation alone is not what is needed; measures that go beyond legislation, meaningful measures to help all first nations with their everyday reality, are also called for.

The Native Women's Association of Canada, the Assembly of First Nations and the national aboriginal women's summit are all organizations that have very strongly criticized the bill brought in by this Conservative government, which is congratulating itself today on listening to the first nations when we can clearly see that the responses show the opposite to be true.

**●** (1325)

[English]

Mr. David Sweet (Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—West-dale, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have listened intently all morning, and now into the afternoon, to members across the way regarding this bill. For years, there have been a number of iterations of the bill. It has been in the public domain and throughout the aboriginal community. There have been 103 consultation sessions in 76 different locations, but members across the way constantly say that we have not listened with regard the bill. I do not understand how they could sit through 15 hours of committee with witnesses clearly saying that the legislation would have saved them their home, from being out on the street with their kids. They continually rationalize why they will vote against it.

Those members keep trying to say that, yes, they are for aboriginal women's rights, but that there are all these technicalities, yet they offered no amendments at all at committee.

Those members need to come clean with the real reason or get onside. Do the right thing and support the legislation so women on reserve can have the same rights as the rest of the women in Canada. [*Translation*]

**Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question.

Perhaps he misunderstood what I said. I stated that the government had indeed held consultations and that I gave it due credit. However, if it had conducted them properly and then understood what was said during those consultations, the bill would never have taken its current form. Aboriginal groups are criticizing the current bill.

Even though the Conservatives held consultations, they did not listen to what was said in these consultations. We listened. We listened to what the groups said, and that is why we are taking this stand today.

In fact, the bill is well intentioned. I am for equal rights for all women in the country, no matter where they are. However, in reality, the current bill does not address this concern properly.

The NDP proposed four amendments in committee to try to improve this situation. Regrettably, the Conservatives refused to listen. Much as the NDP wanted to change the bill for the better and maybe then support it, the Conservatives did not listen. The government consistently opposes anything that comes from the opposition parties.

**Mr. Pierre Jacob (Brome—Missisquoi, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for Sherbrooke who, with calm strength, gave a great speech.

The member opposite spoke about witnesses in committee. I would like the member for Sherbrooke to comment on this short

#### Government Orders

quote from a specific witness, namely David Langtry, the acting chief commissioner of the Canadian Human Rights Commission. He said:

Although the measure is meant to be temporary [of course], many first nations lack the financial and human resources to develop effective dispute resolution systems. This is part of a larger issue.

**•** (1330)

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for the question.

During my speech, I did not have time to get to this very important point. This legislative measure will take effect in 12 months. Through an amendment, which was rejected, we tried to change this time period to three years in order to allow first nations to have their own measures in their respective bands and decide for themselves how to proceed.

Unfortunately, most of the witnesses said that these places did not have any resources to implement internal measures within the various bands in order to improve the situation.

In my opinion, this is inconsistent with our current laws, which call for consultation first and for aboriginal reserves to be masters of their own laws. Bill S-2 would come into effect on all the reserves after one year, and they will not have made any decisions on their own internal measures.

There are serious constitutional problems, according to one of the witnesses that the hon. member for Brome—Missisquoi alluded to.

[English]

**Mr. Claude Gravelle (Nickel Belt, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I am happy to speak to Bill S-2, an act respecting family homes situated on First Nation reserves and matrimonial interests or rights in or to structures and lands situated on those reserves.

My party is opposed to Bill S-2, now at third reading stage. I will give context to the bill, my debate and my contribution.

There are four first nations communities in my riding.

The first one, Nipissing First Nation, is situated between Sturgeon Falls and North Bay along Highway 17 east, and the chief is Marianna Couchie. I specifically will be quoting Chief Couchie later on in my speech because she is the only female chief in my riding. Members will find what she has to say about Bill S-2 very interesting.

The Nipissing First Nation is a good and very modern reserve. There are a lot of small businesses and some very nice land situated along Lake Nipissing. It is a very progressive first nation.

Another first nation community is the Wahnapitae First Nation, and the chief is Ted Roque. It is situated along Lake Wahnapitae in the riding of Nickel Belt. It works very closely with the mining companies on its land or close to it. It does the water monitoring for the mining companies. The first nation hires some of its own people to do the work, to monitor the water in its reserve or close to it.

The third first nation community in my riding is the Whitefish Lake First Nation, located in Naughton, on Highway 17 west. The chief of that first nation is Steve Miller. Again, it is a very progressive first nation. It is building homes, a subdivision, with the help of Mike Holmes, the famous builder we see on television regularly building energy-efficient homes.

The last first nation community in my riding is the Mattagami First Nation and it is situated on Highway 144 west, next to Gogama. Its chief is Walter Naveau. The Mattagami First Nation is also very progressive and it has an agreement with a mining company, IAMGOLD, which is developing an open pit on its traditional land. The first nation has signed an agreement with this company, which is probably one of the best agreements signed with first nations and a mining company. The Mattagami First Nation will be helping with the development of this open pit.

With respect to this legislation, I will read what Chief Couchie from Nipissing First Nation had to say. She emailed me some information about matrimonial homes last night. She said:

#### **●** (1335)

There are some certainties that NFN would like to ensure. We already have our own Matrimonial Rights Property policy in place, that occured quite a few years ago around 2004. (I am concerned about) Will this new Bill have an impact on our Existing MRP Policy?

When we enacted our MRP two matters were of precedent.

- 1. The safe guarding of the right to preserve for ever our Land.
- 2. In our Policy/Act the children if they have status own the family home and which ever parent is prepared to raise the children in the family home can do so.

That means that if the mother is a non-native and the father is native, the mother, if she so wishes, can raise the kids in the family home. Chief Couchie continued:

Implicit in the 2nd matter is that if this is a marriage of a Status man and a non Status women. It the non-Status women is going to raise the child or children then she has the right to live in the matrimony home. This woman can never gain control of the land of the house, both have to be transferred in the name of the child or children).

#### Chief Couchie concluded:

I do, and others at the Nation, worry that the Bill is just another tactic to take our land; our Homeland!

This current government is trying in every way it can to under mine our Treaty and Inherent Rights.

The Conservative government still views First Nation peoples as "a problem".

The Fundamental question is when will the government stop undermining our Rights and start to recognize that we have rights enshrined in Laws and Treaties. They should just change their plans and leave our lands and Rights alone.

It would be even better if the government entered in to a truly respectful dialogue.

With respect to this legislation and how the Conservative government treats first nations, I have said it before and I will say it again. We, as a country, need to get this relationship right. Until we do, we cannot move forward in any meaningful way as a country. The Conservative government's failure to consult and to recognize treaties and rights continues to be the stumbling block to progress.

As important as apologies are for wrong past behaviour, there is no real walking the walk with the Conservative government on these matters. Despite several good reports, consultations and previous legislation, the government fails to listen here.

The federal Conservatives went to the trouble of consulting with first nations and the Native Women's Association of Canada on matrimonial real property, but ignored the results of the consultation when preparing the original legislation. While this iteration of the bill removes some of the most onerous parts of previous legislation attempts, it still refuses to recognize first nations' inherent rights and jurisdiction in this matter.

The opposition to this legislation should give the government pause to consider moving forward. There is opposition from the Native Women's Association of Canada and the Assembly of First Nations. There is opposition from many nations across the country.

Listen to Ms. Jennifer Courchene, in testimony to Parliament on April 30, 2013:

I'm not sure about the politics of this legislation, this bill. I just know that there should be something in place to help. I'm sure I'm not the only one who has gone through this in a first nation community. There are probably many, many other women who have gone through what I've gone through, and the story is pretty much the same: the woman loses the home. I'm not sure how other first nations communities are run, but if there had been something to help us, we would have taken it, rather than be homeless, that's for sure.

This legislation and the recent budget would not provide any of the necessary resources to take care of the fundamental problem. Bill S-2 is the fourth version of similar legislation that the Conservatives have tried to pass since 2008. The NDP has opposed these every time they came up for debate.

There are fundamental principles that need to be adhered to in addressing matrimonial rights and interests on reserve. Unfortunately, I will not have time to name all of these concerns from the Assembly of First Nations, Mr. Speaker, because you have given me the one minute signal, so I would be happy to answer any questions.

**●** (1340)

Mr. Greg Rickford (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development, for the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency and for the Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for his speech today, as difficult as it is for me to appreciate.

Notwithstanding the fact that the four reserves in his riding that he mentioned are progressive communities, there are hundreds of first nations communities in isolated and remote regions of Canada and many in northern Ontario that do not have access to some of the economic development that his communities have. By way of extension, we run into some very serious problems as they relate to MRP, two of them.

I have grappled with this legislation professionally in my capacity as a nurse working in first nations communities, particularly the isolated ones, and as legal counsel. I fail to understand in any measurable way who would have as compelling and substantive a debate against at least two of the features in this bill. They are the emergency protection orders and the occupation orders. The member himself quoted somebody in his speech who was vulnerable for those very reasons, in fact, if we break down what she was saying.

Can the member rise in the House today and explain to us why he is against emergency protection and occupation orders, very basic and urgent rights that occur at a very vulnerable time for many Canadian aboriginal women, who do not have those rights that other women do in other parts of Canada? I cannot understand it.

**Mr. Claude Gravelle:** Mr. Speaker, I know the member cannot understand, and I am not surprised.

The fundamental principles outlined by the Assembly of First Nations on the problem with this bill include "recognition of first nations' jurisdiction". That is what we have to do. We have to recognize their jurisdiction. We have to do more than just talk to them. We have to listen to the first nations. We have to stop telling them what they want and start to listen to them when they tell us what they want. That is what we have to do.

The other problem with the bill is access to justice dispute resolution and remedies. This bill does not have that. It also does not address underlying issues such as access to housing and economic security.

Mrs. Carol Hughes (Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapuskasing, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we hear lots of rhetoric from the other side, but in fact Conservatives did not consult with the first nations, and this is the problem with this bill.

I have a letter from Chief Shining Turtle dated November 9, 2012. I know he has written other letters since, but I picked this one. He says:

Most recently, Indian Affairs has provided an option for Bands to opt in or out of 4 year terms for Chief and Council. Reflecting upon this further, Indian Affairs can amend Bill S-2 to allow Indian bands like Whitefish River that have an MRP law to be exempt from this hideous piece of legislation.

In another letter he wrote to the minister, he went on to talk about the following:

You directed in writing to have your department staff set up to meet with us and this has not occurred nor have your staff attempted to set up any meeting with us on MRP

I can tell members that the chief invited government members to his community, and there was no response.

He further stated:

I will now remind you and your staff that this act undermines the Supreme Court decisions in this Country. In Sparrow, the Crown must have demonstrated accommodation of Aboriginal views and concerns.

The bill does not.

Again, maybe my colleague can remind the government of its duty to consult and the inherent rights of first nations to be respected.

• (1345)

Mr. Claude Cravelle: Mr. Speaker, Lwoul

**Mr. Claude Gravelle:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell my hon. colleague that the Conservative government does not believe that the duty to consult exists, even though there was a court case on it.

I did not have time in my opening remarks to thank the MP for Nanaimo—Cowichan for all of the excellent work she has done on this bill. I also know that my colleague from Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapuskasing does a lot of work for the first nations in her riding.

I know the Minister of Health speaks to a lot of first nations and first nations women, but I want to quote one of her answers a while ago. She stated:

I find it very hard to believe that today I stand in this House as an aboriginal person debating the rights of aboriginal women and non-aboriginal women.

What a shame that the Minister of Health, an aboriginal herself, would find that other people cannot speak for aboriginal people.

Ms. Candice Bergen (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time today with the member for Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar.

I want to take a few minutes as I begin to speak on Bill S-2, the bill that would give real matrimonial property rights to aboriginal women and men living on reserves, and talk a little about why this bill is so important to me personally.

I get very emotional whenever I stand to speak about this. I feel very passionate about it. My granddaughter, Arcaydia Faith, is a baby girl of just over a year old, and she is of aboriginal descent. My son's girlfriend, a beautiful young aboriginal woman named Tamara, is a status Indian. When I look at my granddaughter, Arcaydia, and I look at her beautiful mother, Tamara, who together with my son are trying to build their lives, and I realize that my granddaughter and her mother do not have the same rights as I do as a Canadian woman just because they are born as status Indian women, it saddens and troubles me, and it literally breaks my heart.

It breaks my heart not just for these two aboriginal women who are part of my family but, more importantly, for the tens of thousands of aboriginal women and, frankly, men who are victimized over and over again because of who they are and because of their Canadian status.

When I speak about this issue and when I hear the opposition say it is not aboriginal women talking about aboriginal rights, as Canadians we do not accept that argument anymore. We are here, standing up for those who nobody else will stand up for.

On this side of the House we are standing up for them, and as a grandmother and as a mother, I am standing up for my aboriginal granddaughter and her mother. I am very proud to do so. I will do it for as long as I can, until we see the same rights that are afforded to every other Canadian afforded to aboriginal people.

As well, I want to say this does trouble me. I have a lot of respect for many of the opposition members who I believe are here for very solid and good reasons, but it does sadden me deeply when they oppose this legislation. I think if they looked at themselves in the mirror, they would know they do not have any good reason to oppose it.

I will also say I am very disappointed there has not been more coverage of this issue in the media. I do panels, almost on a weekly basis. I do news panels on the RCMP. I do news panels on prisoners and all kinds of very interesting topics. Why are we not doing panels and why are we not talking about Bill S-2 and the rights of aboriginal women?

We should be talking about this day and night for the next several weeks. We should have been talking about this. I am troubled. I think it begs the question that maybe we all have to look in the mirror. Why is it that aboriginal women in this country deserve to be virtually ignored not only by the media but sadly also by the opposition who I believe are here for the right reasons?

I challenge the opposition members to stand up and have the courage to maybe vote against their leader, maybe vote against their party, and do the right thing and support aboriginal women and the rights of aboriginal women on reserve.

I do want to take few moments to talk about what our government has done in terms of consultation. I think it is important that we look at the statistics on what aboriginal women face.

Approximately 15% of aboriginal women in 2009, in a marriage or with a common-law partner, reported that they had experienced spousal violence in the 5 previous years. This is a very serious and relevant issue. Of those who had been victimized, 58% reported that they had sustained an injury, compared to 41% of non-aboriginal women. Further, 48% reported that they had been sexually assaulted, beaten, choked or threatened with a weapon, and 52% of aboriginal women reported they felt threatened and feared for their lives.

Bill S-2 is designed to address this very real need in first nations communities for fair matrimonial rights and interests. It proposes not only to protect today's victims but also to prevent similar injustices from occurring in the future.

Bill S-2 and its implementation plan have been meticulously developed to take into account the realities of life on first nations reserves. For example, due to the remoteness of many first nations communities, the regulations under this legislation would enable an individual to secure an emergency protection order by telephone, email or fax.

Right now they could be crying for help, they could be phoning, and there is no protection order for them. Not only would this bill bring in the ability for a protection order, but it could actually be acquired by telephone, email or fax for emergency protection. Bill S-2 would also authorize a peace officer or other appropriate person to apply on behalf of a spouse or common-law partner, again providing that support that is so needed in times of crisis.

#### **(1350)**

In addition, the government plans to support the implementation of the legislation through education and training. Front-line police officers would be given tools, policies and training to effectively enforce relevant laws governing matrimonial property rights. Education material and opportunities are also planned for provincial and territorial superior court judges. This would provide judges with a clear understanding of relevant on-reserve social issues, along with Bill S-2 and first nation laws.

There is a two-part phased-in approach proposed for the implementation of Bill S-2. The first part would allow courts to apply first nations' laws. This is very important and something that we recognize. The second part is a provisional federal regime that would apply to those communities that have yet to develop laws related to matrimonial rights and interests. The federal regime would not take effect until 12 months after Bill S-2 becomes law. The end result, however, would be that laws that protect the matrimonial rights and interests of all Canadians, aboriginal or non-aboriginal, regardless of where they live, would occur.

Some first nations currently deal with family violence issues by bringing an independent third party into the household to help resolve disputes, and their laws would continue this process. First nations would be free to create laws that align with their traditions and cultures. Laws developed under the mechanism proposed in Bill S-2 must satisfy only a few criteria. They must be endorsed by a majority of members in a free and open referendum, and they must respect the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the Canadian Human Rights Act.

I do not think anyone could argue that aboriginal people should not have the same rights that we enjoy under the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms or under the Canadian Human Rights Act. To suggest the opposite, some would say is not only unfair but extremely discriminatory.

To support this empowering and culturally sensitive approach, our government would fund the creation of a centre of excellence for matrimonial real property. With the centre of excellence, first nation communities would have support and resources as they draft their own regimes. During its life cycle the centre of excellence would become an important resource to synthesize important tools, communications and research activities, and assist first nation communities and organizations in the development and application of the new legislation.

In addition to its critical role as a central resource, the centre of excellence would be supported by an advisory committee comprised of key stakeholders, such as the Government of Canada, aboriginal organizations, non-governmental organizations and centre of excellence staff. The committee would provide non-binding guidance on the direction of the centre in such areas as research and implementation related activities.

By endorsing Bill S-2 we could close this deplorable legislative gap and start the real and necessary work required to prevent the gap from claiming new victims, while putting an end to the pain and suffering that countless children and women are currently experiencing. It is time that all Canadians, regardless of where they happen to live, have access to a process to help them receive protection from domestic violence and abuse.

Clearly, Bill S-2 would provide first nations women with rights and protections in situations of domestic abuse. It is an essential part of any effective solution of violence against women and children. We talk about that so much in the House, whether it is murdered or missing aboriginal women, or violence against women and young girls in other parts of Canada. This is a very direct thing that we can do to help women on reserve.

I hear words like "we need to consult" and "culturally appropriate" and "treaty rights". All of those things are extremely important, but imagine a young aboriginal woman having someone look her in the eye and say, "You don't have the same rights as every other Canadian because of who you are, because of your ethnicity, because you were born a status Indian and in Canada we are not going to protect that".

That is what the opposition is saying. I ask them to reconsider and to pass this. We are going to do everything we can to pass the bill. I think we have the votes to do it, but more importantly, what a wonderful strong message it would send to aboriginal women if the opposition stood together with us and as one Parliament of Canada we support it and say, "Aboriginal women, we are here for you. We will not turn our backs on you, no matter what opposition we have". I ask the opposition to do that.

#### **(1355)**

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): Before I go to questions and comments I just want to remind all hon. members that if they want to ask a question they ought to wait until the speech is over as opposed to standing several minutes in advance in order to hopefully catch the eye of the Speaker.

Having said that, questions and comments, the hon. member for Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapuskasing.

Mrs. Carol Hughes (Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapuskasing, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the member said that consultation is important but that there are other avenues. According to the law and the inherent rights of first nations, it is a mandate for the government to consult. So again, let me remind her about Chief Shining Turtle from Whitefish River First Nation. He said:

While MRP laws may be needed for a handful of First Nation communities, what is desperately needed is capacity building and funding to support First Nations to work with their communities to come up with their own laws and local dispute resolution mechanism—we already know from residential schools how things turn out when Canada imposes its own views on Aboriginal peoples.

Again, here is a community that has had matrimonial real property legislation already in place within the community. Why is it that the Conservative government does not just provide capacity and resources to other first nations who are in need, because there are a lot of first nations that already have that?

**Ms. Candice Bergen:** Mr. Speaker, this is what I continually hear from the opposition on this matter, a bunch of mumbo-jumbo. Instead of talking about—

Mrs. Carol Hughes: Chief Shining Turtle of a first nation.

**Ms. Candice Bergen:** The chief the hon. colleague was talking about, if she is a woman, would like to have the same rights as I have as a non-aboriginal woman. Let us talk about basic human rights. As a woman or a man in Canada, I am free from violence. I am free to

#### Government Orders

acquire assets and if I go through a divorce, I actually can have half of those assets. The law makes sure that happens.

Why will that member not stand and instead of just talking a bunch of talking points and bureaucratic mumbo-jumbo, actually stand up for women in this country who live on reserves and happen to be born as status Indians. They should have the same rights as I have as a non-aboriginal woman.

**Mr. Marc Garneau (Westmount—Ville-Marie, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is one thing to debate a bill and we are to debate a bill on its own merits, but the sanctimony and hypocrisy coming from that side of the House is mind-boggling.

The member said let us look at ourselves in the mirror. Let me remind her, this bill started off as Bill C-47. What happened to it? It died on the order paper because the Prime Minister called a sudden election in 2008. It came back as Bill C-8. It died again on the order paper. Why? Because the government prorogued in December 2009. It came back again, this time as Bill S-4. They had seven months and the Conservatives did not do a thing with it. It came back as Bill S-2 in May 2011. It has been there almost two years. What did they do?

Now we are in a big rush. What does the government have to say about the priority of the bill?

#### **●** (1400)

**Ms. Candice Bergen:** Mr. Speaker, what the hon. colleague clearly did not hear is that this is actually very personal to me. My granddaughter is a member of the first nations. Her mom is a status Indian. I only speak for two Indian women in this country, but there are tens of thousands of Indian women who deserve the same rights as we do sitting here as non-aboriginal women.

The member can holler and yell. He can do the same thing that the opposition and the NDP are doing. This is a basic right for every single Canadian. Aboriginal and non-aboriginal women should have the same rights. That is what this is about.

Here is the good thing that I can say to my granddaughter: "We got it passed. We got it done. We are making sure that aboriginal women have the same rights as everybody else".

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): The time for government orders has expired.

Statements by members, the hon. member for Okanagan—Coquihalla.

Statements by Members

#### STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

#### CAPTAIN JONATHAN SNYDER

Mr. Dan Albas (Okanagan—Coquihalla, CPC): Mr. Speaker, David Snyder was one of my favourite teachers in high school. He was more than an impassioned English teacher and author. He was also a husband to Anne and a father to Adam and Jonathan.

It was five years ago this week that his son, Captain Jonathan Snyder, tragically lost his life while on night patrol in Afghanistan during his second tour of duty. Captain Snyder was the recipient of the Star of Military Valour. He was brave, courageous and strong. Captain Snyder saved the lives of his team when under fire from a Taliban ambush. He was 26 years old.

Today in my riding of Okanagan—Coquihalla a memorial plaque will be commemorated in honour of Captain Jonathan Snyder.

May we never forget the sacrifice of our brave men and women who serve and may we always find comfort for the family and friends left behind.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP

Ms. Isabelle Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate an exceptional citizen from my riding who shows great leadership, dedication and community spirit in her care for the environment. Every spring for the past three years, Maja Vodanovic leads a team of families, students, teachers and local residents to clean out the Bouchard Creek. This year, more than 100 students from 10 schools participated.

This is a noble effort to reclaim a piece of land that belongs to all of us and to pass on the importance of environmental stewardship to our kids.

[Translation]

I commend Maja and all the volunteers on their good work. The Conservative government is jeopardizing the water quality of our lakes and rivers with Bill C-38 and Bill C-45. An NDP government will protect and respect the environment, and it is precisely this optimism, this hope and these actions that we will bring to Canadians every day.

By coming together to clean riverbanks and waterways across Canada, Canadians are showing the Conservative government the right way to go.

[English]

#### 1989 TIANANMEN SQUARE PROTEST

Mr. Mark Adler (York Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Canada-China relationship is a successful partnership based on co-operation in trade and investment, and deep and historic people-to-people ties. Human rights are an integral part of Canada's foreign policy and remain a priority with respect to China.

June 4 marks the 24th anniversary of the violent crackdown on pro-democracy demonstrations in Tiananmen Square. Canada

expresses its deepest condolences to those who lost friends and family members in the Tiananmen Square massacre.

We reiterate our call for China to account for those who remain missing and to release those who continue to be imprisoned more than two decades later for their participation in this non-violent event

In light of the ongoing suppression in China of freedom of religion, freedom of expression and other universally held rights, we continue to urge the Government of China to abide by international human rights standards and to engage in an ongoing and open dialogue with its people about the events of 1989.

#### NEW WATERFORD CENTENNIAL

**Hon. Mark Eyking (Sydney—Victoria, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as the member of Parliament representing the community of New Waterford, it gives me great pleasure to rise today and congratulate the town on its centennial year.

This past weekend I was pleased to attend an event honouring some of the town's seniors who have contributed greatly to their community. Over the last 100 years, New Waterford has faced some challenges. It was once one of the busiest coal-mining communities and home to No. 16 colliery, one of the biggest and best coal mines in Canada, which was shut down in 1963.

New Waterford is home to many great traditions from the Coal Dust Days to Davis Day to the Coal Bowl Classic basketball tournament, just to name a few. It is the residents' strong sense of pride for their community that attracts visitors, local and away, year after year to New Waterford.

I say congratulations to all of the volunteers and organizations who have worked so tirelessly to make a difference and to make the centennial celebrations possible.

I look forward to taking part in the festivities throughout this summer and invite my colleagues, especially the member for Charlottetown and his wife Kathleen, to these festivals.

• (1405)

# MIGHTY PEACE DAY

**Mr. Chris Warkentin (Peace River, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I stand in the House today in support of Mighty Peace Day, an event taking place in my riding this fall.

Mighty Peace Day will allow youth to come together and reflect on the relative wealth that we all enjoy here in Canada and contemplate how we might work together to give back to those in need. The event encourages philanthropy among youth and is based on the idea that young people have the power to change the world.

Statements by Members

Mighty Peace Day will feature speakers, dancers, bands and athletes. The occasion sets out to promote a strong and united global community, built on volunteerism and donating one's own resources to help those in need. Spearheaded by four energetic youth advocates, Tegwyn Curtis, Nicole Chrenek, Emma Chrenek and Hailey Winnicky-Lewis, the event will take place on October 1 in Grande Prairie.

In today's increasingly interconnected world, young people have more opportunity to engage with one another and to effect serious change. I hope all members of the House will stand with me to support Mighty Peace Day.

#### HELEN LU

**Ms. Olivia Chow (Trinity—Spadina, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I stand to honour the mother of charities, Helen Lu, better known in Toronto as "Mama Lu".

Nothing gave Helen Lu greater pleasure and pride than helping those in need. Charity was Mama Lu's passion. She was one of the founders of Toronto's Yee Hong Centre for Geriatric Care and its community wellness foundation. Her trademark was her running shoes. She wore them almost every day as she did not want to miss one minute in her service to others.

For Mama Lu, there were always more opportunities to serve, be it seniors of Yee Hong, the Heart and Stroke Foundation, the United Way, or victims of flood and famine. For her 30 years of selfless service to others, Mama Lu was recognized with the Outstanding Achievement Award for Voluntarism in Ontario, in 1998, and Yee Hong Centre named a room after her.

We will miss Mama Lu, but her spirit and her legacy will live on through those who dedicate themselves to volunteering and serving others.

#### MICRONUTRIENT INITIATIVE

**Mr. Dean Allison (Niagara West—Glanbrook, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Mr. M. G. Venkatesh Mannar, who was recently invested as an officer of the Order of Canada by the Governor General.

Mr. Mannar is the president of Micronutrient Initiative, a leading Canadian development organization that saves and improves the lives of mothers, children, families and communities every year through proven and cost-effective nutrient programs. I had the opportunity to see Micronutrient Initiative's work first-hand last year when I visited Senegal. I was with Mr. Mannar to launch the Zinc Alliance for Child Health, or ZACH, a partnership between Micronutrient Initiative, the Government of Canada and Teck, a leader in the extractive sector. The goal of ZACH is to scale up zinc and oral rehydration salts to treat childhood diarrhea and, ultimately, save lives.

It is an honour to see such a dedicated person like Mr. Mannar, who has chosen Canada as his home, be recognized for his incredible work through MI with one of our country's highest civilian honours.

#### **SCLERODERMA**

Mr. David Sweet (Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—West-dale, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise once again to remind all hon. members that June is Scleroderma Awareness Month.

My family and I know, intimately, the terrible nature of this disease, having lost our mother to complications from scleroderma nearly 14 years ago. Scleroderma is a chronic, often progressive autoimmune disease, like rheumatoid arthritis and multiple sclerosis, where the body's immune system attacks its own tissues. Scleroderma can cause one's internal organs to turn as hard as stone and one's skin can tear easily, like parchment. Unfortunately, it afflicts women three times more often than men.

Our government has invested almost \$1.5 million, through a CIHR grant, for the scleroderma patient-centered intervention network and in doing so, has recognized the groundbreaking work of this team. However, more needs to be done. I ask all members to participate in the many fundraising events that will take place this month to raise funds for more research for scleroderma. I will be walking this Saturday, in memory of my mother, at McQuesten Park, in Hamilton.

I kindly ask all Canadians to join me and others to find a cure for scleroderma.

\* \* \*

**●** (1410)

[Translation]

#### QUEBEC WEEK OF DISABLED PERSONS

**Ms. Manon Perreault (Montcalm, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, every year, the first week of June marks the Quebec week of disabled persons, which is intended to promote and encourage the social participation of people with disabilities. This week provides an opportunity to raise awareness about the educational, social and professional realities that people with disabilities face.

Whether it involves access to paratransit, affordable and accessible housing and inclusive job markets or putting an end to financial insecurity, action is urgently needed to ensure that people with disabilities enjoy the same rights as all other Canadians.

Accordingly, I want to acknowledge all the work that the City of Mascouche has done in 2013 to develop an action plan for people with disabilities. The goal of this policy is to ensure that every individual can be independent and safely participate in the community's activities. I would like to congratulate Chantal Filion, who works for the City of Mascouche's municipal services, as well as all of the organizations involved in this action plan, including La Rose Bleue.

[English]

#### JAMES KELLEHER

**Mr. Bryan Hayes (Sault Ste. Marie, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the passing of one of Sault Ste. Marie's former members of Parliament, Mr. James Kelleher.

#### Statements by Members

Senator Kelleher practised law in the Sault before being part of the Conservative sweep to power, in 1984, under the Mulroney administration. He was appointed to cabinet as the international trade minister in 1985, becoming Canada's solicitor general in 1986. In 1990, he was appointed to the Senate and served until mandatory retirement, in 2005.

Jim was instrumental in setting the two nations of Canada and the United States on a course that would, ultimately, lead to the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement, in 1988, the success of which continues to harness the prosperity-generating power of free and open trade. Jim was the face of the Conservative Party in Sault Ste. Marie for years, always listened to the grassroots people, and was a dedicated family man, known for his integrity and honesty.

I would like to extend my sincere condolences to his wife Helen, daughters Martha and Sarah, sister Patti, and all family and friends. May he rest in peace.

 $[\mathit{Translation}]$ 

#### COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION IN LA PRAIRIE

**Mr. Hoang Mai (Brossard—La Prairie, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Complexe Le Partage, a wonderful organization in my riding.

On May 24, during an event called "Panthéon de l'excellence", business people and members of the Royal Roussillon chamber of commerce and industry awarded the organization a prize in the category of "service and retail business with over 20 employees".

Complexe Le Partage is a community organization that was founded by Laurent Blais, a municipal councillor for La Prairie, and it is run by Cathy Lepage. It offers peer assistance services, support services, integration services and training to underprivileged families in a spirit of community and of individual and collective responsibility.

For 15 years, this organization has been changing the lives of people in my region, and I am proud that its work and commitment have been recognized and rewarded.

Congratulations to the team and the volunteers at Complexe Le Partage. You are turning social development into a winning business formula!

[English]

#### SAMUEL DE CHAMPLAIN

Mr. Royal Galipeau (Ottawa—Orléans, CPC): Mr. Speaker, 400 years ago today, the great French explorer Samuel de Champlain sailed up the Ottawa River and set foot on the shores of what would become the capital city of the best country in the world.

[Translation]

Five years ago in this House, I had the privilege of making a statement looking forward to this milestone anniversary. Given that Champlain's voyage was a historically significant event for our region, the government provided funding to the Société franco-

ontarienne du patrimoine et de l'histoire d'Orléans, so that it could organize a special event to celebrate the anniversary.

[English]

This evening, I would like to invite all members to join the celebration at Petrie Island. There will be a birchbark canoe launch, a community supper, concerts by l'Écho d'un peuple and Les St-Pierre, and more.

[Translation]

For more information on the SFOPHO's activities to celebrate the 400th anniversary of Samuel de Champlain's voyage, visit sfopho. com.

[English]

#### JANE PURVES

Hon. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Jane Purves was a refreshingly forthright person, a smart straight shooter with a wicked sense of humour. She spent 25 years in the newspaper business, rising to managing editor of Nova Scotia's largest daily, *The Chronicle Herald.* She was a trailblazer and mentor for women. She served as president of the Canadian Managing Editors Conference and was on the board of the Canadian Press and the National Newspaper Awards. That career in journalism prepared her well for public office.

Elected as the MLA for Halifax Citadel in 1999, she served as minister of education and then as minister of health. The Nova Scotia Community College paid tribute to her work to increase opportunities for youth to enter skilled trades by awarding her an honorary diploma.

Jane was not a rabid partisan, but a politician dedicated to listening, to understanding and to doing the right thing. She had a deep love for her family, her profession and her province. Her passing last weekend at the still-young age of 63 is an enormous loss to Nova Scotia. We thank Jane. We will miss her smarts, her candour, her sense of humour and her commitment to the people of Nova Scotia.

**●** (1415)

## THE SENATE

Mr. Ted Opitz (Etobicoke Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our government remains focused on Senate reform, including elections, term limits and tough new spending oversight. Last week, the Senate adopted our Conservative government's 11 tough new rules governing Senate travel and expenses proposed by Conservative senators, just as we promised we would do for Canadian taxpayers. Today, the Leader of the Government in the Senate will introduce a motion asking the Auditor General of Canada to conduct a comprehensive audit of Senate expenses.

Oral Questions

# ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

#### **NEW MEMBER**

**The Speaker:** I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Chief Electoral Officer a certificate of the election and return of Ms. Yvonne Jones, member for the electoral district of Labrador.

#### NEW MEMBER INTRODUCED

Ms. Yvonne Jones, member for the electoral district of Labrador, introduced by Mr. Justin Trudeau.

# **ORAL QUESTIONS**

(1420)

[English]

#### **ETHICS**

**Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has said that he did not find out about the payment from Nigel Wright to Mike Duffy until May 15.

However, yesterday his cabinet colleague, Marjory LeBreton, said, "On the 14th of May...the Prime Minister had dealt with it."

Who is telling the truth?

**Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I have been very clear. I learned of this matter on May 15, and of course I immediately made this information public.

The real question is why the leader of the NDP, on November 16, 2010, said that he knew nothing about the activities of the mayor of Laval, which are now before the Charbonneau commission, when in fact he had known for 14 years.

[Translation]

**Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, on what exact date did the Prime Minister first speak with Mike Duffy about his expenses?

**Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, that information was already made public on February 13, and I have been very clear about this. Mr. Duffy approached me after a caucus meeting to discuss this matter.

From the beginning, my position has been clear: any inappropriate expenses should be refunded to taxpayers by the senators concerned.

The real question is why the leader of the NDP told the public the complete opposite of what he knew about the mayor of Laval in 2010.

**Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, can the Prime Minister confirm that he ordered his caucus to repay their illegal expenses that same day?

While we are working very hard to make the Senate more accountable, the Liberal leader is defending the status quo in the Senate because it gives an advantage for Quebec. Recently, the Liberal leader said, "We have 24 Senators in Quebec and there are only 6 for Alberta and British Columbia. That benefits us. To want to abolish it, that's just demagoguery...".

Time and again, the Liberal leader takes potshots at the west and then comes to the House and pretends he is defending its interests. Western Canadians and, in fact, all Canadians know better.

#### THE SENATE

\* \* \*

Mr. John Rafferty (Thunder Bay—Rainy River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, while the unaccountable Senate has been embroiled in ugly scandals, Conservatives and Liberals continue to defend the entitlements of their unelected caucus mates. The Prime Minister once called the Senate a "relic of the 19th century". Indeed, it hearkens back to a time when lords watched over us commoners, when women could not vote, when penicillin was not around. While the rest of our society has evolved, the Senate has not.

For 150 years, Liberals and Conservatives failed to get Senate spending under control, and failed to bring in accountability. The time has come to turn off the taps to this vestigial organ. Tomorrow, this House will have an opportunity to do just that. Therefore, we urge the Conservatives and Liberals to stop defending perks for their partisan senators and join New Democrats in the 21st century. The time has come to roll up the red carpet on the unelected upper chamber, to end the gravy train and to abolish the Senate.

NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF CANADA

Mr. Greg Rickford (Kenora, CPC): Mr. Speaker, day after day, NDP members stand in this House with full knowledge that two tax evaders are in their midst—two NDP MPs who could not be bothered to pay their fair share, yet claim to represent the interests of Canadian taxpayers.

As Pink Floyd might sing, "If you don't pay your taxes, how can you have any benefits? And how can you have any benefits if you don't pay your taxes?"

Sadly, this kind of hypocrisy is not surprising from the NDP, and it gets better. NDP members admitted that they knew from the beginning that the member for Brossard—La Prairie owed thousands of dollars in back taxes. Despite this, well, they appointed him to be the NDP critic for revenue.

The NDP cannot claim to represent Canadian taxpayers when it will not stand up against tax evaders in its own caucus. It has been 10 days. It is clear that the NDP would rather protect NDP tax evaders than stand up for the interests of Canadian taxpayers.

#### Oral Questions

[English]

**Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, once again, I have been very clear about all of these matters, very clear about the dates, and my position on this matter has been known from the beginning.

I believe that any inappropriate expenses should be refunded to taxpayers. My statements in private and in public have been consistent with that, unlike the leader of the NDP, who told the public he knew nothing about the goings-on of the mayor of Laval in 2010 when in fact he had known the contrary for 14 years.

Why did he misinform the public of his knowledge of what the mayor of Laval was doing?

[Translation]

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, were members of the Prime Minister's staff present when he ordered his caucus to repay their illegal expenses? Were members of his staff present, yes or no?

(1425)

**Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, from the outset, our caucus and my employees have been aware of my position. Senators should reimburse taxpayers for inappropriate expenses.

[English]

I go back: I have been very clear, very public, very consistent.

Why did the leader of the NDP, as a contrast, not think it important to tell the public in 2010 that he knew of questionable activity by the mayor of Laval? Why did he tell the public precisely the opposite when he knew that to be the case?

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, why then did the Prime Minister, last week, deny instructing any members of his personnel to settle the Mike Duffy matter when he gave that order with that personnel present in the room at a caucus meeting in February of this year?

**Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it was my view from the beginning that any inappropriate expenses by any senator should be repaid by the senator, not by somebody else. That was very clear.

Those are the facts obviously before us. As I say, my statements on this matter have been very clear and very consistent, which is totally different from the hon. member, who keeps refusing to answer questions as to why his knowledge of bribery attempts were not clearly and correctly conveyed to the public and the police over a period of 17 years.

Mr. Justin Trudeau (Papineau, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it has been 21 days—three weeks—and the Prime Minister still has not answered some basic questions about the actions of his chief of staff. Canadians are asking why. Why did Nigel Wright pay a sitting senator \$90,000?

The Prime Minister surely asked why, so what was the reason that Nigel Wright gave his boss for having written that \$90,000 cheque to Mike Duffy?

**Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, as I think I have said repeatedly, Mr. Wright said that he

wanted to be sure that taxpayers were reimbursed. The fact of the matter is that taxpayers have been reimbursed. They obviously should have been reimbursed by the senator rather than by Mr. Wright, but Mr. Wright obviously will be accountable for those actions.

On the other hand, why has the Liberal Party resisted making Senate expenses transparent, why has it consistently resisted looking into these matters, and why is it today resisting having the Auditor General further look into these matters?

Mr. Justin Trudeau (Papineau, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are really wondering. One does not simply offer \$90,000 cheques for no reason. The chief of staff must have told the Prime Minister why Mike Duffy was so special.

Can the Prime Minister confirm whether the \$90,000 cheque had anything to do with Mike Duffy's role as one of the chief fundraisers for the Conservative Party of Canada?

**Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Mr. Wright has been very clear that he thought the taxpayers should be reimbursed, and he will be accountable for those matters. We have been very clear that the taxpayers should be reimbursed, obviously a very different position from that of the Liberal Party, which even today continues to resist the fact that the Senate wants to have the Auditor General look at all these expenses.

I know how dedicated the Liberals are to the status quo in the Senate, but this is a positive move by the Senate and Liberal senators, and the Liberal Party should support it.

[Translation]

**Mr. Justin Trudeau (Papineau, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, one does not just write \$90,000 cheques without a good reason. Surely the Prime Minister must have asked Nigel Wright why he did what he did.

Can the Prime Minister tell us whether the \$90,000 cheque had anything to do with Mike Duffy's role as one of the chief fundraisers for the Conservative Party of Canada?

**Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Mr. Wright's position is that taxpayers must be reimbursed for any inappropriate expenses. His position is clear. He is prepared to explain that position to the authorities.

The Leader of the Government in the Senate has asked the Auditor General to conduct an audit of all Senate expenses to ensure value for taxpayers. The Liberal senators are the ones who are resisting. It is time for the Liberal Party to support real change and real reforms in the Senate.

**●** (1430)

[English]

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the scandal had been in the news for three months when the Prime Minister ordered the members of his caucus, including Mike Duffy, to reimburse their illegal expenses. Mike Duffy refused, but a week later he accepted. He changed his mind and said he was going to reimburse.

What did the Prime Minister's staff say to Mike Duffy to get him to change his mind and accept to reimburse?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our position from the beginning has been very clear: any inappropriate expenses should be reimbursed. Obviously, in late February, Mr. Duffy said he would do that, and in the middle of April, he said he had done that. Of course, the facts of the matter are, as we learned later, not to that effect. When I learned those facts, I made them clear immediately.

We have been very clear on this, unlike the leader of the NDP, who continues to refuse. For 17 years, he has not been truthful with the Canadian people or the authorities on his knowledge of the affairs that are now before the Charbonneau commission.

[Translation]

**Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, last week, the Prime Minister's Office confirmed that it was the Prime Minister himself who asked Mike Duffy to reimburse his expenses.

Who was present when the Prime Minister asked Mike Duffy to reimburse his expenses?

**Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I have been clear since the beginning: inappropriate expenses should be refunded to taxpayers. My statements have been clear and transparent. My responses have been consistent.

Again, the leader of the NDP refuses to tell us why he hid the truth about the goings on of the mayor of Laval for 15 years. It is high time that he answer the questions.

**Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister' Office says that the Prime Minister himself spoke with Mike Duffy to ask him to reimburse the expenses.

Who was present during that conversation?

[English]

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, once again, I have been very clear. My views were known to the entire caucus. Mr. Duffy approached me to seek some clarification. I was very adamant that any inappropriate expenses should be repaid. Those were the facts of the matter. I have been very clear and consistent on that.

Once again, we are waiting for some clarity and some consistency from the leader of the NDP on matters that are now before a major commission. Maybe if that individual had been clear with the public and with authorities some 17 years ago, the kinds of things that led to the Charbonneau commission would not be happening today.

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, on May 17, the Prime Minister's director of communication said, "The prime minister has full confidence in Mr. Wright and Mr. Wright is staying on". Who told Andrew MacDougall to say that?

**Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, once again, Mr. Wright believed, as we all believe, that the taxpayers of Canada should be reimbursed for the inappropriate expenses. He decided to do that on his own without informing us. For that reason, upon reflection, I accepted his resignation. As soon as I learned other relevant information, on May 15, I made that public.

#### Oral Questions

Once again, why does the leader of the NDP, when knowing about things like bribery, think it is not appropriate for 17 years to appropriately inform the police and the public about those kinds of things?

**●** (1435)

**Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, last week, the Prime Minister confirmed that Nigel Wright would be receiving an executive severance package. Is that severance package greater than \$90,000 or less than \$90,000?

**Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, first, I have been very clear. Mr. Wright will receive only the monies that are required absolutely under law Those amounts are obviously less than the amount in question. Let me be absolutely clear. Any suggestion that Mr. Write is being compensated by taxpayers, directly or indirectly, for his cheque to Mr. Duffy is absolutely and categorically false.

**Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, was Ray Novak involved in any discussions about the Senate expense scandal?

**Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, once again, Mr. Wright decided to do this on his own, using his own funds. He has taken full responsibility and he will be accountable to the various authorities' inquiries for his actions in that regard.

It is time for the leader of the NDP to do the same thing. He sat in the cabinet of Quebec for years when the cabinet of Quebec was doing business with the mayor of Laval and others.

They are now matters of inquiry before the Charbonneau commission. Why did he think, as a minister of the Crown, it was not appropriate to inform the public and the authorities of his knowledge of the dealings of that particular individual.

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, did Senator Marjory LeBreton recuse herself from any of the cabinet discussions involving the Senate expense scandal? Now we are not talking about the illegal payment from Nigel Wright to Mike Duffy. We are talking about whether or not she recused herself from cabinet. This is not a question of cabinet confidence. The Prime Minister has to answer.

**Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, last week the member asked if this was ever a matter of cabinet business. I said it was not a matter of cabinet business, so why would someone recuse himself or herself from something that was not a matter of cabinet business?

The answer to that question is pretty obvious before he even asked it, which makes it pretty obvious why the leader of the NDP simply does not want to answer questions about his knowledge of potentially illegal activities in Quebec of which he was fully knowledgeable. Why not come clean on that subject?

[Translation]

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, who—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

#### Oral Questions

**Hon. Thomas Mulcair:** Mr. Speaker, who at the PMO is responsible for the Senate?

**Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, under our Constitution, the Senate is an independent entity. Obviously, we still have discussions with our Senate colleagues, as all parties have done.

Again, why did the leader of the NDP not tell the authorities and the public about his knowledge of the possible illegal activities of the mayor of Laval, knowledge that he had for more than 15 years?

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, last week, we learned that Mike Duffy regularly billed the taxpayer for partisan political work that he did for and on behalf of the Conservative Party, including during the last election campaign.

Are there other senators who did the same thing: bill the taxpayer for partisan work for the Conservative Party?

• (1440)

**Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Party has been clear that it pays its own campaign expenses.

[English]

In fact, those were reported. When we became aware that Mr. Duffy had possibly in effect double billed, that is why the Senate has now referred the matter to other authorities.

Once again, in this case, the Conservative Party acted immediately on the information it knew. Why, when knowing about envelopes stuffed full of cash, did the leader of the NDP not think it appropriate for 17 years to report these matters to the public and to the police?

Mr. Justin Trudeau (Papineau, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in December 2008, despite promises to the contrary, the Prime Minister appointed 18 senators. I would ask the Prime Minister to explain why he chose Mike Duffy to be a senator.

**Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, this is an interesting question. For almost three years, I left the Senate vacancies unfilled. What happened in that period when we were trying to get those filled by elected people? The Liberal Party and other parties got together and tried to fill those Senate vacancies with their own people. That is why, as I said at the time, I acted to ensure that if the Senate was not going to be elected, it would at least support the government that Canadians did elect.

**Mr. Justin Trudeau (Papineau, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, apparently the Prime Minister does not quite know why he appointed Mike Duffy to the Senate either.

Pursuant to another appointment made, I would like to hear from the Prime Minister why he appointed Pamela Wallin to sit in Canada's Senate.

**Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I suppose for the same reason the previous government made Ms. Wallin Canada's consul general for New York.

None of these things answers why the Liberal Party has tried to resist making Senate expenses transparent and why it is now resisting the Auditor General looking—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Papineau.

**Mr. Justin Trudeau (Papineau, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Ms. Wallin did not do any fundraising for us when she was consul general for New York.

[Translation]

In December 2008, the Prime Minister appointed 18 senators.

Can the Prime Minister explain to Canadians why he chose Mike Duffy and Pamela Wallin to sit in the Senate?

**Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I just answered that question.

[English]

We have just seen why the leader of a party should have some idea of what an answer is before he asks the question.

While various Canadians have been appointed to the Senate, whatever their background, we expect them to follow the rules on expenses, and if those rules are not followed, we expect appropriate action to be taken to ensure accountability. That is what is happening here.

The majority in the Senate have indicated they want to have the Auditor General come and look at those expenses. Why is the Liberal Party in the Senate resisting having the Auditor General look at Senate expenses?

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Ms. Ève Péclet (La Pointe-de-l'Île, NDP): Mr. Speaker, 67 countries have signed the global arms trade treaty, including Australia, Brazil, Italy, France, Germany, Mexico and the United Kingdom. They all signed it as soon as it was possible, which was yesterday. At the same time, when questioned by the NDP, the Minister of Foreign Affairs went into a pitiful tirade instead of saying whether or not Canada will sign.

Why will Canada not immediately commit to signing this treaty? [*English*]

**Hon. John Baird (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, what I said yesterday was that we would consult Canadians, firearms owners, provinces and territories and industry before the government would act, and that is exactly what we intend to do.

● (1445)

**Mr. Paul Dewar (Ottawa Centre, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the reality is the only countries to oppose this treaty are Iran, Syria and North Korea. The United Kingdom signed the treaty yesterday. It understands it will protect legitimate arms trade while reducing "unfettered proliferation of weapons".

With its closest allies signing now, why is the government dragging its feet? This is about saving lives and stopping the illegal transfer of weapons. Will the government sign this treaty, yes or no?

**Hon. John Baird (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the NDP's foreign affairs critic was suggesting that if the arms trade treaty had been in place, we would not have a civil war going on in Syria. That is quite ridiculous.

We work constructively with the arms trade treaty negotiations. We are now taking the opportunity to consult with Canadians, with industry, with the provinces and the territories and with non-governmental organizations and we will listen before we act.

\* \* \*

#### NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Jack Harris (St. John's East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we learned yesterday that the defence minister used the independent National Investigative Service to probe an alleged leak that turned out to be from a U.S. Navy press release. Now we learn the military's elite police force has also been used to investigate the release of embarrassing information on the country's top general.

Could the Minister of National Defence tell us if the NIS is being used as it should be, or is it being used by the minister as a tool to go after those who embarrass him or his department in the media?

Hon. Kerry-Lynne D. Findlay (Associate Minister of National Defence, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the military releases information to Canadians through access to information, proactive disclosure and public communications, while protecting classified and sensitive information. When unauthorized information is leaked, we expect the necessary assessments to take place to determine the source.

To be clear, it is the source of an unauthorized leak, not the media, that is investigated.

What is not clear is why the leader of the opposition hid his direct knowledge of corruption for so many years.

 $[\mathit{Translation}]$ 

Ms. Christine Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is rather strange that embarrassing information is all of a sudden confidential.

At the direction of the Minister of National Defence's office, five investigations targeted a journalist who has been bothering the minister. Another investigation was carried out when a different journalist released embarrassing information about the former chief of the defence staff.

Why is the minister using the military policy to go after those who have been trying to shed some light on embarrassing events in his department?

[English]

Hon. Kerry-Lynne D. Findlay (Associate Minister of National Defence, CPC): Mr. Speaker, when information is leaked inappropriately or illegally at the Department of National Defence, it is expected that such incidents will be looked into by an appropriate authority.

The Canadian Forces Military Police is mandated to assess allegations of inappropriate or illegal release of information within the Department of National Defence. The Canadian Forces National Investigation Service has no mandate or jurisdiction to investigate any individual or group external to National Defence and conducts only assessments related to defence activities, not media.

#### Oral Questions

## **HUMAN RIGHTS**

Mr. Devinder Shory (Calgary Northeast, CPC): Mr. Speaker, over the weekend the Quebec Soccer Federation decided to ban those wearing turbans and other religious headwear from playing soccer. This means that those children and youth will not be allowed to play soccer in Quebec even if they want to.

Can the Minister of State for Sport update this House on our position on this ban?

**Hon. Bal Gosal (Minister of State (Sport), CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for a great question.

We believe that amateur sports like soccer should encourage the participation of children rather than exclude them. We see no valid reason why kids should be banned from playing soccer because of their religion.

I encourage the Quebec Soccer Federation to follow the lead of soccer leagues across Canada and around the world and not create barriers for children who want to play the sport they love.

Furthermore, the leader of the NDP and the leader of the Liberal Party should be ashamed of their silence on this matter.

\* \* \*

#### 41ST GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Craig Scott (Toronto—Danforth, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the members for Saint Boniface and Selkirk—Interlake have been caught failing to comply with election laws. They have not filed documents from the 2011 campaign over two years ago. They failed to account for the money their campaigns spent and they failed to cooperate with authorities. Elections Canada has therefore advised the Speaker that these MPs not continue to sit or vote as members of this House.

The Prime Minister once said, "Bend the rules, you will be punished", so why do the Conservatives and the Prime Minister continue to act as if they are above the law?

**●** (1450)

Mr. Pierre Poilievre (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities and for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the preface of the member's question is completely false. These members acted in good faith. Due to legitimate differences of opinion, Election Canada's interpretation of the rules is now before the courts. That is the members' right to pursue, and we support their right to pursue it.

That said, the hon. member would do well, if he believes in a higher standard of ethics, to have his leader explain why he kept secret for 17 years his knowledge of an illegal bribe offer.

. . .

#### THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Peter Julian (Burnaby—New Westminster, NDP): Mr. Speaker, for three years the Conservatives have known about inadequate equipment for oil spills and have done nothing.

#### Oral Questions

Our Coast Guard does not have the capacity to clean up even a single supertanker spill, yet Conservatives want British Columbians to accept a massive increase in tanker traffic. "Just trust us" clearly is not good enough.

Why has the minister failed to act when we have such a shoddy oil response capacity, and why is he forcing British Columbians to pay the huge price when things go wrong?

Hon. Keith Ashfield (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and Minister for the Atlantic Gateway, CPC): Mr. Speaker, industry is the first responder to its own oil spills under the polluter pay principle. The Coast Guard, of course, is the lead agency for ensuring appropriate response to ship-source spills in Canadian waters.

On March 18, 2013, the government announced the world-class tanker safety initiative, which included an investment in the incident command system for the Coast Guard. This responds directly to the recommendations from the 2010 CESD audit.

# PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. Randall Garrison (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, NDP): Mr. Speaker, from oil spills to firearms, the current Conservative government has put public safety at risk again and again through its inaction.

The Minister of Public Safety was warned by the RCMP in 2012 that his failure to update classification of firearms "...poses a risk to public safety." His failure to act is allowing military and paramilitary firearms to be treated as though they were ordinary hunting rifles.

Did the minister see this warning, and if he did, does he think it is okay to ignore RCMP advice to modernize a list that has not been updated since 1988?

Hon. Vic Toews (Minister of Public Safety, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the facts are clear. Our measures to keep Canadians safe are working. Firearms-related homicides are at their lowest point in 50 years. Homicides committed with handguns are down by 30% since 2008.

Thanks to the strong measures this government has brought in with mandatory prison sentences for that type of firearm, this success is continuing. Unfortunately, that member and his party failed to support the measures that are turning around the issue of gun crime. [Translation]

**Ms. Rosane Doré Lefebvre (Alfred-Pellan, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, what I hear is that the minister thinks that this failure to update the classification is acceptable and that he is not bothered by the fact that paramilitary groups could take advantage of this situation.

The consequences of the minister's inaction are very real. A firearm that the RCMP recommended banning in 2010 was used in the fatal shooting that took place the night of the most recent Quebec provincial election.

How many more tragedies must there be for the minister to take action?

[English]

Hon. Vic Toews (Minister of Public Safety, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that is the precise question that I would ask that member.

In fact, firearms-related homicides are at their lowest point in 50 years, and homicides committed with handguns are down by 30% since 2008.

We have asked the NDP to co-operate and work with us to impose mandatory prison sentences for those who possess firearms illegally. The NDP has refused.

#### SEARCH AND RESCUE

Ms. Yvonne Jones (Labrador, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my apologies, and my thanks for your tolerance today.

On May 8, there was an emergency at Park Lake, near Happy Valley-Goose Bay. However, none of the three Griffin helicopters based at 5 Wing Goose Bay were available. All were out of service for maintenance.

This was days after the Minister of National Defence made a campaign stop in town to reassure people that adequate search and rescue was in place.

Why does the government continue to ignore the people of Newfoundland and Labrador who are crying out for help with search and rescue?

**●** (1455)

Hon. Kerry-Lynne D. Findlay (Associate Minister of National Defence, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the new hon. member's question gives me the opportunity to state that our government remains committed to fulfilling our commitment to establish a clear sovereignty protection mission for CFB Goose Bay.

Since 2006, we have committed investments to the base totalling nearly \$407 million.

Our government will continue to support Canada's men and women in uniform, along with supporting long-term growth and prosperity through prudent planning and investments in CFB Goose Bay. We take our search and rescue responsibilities seriously across the nation, including in Goose Bay.

**Ms. Yvonne Jones (Labrador, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Conservative government, and it knows this, has really gutted front-line search and rescue services.

The Minister of National Defence made a fly-through announcement in response to the Auditor General's report and did little to address any of the deficiencies.

In May, a local 5 Wing Goose Bay official said that search and rescue for Labradorians is not their first or their second priority.

Why does the Conservative government not fix search and rescue in Newfoundland and Labrador before more lives are lost?

Hon. Kerry-Lynne D. Findlay (Associate Minister of National Defence, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we are extremely proud of our search and rescue teams that work with federal, provincial and municipal partners to respond as quickly as possible. They risk their own lives so that others may live.

Each search and rescue operation is complex, and the victims' survival depends on many factors. Our government constantly assesses our search and rescue capabilities. Our search and rescue area of responsibility covers 18 million square kilometres of land and sea, an area greater than the size of continental Europe.

We are committed to every region of Canada.

### **PENSIONS**

Ms. Irene Mathyssen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the CPP and QPP are the backbone of our pension system.

Every working Canadian pays into the plan, and we all benefit. Experts agree that increasing CPP benefits can help all Canadians retire with dignity and security.

After years of delay, the Minister of Finance promised he would call together provincial ministers in June to take action on improving CPP.

When will the Minister of Finance meet with the provinces, and where is his plan for increasing CPP?

Hon. Ted Menzies (Minister of State (Finance), CPC): Mr. Speaker, it raises the question of why the NDP will not actually come and show some support for those Canadians who do not have a retirement income available to them. The workplace contains an incredible number of Canadians who actually do not have a workplace pension at this time.

We have come to the opposition and asked for its support. We have the support of many of the provinces. The three western provinces have actually tabled legislation to move forward on the pooled registered pension plan, and all of the provinces have initiated the response that they will tabling legislation in the very near future. Quebec has done that.

We would suggest that the opposition should actually get on board and help Canadians with their retirement.

[Translation]

Ms. Lysane Blanchette-Lamothe (Pierrefonds—Dollard, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance has been dragging his feet on this issue for far too long. Meanwhile, many Canadians are still not receiving enough pension benefits.

The pension issue will not magically disappear just because the Conservatives do not know what to do about it. The minister committed to addressing this issue with the provincial ministers in June. Surprise. It is now June.

When can we expect this meeting to happen? What will the government propose at this meeting?

[English]

Hon. Ted Menzies (Minister of State (Finance), CPC): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should know, sitting in the House, that

### Oral Questions

jurisdiction is shared with the provinces. The Canada pension plan is a shared jurisdiction with the provinces. We cannot arbitrarily make a decision on that.

We have consulted with the provinces on increases to the Canada pension plan, and there was not consensus among all of the provinces to increase the cost to businesses. However, there was consensus and unanimous support to move forward with the pooled registered pension plan.

It is shocking that despite that, the NDP actually voted against it in the House.

\* \* \*

● (1500)

### CONSUMER PROTECTION

**Mr. Earl Dreeshen (Red Deer, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the new mandatory wireless code is a step in the right direction and addresses such key consumer concerns as contract length and roaming charges. Canadians want a fair deal, and our government is always looking for ways to improve customer protection and foster more competition.

Can the Minister of Industry please update the House on what the government will do to ensure progress toward competition and more players?

Hon. Christian Paradis (Minister of Industry and Minister of State (Agriculture), CPC): Mr. Speaker, today I announced that any proposed wireless transfer resulting in undue spectrum concentration and therefore less competition will not be approved. Spectrum set aside for new entrants was never intended to be transferred to incumbents and as such will not be approved now, nor will it likely be in the future.

Our Conservative government will not hesitate to use any and every tool at its disposal to support greater competition in the market and protect Canadian consumers.

Let me quote at this point the Public Interest Advocacy Centre, which said this morning that "This government stood up for wireless consumers...".

\* \* \*

### ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

**Hon. Judy Sgro (York West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, for months I have been meeting with RCMP officers who have endured sexual assault, harassment and workplace bullying and who shared their stories directly with Commissioner Paulson.

Sadly, rather than fixing the problems, the commissioner went on the attack, saying that victims who complain may be showing ambition beyond ability.

The commissioner's shameful comments demand a public apology at least. Given the fact that Commissioner Paulson clearly crossed the line in attacking the victims, can the minister please tell me if he has full confidence in Commissioner Paulson today?

### Oral Questions

**Hon. Vic Toews (Minister of Public Safety, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, our government has taken strong action to restore pride in Canada's national police force. Harassment in the RCMP, especially harassment that is sexual in nature, is a problem.

Canadians and the commissioner find it totally unacceptable, and our government agrees. That is why we introduced the enhancing RCMP accountability act.

What I do not understand is why the NDP would have voted against that very necessary legislation.

[Translation]

### 41ST GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Craig Scott (Toronto—Danforth, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I gave the Prime Minister the opportunity to tell us why the members for Saint Boniface and Selkirk—Interlake are still part of the Conservative caucus when the Chief Electoral Officer has recommended that they be suspended.

The members had two years to work with Elections Canada and straighten out the situation, yet they failed to do so.

Why does the Prime Minister think that these members are above the law?

[English]

Mr. Pierre Poilievre (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities and for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the reason these two members are in the House of Commons is that they were democratically elected by their constituents. They acted in good faith. Due to legitimate differences of opinion with Elections Canada, the agency's interpretation is now before the court. That is the right of these members, and they are exercising it accordingly.

The real question is, speaking of members sitting in caucuses, why there are two members sitting in the NDP caucus who refuse to pay their taxes.

# \* \* \* NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Blake Richards (Wild Rose, CPC): Mr. Speaker, natural resources are an integral part of Canada's economy that creates opportunities for Canadians and communities all across Canada. Our government has a plan to spur resource development while ensuring the environment is protected through our responsible resource development plan. Every sector of the Canadian economy is poised to benefit from this growth, from service companies to manufacturers supplying much-needed equipment, to the local grocer.

Could the Minister of Natural Resources share with the House the latest report on resource development?

Hon. Joe Oliver (Minister of Natural Resources, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Macdonald-Laurier Institute just published "Six Myths Surrounding the Development of Canada's Natural Resources". Granted, economics is not required reading in the New Democrats' book club, and while it may be somewhat traumatic for them, I

would recommend they read about the economic importance of Canada's natural resources. They would learn their cherished Dutch disease theory is a myth, and while the NDP oppose resource development and the Liberals stay silent, our government stands up for Canadian jobs.

• (1505)

[Translation]

### ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

**Mr. Jonathan Genest-Jourdain (Manicouagan, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada paid more than \$6.7 million over six years to private auditing companies for information that is already being provided through existing reporting mechanisms.

The Conservatives ignore these basic government reporting mechanisms and force taxpayers to pay twice as much to ensure that aboriginal peoples are accountable. There is one set of rules for the government and another for aboriginal peoples.

Can the minister explain why he hires private auditing firms to duplicate the work that his department is responsible for doing?

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development, CPC): Mr. Speaker, unlike the Liberals and the NDP, we believe in accounting for taxpayers' money.

That is why we have a solid audit system to respond to complaints from members of aboriginal communities about the use of funds by their chiefs and councils. That is also exactly why we kept our promise and passed the First Nations Financial Transparency Act.

Once again, despite their fine rhetoric, they voted against this bill.

[English]

### RAIL TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Bruce Hyer (Thunder Bay—Superior North, Ind.): Mr. Speaker, VIA Rail announced service cuts a year ago and tooted about how ridership and revenues would be boosted, but VIA's plan has gone off the rails. Its annual report shows operating expenses up and ridership down. There are fewer trains and they are emptier and later. Clearly, VIA intends to abandon Canada, except for the Quebec City-Windsor corridor.

Will the minister show leadership with a national strategy to put VIA Rail back on the right track?

**Hon. Steven Fletcher (Minister of State (Transport), CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the member has correctly pointed out that people do not take the train as much as they did in the 1950s or 1940s. I am glad that is evident to him. I also hoped he would have supported the \$1-billion of investment we put into VIA, but he did not.

Ridership continues to go down because there are alternative methods of transportation, like automobile, bus and airplane. We are making the best possible rail service, but we are not going to have taxpayers wasting money on trains that do not have people in them.

### **GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[English]

### **ECONOMIC ACTION PLAN 2013 ACT, NO. 1**

The House resumed from June 3 consideration of Bill C-60, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on March 21, 2013 and other measures, as reported (without amendment) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

**The Speaker:** Pursuant to an order made on Wednesday, May 22, 2013, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded divisions on the motions at report stage of Bill C-60.

Call in the members.

[Translation]

The question is on Motion No. 1.

**(1515)** 

Dion

Donnelly

[English]

(The House divided on Motion No. 1, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 712)

### YEAS

## Members

Dionne Labelle

Doré Lefebyre

Allen (Welland) Andrews Ashton Angus Aubin Ayala Bélanger Bellavance Bennett Blanchette Blanchette-Lamothe Borg Boutin-Sweet Boulerice Brison Brosseau Byrne Casey Cash Chicoine Charlton Chisholm Choquette Chow Christopherson Cleary Comartin Cotler Crowder Cullen Davies (Vancouver East) Cuzner Dewar Day

Dubé Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona) Dusseault
Easter Eyking
Foote Fortin
Freeman Fry

Garneau Garrison
Genest Genest-Jourdain
Giguère Godin
Goodale Gravelle

Groguhé Harris (Scarborough Southwest) Harris (St. John's East) Hsu

### Government Orders

Mourani

Latendresse Laverdière LeBlanc (Beauséjour) LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)

 Leslie
 Liu

 MacAulay
 Mai

 Marston
 Martin

 Masse
 Mathyssen

 May
 McCallum

McGuinty McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
Michaud Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord) Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)

Nantel Mulcair Nicholls Nash Nunez-Melo Pacetti Papillon Patry Perreault Pilon Plamondon Quach Rae Rafferty Ravignat Raynault Regan Rousseau Saganash Sandhu Scarpaleggia Scott Sellah Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)

Sims (Newton-North Delta)

Morin (Laurentides-Labelle)

 Sitsabaiesan
 St-Denis

 Stewart
 Stoffer

 Sullivan
 Toone

 Tremblay
 Trudeau

 Turmel
 Valeriote-— 132

### NAYS

### Members

Adams Adler Aglukkaq Albas Albrecht Alexander Allison Allen (Tobique-Mactaquac) Amblei Ambrose Anders Andersor Ashfield Armstrong Aspin Baird Bateman Bergen Bernier Bezan Blaney Block

Boughen Braid
Breitkreuz Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Brown (Newmarket—Aurora) Brown (Barrie)

Bruinooge Butt Calkins Calandra Carmichael Cannan Carrie Chisu Clarke Chong Clement Crockatt Daniel Davidson Del Mastro Dechert Devolin Dreeshen Duncan (Vancouver Island North) Dykstra Fantino Findlay (Delta-Richmond East) Flaherty Fletcher Galipeau Glover Goguen Goodyear Gosal Gourde Grewal

Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)

Hawn Hayes Hiebert Hillyer

Holder James Jean Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)

Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's) Kenney (Calgary Southeast)

Kerr

Komarnicki Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)

Lauzon Lebel Leitch Leung Lobb Lemieux Lizon Lukiwski Lunney MacKenzie Mayes McLeod McColeman Menegakis Menzies Merrifield Miller

Sandhu

Scott

Sgro

sor)

St-Denis Stoffer

Toone Trudeau

Gourde

Lizon

Valeriote- — 131

Sims (Newton-North Delta)

### Government Orders

Moore (Port Moody-Westwood-Port Coquitlam) Hyer Julian Kellway Moore (Fundy Royal) Norlock Karygiannis Nicholson O'Connor Lapointe Oliver O'Neill Gordon Larose Latendresse LeBlanc (Beauséjour) O'Toole Laverdière Opitz Paradis LeBlanc (LaSalle-Émard) Payne Leslie Poilievre Preston Liu MacAulay Raitt Rajotte Mai Marston Rathgeber Reid Martin Masse Mathyssen McCallum May McGuinty Rempel Richards Rickford Ritz McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood) Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue) Saxton Schellenberger Michaud Seeback Shea Morin (Chicoutimi-Le Fjord) Shorv Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce-Lachine) Shipley Morin (Laurentides-Labelle) Smith Sopuck Stanton Storseth Nantel Nash Strahl Nicholls Nunez-Melo Sweet Tilson Toet Pacetti Papillon Toews Trost Patry Péclet Trottier Truppe Perreault Pilon Uppal Plamondon Quach Rae Rankin Valcourt Van Kesteren Rafferty Van Loan Vellacott Ravignat Wallace Warawa Raynault Regan Warkentin Watson Rousseau Saganash

Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)

Weston (Saint John)

Williamson Wilks Wong Yelich Young (Oakville) Young (Vancouver South) Zimmer-

**PAIRED** 

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 2. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 3.

**(1520)** 

Dion

(The House divided on Motion No. 2, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 713)

### YEAS

### Members

Dionne Labelle

Dusseault

Allen (Welland) Andrews Angus Aubin Ashton Ayala Bélanger Bellavance Bennett Blanchette Blanchette-Lamothe Borg Boutin-Sweet Boulerice Brison Brosseau Byrne Casey Cash Chicoine Charlton Chisholm Choquette Chow Christopherson Comartin Cleary Cotler Crowder Cullen Davies (Vancouver East) Cuzner Day Dewar

Donnelly Doré Lefebvre Duncan (Etobicoke North) Duncan (Edmonton-Strathcona)

Eyking Easter Foote Fortin Fry Garrison Freeman Garneau Genest-Jourdain Giguère

Godin Goodale Gravelle Groguhé Harris (St. John's East) Harris (Scarborough Southwest) Hsu Hughes

### **NAYS** Members

Scarpaleggia

Sitsabaiesan

Stewart Sullivan

Tremblay

Turmel

Simms (Bonavista-Gander-Grand Falls-Wind-

Adler Adams Aglukkaq Albas Albrecht Alexander Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac) Allison Ambler Ambrose Anders Andersor Armstrong Ashfield Aspin Baird Bateman Bergen Bernier Bezan Blaney Block Boughen Braid

Brown (Leeds-Grenville) Breitkreuz Brown (Newmarket-Aurora) Brown (Barrie) Bruinooge Calandra Calkins Carmichael Cannan Carrie Chisu Clarke Chong Crockatt Clement Daniel Davidson Del Mastro Dechert Devolin Dreeshen Duncan (Vancouver Island North) Dykstra Fantino Fast Findlay (Delta—Richmond East) Flaherty Fletcher Galipeau Gallant Gill Glover Goguen Goodyear Gosal

Harper Harris (Cariboo-Prince George) Hawn Hiebert Hillver Holder James

Kamp (Pitt Meadows-Maple Ridge-Mission) Keddy (South Shore-St. Margaret's) Kenney (Calgary Southeast)

Grewal

Kent Komarnicki Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings) Lake Lauzon Lebel Leitch Leung Lobb Lemieux

Lukiwski Lunney MacKenzie Mayes McColeman McLeod Menegakis Menzies Moore (Port Moody-Westwood-Port Coquitlam)

Moore (Fundy Royal)

Norlock O'Connor Obhrai Oliver O'Neill Gordon O'Toole Opitz Paradis Payne Poilievre Preston Raitt Rajotte Rathgeber Reid Richards Rickford Ritz Schellenberger Saxton Shipley Shory Smith Sopuck Storseth Stanton Strahl Tilson Toet Toews Trost Trottier Truppe Tweed Uppal Valcourt Van Kesteren Van Loan Vellacott Wallace Warawa Warkentin Watson Weston (West Vancouver-Sunshine Coast-Sea to Sky Country)

Weston (Saint John)

Wilks Williamson Wong Woodworth Young (Oakville) Yelich Young (Vancouver South)

### **PAIRED**

The Speaker: I declare the Motion No. 2 defeated. I therefore declare Motion No. 3 defeated as well.

The next question is on Motion No. 6. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 7 to 11.

Hon. Gordon O'Connor: Mr. Speaker, if you seek it, I believe you would find agreement to apply the results of the vote on the previous motion to the current motion, with the Conservatives voting

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to proceed in this fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Translation]

Ms. Nycole Turmel: Mr. Speaker, we agree to apply the vote, and the NDP will vote in favour of the motion.

Ms. Judy Foote: Mr. Speaker, the Liberals agree to apply and will vote yes.

[Translation]

Mr. Louis Plamondon: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois will vote in favour of the motion.

[English]

Mr. Bruce Hyer: Mr. Speaker, Thunder Bay-Superior North agrees and will be voting yes.

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees and will be voting yes.

### [Translation]

(The House divided on Motion No. 6, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 714)

### YEAS

#### Members

Allen (Welland) Andrews Angus Aubin Ayala Bélanger Bellavance Bennett Blanchette Blanchette-Lamothe Borg Boulerice Boutin-Sweet Brosseau Byrne Casey Cash Charlton Chicoine Chisholm Choquette Chow Christopherson Cleary Comartin Cotler Côté Crowder Cullen

Cuzner Davies (Vancouver East) Day Dewar Dionne Labelle Dion Doré Lefebyre Donnelly Duncan (Etobicoke North) Dubé

Duncan (Edmonton-Strathcona) Foote Fortin Freeman Fry Garrison Garneau Genest-Jourdain Giguère Godin Goodale Gravelle Groguhé

Harris (St. John's East) Harris (Scarborough Southwest)

Hughes Hyer Jacob Jones Julian Kellway Karygiannis Lapointe Lamoureux Latendresse Larose Laverdière LeBlanc (Beauséjour) LeBlanc (LaSalle-Émard) Leslie

Liu MacAulay Mai Marston Martin Masse Mathyssen May McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood) Michaud

Moore (Abitibi-Témiscamingue) Morin (Chicoutimi-Le Fjord) Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce-Lachine) Morin (Laurentides-Labelle)

Mulcair Mourani Nash Nantel Nicholls Nunez-Melo Pacetti Papillon Patry Perreault Pilon Plamondon Quach Rae Rafferty Rankin Ravigna Raynault Regan Rousseau Saganash Sandhu Scarpaleggia Scott Sellah

Sgro Simms (Bonavista-Gander-Grand Falls-Wind-

sor) Sims (Newton-North Delta) Sitsabaiesan St-Denis Stewart Stoffer Sullivan Tremblay Trudeau Turmel

Valeriote- - 131

Warawa

Watson

Williamson

Woodworth

Young (Oakville)

Zimmer- - 156

Weston (West Vancouver-Sunshine Coast-Sea to Sky Country)

Warkentin

Wilks

Wong

Weston (Saint John)

Young (Vancouver South)

#### NAYS **PAIRED** Nil Members The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 6 defeated. I therefore declare Adams Adler Motions Nos. 7 to 11 defeated. Aglukkaq Alhas Albrecht Alexander The next question is on Motion No. 12. A vote on this motion also Allison Allen (Tobique-Mactaquac) applies to Motions Nos. 13 to 15. Ambler Ambrose Anders Anderson **●** (1530) Armstrong Ashfield Aspin Baird [English] Bateman Bergen Bernier Bezan (The House divided on Motion No. 12, which was negatived on Blaney Block Boughen Braid the following division:) Breitkreuz Brown (Leeds-Grenville) Brown (Newmarket-Aurora) Brown (Barrie) (Division No. 715) Butt Bruinooge Calandra Calkins YEAS Cannan Carmichael Chisu Members Carrie Chong Clarke Bellavance Clement Crockatt Fortin Daniel Davidson Hyer May Dechert Del Mastro Mourani Patry Plamondon- - 7 Devolin Dreeshen Duncan (Vancouver Island North) Dykstra Fast Flaherty **NAYS** Findlay (Delta-Richmond East) Fletcher Galipeau Members Gallant Gill Adams Aglukkaq Adler Glover Goguen Albas Goodyear Gosal Albrecht Alexander Gourde Grewal Allen (Welland) Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac) Harris (Cariboo-Prince George) Harper Allison Ambler Hawn Hayes Ambrose Anders Hiebert Anderson Andrews Holder James Angus Ashfield Armstrong Kamp (Pitt Meadows-Maple Ridge-Mission) Jean Ashton Keddy (South Shore-St. Margaret's) Kenney (Calgary Southeast) Atamanenko Aspin Kent Kerr Aubin Avala Komarnicki Kramp (Prince Edward-Hastings) Bateman Baird Bélanger Bennett Lebel Leitch Bergen Bernier Lemieux Leung Blanchette Lobb Bezan Blanchette-Lamothe Blaney Lukiwski Lunney Borg Boulerice MacKenzie Mayes Block Boughen McColeman McLeod Boutin-Sweet Braid Menegakis Menzies Breitkreuz Brison Merrifield Miller Brown (Leeds-Grenville) Moore (Port Moody-Westwood-Port Coquitlam) Brosseau Brown (Newmarket-Aurora) Brown (Barrie) Moore (Fundy Royal) Bruinooge Nicholson Norlock Butt Calandra Obhrai O'Connoi Byrne Calkins Cannan Oliver O'Neill Gordon O'Toole Carmichael Caron Opitz Paradis Payne Carrie Casev Cash Charlton Poilievre Preston Chicoine Chisholm Raitt Rajotte Rathgeber Reid Chisu Chong Choquette Chow Remnel Richards Rickford Christopherson Clarke Ritz Cleary Comartin Saxton Schellenberger Clement Côté Seeback Shea Cotler Crockatt Shipley Shory Crowder Smith Sopuck Cullen Daniel Cuzner Stanton Storseth Davidson Davies (Vancouver East) Strahl Sweet Tilson Toet Day Del Mastro Dechert Devolin Toews Trost Trottier Truppe Dewar Dionne Labelle Doré Lefebvre Tweed Uppal Donnelly Dreeshen Van Kesteren Valcourt Dubé Duncan (Vancouver Island North) Van Loan Vellacott Wallace

Duncan (Etobicoke North)

Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)

Dusseault

Easter

Fantino

Fletcher

Freeman Galipeau Duncan (Edmonton-Strathcona)

Dvkstra

Eyking

Flaherty

Foote

Fry Gallant

Garrison Genest-Jourdain Genest Giguère Gill Godin Goguen Goodale Goodyear Gosal Gourde Grewal Groguhé Harris (Scarborough Southwest) Harper Harris (St. John's East) Harris (Cariboo-Prince George)

Hawn Hayes Hiebert Hillver Holder Hughes Jacob James Jean Jones Julian

Kamp (Pitt Meadows-Maple Ridge-Mission) Karygiannis Keddy (South Shore-St. Margaret's) Kellway Kenney (Calgary Southeast) Kent Komarnick Kramp (Prince Edward-Hastings) Lake Lamoureux Lapointe Larose Latendresse Lauzon Laverdière Lebel LeBlanc (Beauséjour) LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)

Leitch Lemieux Leslie Liu Lobb Lizon Lukiwski Lunney MacAulay MacKenzie Mai Marston Martin Masse Mathyssen Mayes McCallum McColeman

McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood) McGuinty

McLeod Menegakis Merrifield Menzies Michaud

Moore (Abitibi-Témiscamingue) Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam) Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)

Moore (Fundy Royal) Morin (Laurentides-Labelle)

Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce-Lachine) Mulcair Nantel Nash Nicholls Nicholson Norlock Nunez-Melo Obhrai Oliver O'Connor O'Neill Gordon Opitz O'Toole Pacetti Papillon Paradis Payne Péclet Perreault Pilon Poilievre Preston Ouach Rae Raitt Rafferty Rankin Rajotte Rathgeber Ravignat

Raynault Regan Reid Rempel Richards Rickford Ritz Rousseau Saganash Saxton Scarpaleggia Schellenberger Scott Seeback Sellah Shea

Shipley Shory Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)

Sims (Newton-North Delta)

Wallace

Smith Sitsabaiesan Sopuck St-Denis Stewart Stoffer Storseth Strahl Sullivan Sweet Tilson Toet Toews Toone Tremblav Trost Trottier Trudeau Truppe Turmel Tweed Uppal Valcourt Valeriote Van Kesteren Van Loan Vellacott

Warawa

Weston (West Vancouver-Sunshine Coast-Sea to Sky Country) Weston (Saint John) Wong Woodworth Young (Oakville) Yelich Young (Vancouver South)

**PAIRED** 

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 12 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 13 to 15 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 16.

Hon. Gordon O'Connor: Mr. Speaker, if you seek it, I believe you would find agreement to apply the results of the previous motion to the current motion, with the Conservatives voting no.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to proceed in this fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Translation]

Ms. Nycole Turmel: Mr. Speaker, we agree to apply the vote, and the NDP will vote in favour of the motion.

Ms. Judy Foote: Mr. Speaker, the Liberals agree to apply and will be voting no.

[Translation]

Mr. Louis Plamondon: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois is voting in favour of the motion.

Mr. Bruce Hyer: Mr. Speaker, Thunder Bay-Superior North agrees to apply and votes yes.

[Translation]

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party is voting in favour of the motion.

[English]

(The House divided on Motion No. 16, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 716)

## YEAS

Members

Allen (Welland) Angus Ashton Aubin Atamanenko Ayala Bellavance Blanchette Blanchette-Lamothe Borg Boutin-Sweet Boulerice Brosseau Caron Cash Charlton Chicoine Chisholm Choquette Chow Christopherson Cleary Côté Comartin Crowder Cullen Davies (Vancouver East) Day Dionne Labelle Dewar Donnelly Doré Lefebvre

Dubé Duncan (Edmonton-Strathcona) Dusseault Fortin

Freeman Garrison Genest Genest-Jourdain

Giguère Lauzon Gravelle Groguhé Lebel LeBlanc (Beauséjour) Harris (Scarborough Southwest) Harris (St. John's East) Leitch Lemieux Hughes Leung Lizon Jacob Julian Lobb Lukiwski Kellway Lapointe MacAulay Lunney Larose MacKenzie Mayes Laverdière LeBlanc (LaSalle-Émard) McCallum McColeman

Leslie Mai Marston Martin

Masse Mathyssen May Moore (Abitibi-Témiscamingue) Michaud

Morin (Chicoutimi-Le Fjord) Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce-Lachine) Morin (Laurentides-Labelle) Mourani Mulcair Nash Nicholls

Nunez-Melo Papillon Patry Perreault Pilon Plamondon Quach Rafferty Rankin Ravignat Raynault Roussean Saganash Sandhu

Sellah Sims (Newton-North Delta) Sitsabaiesan Stewart

Stoffer Tremblay Turmel- — 99

### **NAYS**

#### Members

Adams Adler Aglukkaq Albas Albrecht Alexander Allen (Tobique-Mactaquac) Allison Ambler Ambrose Anders Anderson Andrews Armstrong Ashfield Aspin Bateman Baird Bélanger Bennett Bernier Bergen Blaney Block Boughen Braid Breitkreuz Brown (Leeds—Grenville) Brison Brown (Newmarket-Aurora) Brown (Barrie)

Butt Bruinooge Calandra Calkins Cannan Carmichael Carrie Casey Chisu Chong Clarke Clement Cotler Crockatt Cuzner Daniel Davidson Dechert Del Mastro Devolin Dion

Duncan (Vancouver Island North) Dreeshen

Duncan (Etobicoke North) Dykstra Eyking Fantino Fast

Flaherty Findlay (Delta-Richmond East) Fletcher Foote Frv Galipeau Gallant Garneau Gill Glover Goguen Goodale Goodyear Gosal Gourde

Harris (Cariboo-Prince George) Harper Hawn Hayes

Hiebert Hillyer Holder Hsu Jean James Jones

Kamp (Pitt Meadows-Maple Ridge-Mission) Karygiannis Keddy (South Shore-St. Margaret's)

Kenney (Calgary Southeast) Kent Komarnick Kramp (Prince Edward-Hastings) Lake

McGuinty McLeod

McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood) Menegakis

Menzies Miller Moore (Port Moody-Westwood-Port Coquitlam)

Moore (Fundy Royal) Nicholson Norlock Obhrai O'Connor Oliver O'Neill Gordon Opitz O'Toole Pacetti Paradis Pavne Poilievre Preston Raitt Rae Rajotte Rathgeber Regan Reid

Richards Rempel Rickford Ritz Saxton Scarpaleggia Schellenberger Seeback Shea Shipley Shory Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor) Smith

Sopuck Stanton St-Denis Storseth Strahl Sweet Tilson Toet Trost Toews Trottier Trudeau Truppe Tweed Valcourt Uppal Valeriote Van Kesteren Van Loan Vellacott Wallace Warawa Warkentin Watson Weston (West Vancouver-Sunshine Coast-Sea to Sky Country)

Weston (Saint John) Wilks Williamson Woodworth Wong

Yelich Young (Oakville) Young (Vancouver South)

### **PAIRED**

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 16 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 17. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 18 and 19.

Hon. Gordon O'Connor: Mr. Speaker, if you seek it, I believe you would find agreement to apply the results of the previous motion to the current motion, with the Conservatives voting no.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Translation]

Ms. Nycole Turmel: Mr. Speaker, we agree to apply the vote, and the NDP will vote in favour of the motion.

[English]

Ms. Judy Foote: Mr. Speaker, the Liberals agree to apply and will be voting no.

[Translation]

Mr. Louis Plamondon: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois is voting in favour of the motion.

## Mr. Bruce Hyer: Mr. Speaker, Thunder Bay—Superior North agrees voting yes.

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees to apply and votes yes.

(The House divided on Motion No. 17, which was negatived on the following division:)

### (Division No. 717)

### YEAS

#### Members

Allen (Welland) Angus Ashton Atamanenko Aubin Avala Blanchette Bellavance Blanchette-Lamothe Borg Boutin-Sweet Boulerice Brosseau Caron Cash Charlton Chicoine Chisholm Choquette Chow Christopherson Cleary Comartin Côté Cullen Crowder Davies (Vancouver East) Day Dewar

[English]

Dionne Labelle Doré Lefebvre Donnelly Duncan (Edmonton-Strathcona) Dubé

Dusseault Fortin Garrison Freeman Genest-Jourdain Giguère Godin Gravelle Groguhé

Harris (Scarborough Southwest) Harris (St. John's East) Hyer

Hughes Julian Jacob Kellway Lapointe Larose Latendresse LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard) Laverdière

Leslie Mai Marston Martin Masse

Mathyssen May Michaud

Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue) Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine) Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord) Morin (Laurentides-Labelle) Mourani

Mulcair Nantel Nicholls Nash Nunez-Melo Papillon Patry Péclet Perreault Pilon Plamondon Quach Rafferty Rankin Ravignat Raynault Rous Saganash Sandhu Scott

Sellah Sims (Newton-North Delta) Sitsabaiesan

Stoffer Sullivan Tremblay Toone Turmel- - 99

### NAYS

Members Adams Adler Aglukkaq Albas Alexander Albrecht Allen (Tobique-Mactaquac) Allison Ambler Ambrose

Anders Anderson Andrews Armstrong Ashfield Aspin Baird Bateman Bélanger Bennett Bergen Bernier

Blaney Bezan Boughen Breitkreuz Block Braid

Brown (Leeds-Grenville) Brown (Newmarket-Aurora) Brown (Barrie)

Bruinooge Calandra Byrne Calkins Cannan Carmichael Carrie Chisu Casey Chong Clarke Cotler Clement Crockatt Cuzner Daniel Davidson Dechert Del Mastro Devolin Dion

Dreeshen Duncan (Vancouver Island North) Duncan (Etobicoke North) Dykstra

Eyking Easter Fantino Fast Flaherty Findlay (Delta-Richmond East) Fletcher Fry Galineau Gallant Garneau Gill Glover Goodale Goguen Goodyear Gosal Gourde Grewal

Harris (Cariboo-Prince George) Harper

Hawn Hayes Hiebert Hillyer Holder Hsu James

Jones Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission) Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's) Karygiannis

Kenney (Calgary Southeast) Komarnicki

Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings) Lake Lauzon

Lebel LeBlanc (Beauséjour) Leitch Lemieux

Leung Lizon Lobb Lukiwski MacAulay Lunnev MacKenzie Mayes McColeman McCallum

McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood) McGuinty

McLeod Menegakis Merrifield

Menzies Miller Moore (Port Moody-Westwood-Port Coquitlam)

Moore (Fundy Royal) Nicholson Norlock Obhrai O'Connor Oliver O'Neill Gordon Opitz Pacetti O'Toole Paradis Payne Poilievre Preston Rae Raitt Rajotte Rathgeber Regan Reid Richards Rempel Rickford Saxton Scarpaleggia Schellenberger Seeback Sgro Shipley

Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)

Smith

Sopuck St-Denis Stanton Storseth Strahl Sweet Tilson Toet Toews Trost Trottier Trudeau Truppe Tweed Valcourt Uppal Valeriote Van Kesteren Van Loan Vellacott Wallace Warawa Warkentin Watson Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)

Weston (Saint John)

Williamson Wilks Wong Woodworth

Young (Oakville) Young (Vancouver South)

**PAIRED** 

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 17 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 18 and 19 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 20. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 24, 26, 27 and 29 to 36.

(The House divided on Motion No. 20, which was negatived on the following division:)

### (Division No. 718)

### YEAS

#### Members

Allen (Welland) Angus Ashton Atamanenko Aubin Ayala Bellavance Blanchette Blanchette-Lamothe Borg Boulerice Boutin-Sweet Brosseau Caron Cash Charlton Chicoine Chisholm Choquette Chow Christopherson Cleary Comartin Côté Crowder Cullen Davies (Vancouver East) Day Dionne Labelle Dewar

Donnelly Doré Lefebyre Dubé Duncan (Edmonton-Strathcona)

Dusseault Fortin Garrison Freeman Genest-Jourdain Genest Giguère Godin Gravelle Groguhé Harris (St. John's East) Harris (Scarborough Southwest)

Hughes Hyer Jacob Julian Kellway Lapointe

Larose Latendresse Laverdière LeBlanc (LaSalle-Émard)

Mai Marston Martin Masse

Mathyssen May Michaud

Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue) Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord) Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine) Morin (Laurentides-Labelle)

Mulcair Nantel Nash Nicholls Nunez-Melo Papillon Patry Perreault Péclet Pilon Plamondon Quach Rafferty Rankin Ravignat Raynault Rousseau Saganash

Sandhu Scott Sims (Newton-North Delta) Sellah Sitsabaiesan Stewart

Stoffer Sullivan Tremblay Toone

Turmel- - 99

NAYS

Members

Adler Aglukkaq Albas Albrecht Alexander Allen (Tobique-Mactaquac) Allison Ambler Ambrose

Andrews Ashfield Armstrong Aspin Bateman Bélanger Bennett Bergen Bernier Blaney Boughen Breitkreuz Block Braid

Brown (Leeds-Grenville) Brown (Newmarket-Aurora) Brown (Barrie) Bruinooge Calandra

Calkins Cannan Carmichael Carrie Chisu Chong Clarke Cotler Clement Crockatt Cuzner Daniel Davidson Dechert Del Mastro Devolin Dion

Duncan (Vancouver Island North) Dreeshen

Duncan (Etobicoke North) Dykstra Easter Eyking Fantino Fast Findlay (Delta—Richmond East) Flaherty Fletcher Fry Galipeau Gallant Garneau Glover Goodale Gill Goguen Goodyear Gosal Gourde Grewal

Harris (Cariboo—Prince George) Harper

Hiebert Hillyer Holder Hsu

Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission) Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's) Jones Karygiannis

Kenney (Calgary Southeast) Kent Kerr Komarnicki

Kramp (Prince Edward-Hastings) Lake Lauzon LeBlanc (Beauséjour) Lebel

Leitch Lemieux Leung Lizon Lukiwski Lobb MacAulay Lunney Mayes McColeman MacKenzie McCallum

McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood) McGuinty McLeod

Menegakis Merrifield Menzies

Miller Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)

Moore (Fundy Royal) Nicholson Norlock Obhrai O'Connor O'Neill Gordon Opitz Pacetti O'Toole Paradis Payne Poilievre Preston Rae Raitt Rajotte Rathgeber Regan Reid Richards Rempel Rickford Saxton Scarpaleggia Schellenberger Seeback Sgro Shipley

Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)

Smith Sopuck St-Denis Strahl

Stanton Storseth Sweet Tilson Toet Toews Trost Trottier Trudeau Truppe Tweed Valcourt Uppal Valeriote Van Kesteren Van Loan Vellacott

Hver

Jones Karygiannis

### Government Orders

Jacob

Julian

Kellway

Michaud

Wallace Warawa
Warkentin Watson
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)
Wilks Williamson
Wong Woodworth
Yelich Young (Oakville)
Young (Vancouver South)

### **PAIRED**

Nil

**The Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 20 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 24, 26, 27 and 29 to 36 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 37. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 38 to 40.

**Hon. Gordon O'Connor:** Mr. Speaker, if you seek it, I believe you would find agreement to apply the result of the previous motion to the current motion, with the Conservatives voting no.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Translation]

**Ms. Nycole Turmel:** Mr. Speaker, we agree to apply the vote, and the NDP will vote in favour of the motion.

[English]

**Ms. Judy Foote:** Mr. Speaker, the Liberals agree to apply and will vote yes.

[Translation]

Mr. Louis Plamondon: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois is voting in favour of the motion.

[English]

**Mr. Bruce Hyer:** Mr. Speaker, Thunder Bay—Superior North agrees and will be voting yes.

[Translation]

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party is voting in favour of the motion.

The House divided on Motion No. 37, which was negatived on the following division:)

### (Division No. 719)

### YEAS Members

Allen (Welland) Andrews Ashton Angus Atamanenko Auhin Avala Bélanger Bellavance Bennett Blanchette Blanchette-Lamothe Boulerice Borg Boutin-Sweet Brison

Brosseau Byrne Caron Casev Charlton Chicoine Chisholm Choquette Chow Christopherson Cleary Comartin Côté Crowder Cotler Cuznei Davies (Vancouver East) Day Dion Dewar Dionne Labelle Donnelly Doré Lefebvre Dubé

Duncan (Etobicoke North) Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)

Dusseault Easter
Eyking Foote
Fortin Freeman
Fry Garneau
Garrison Genest
Genest-Jourdain Giguère
Godin Godale
Gravelle Groguhé

Harris (Scarborough Southwest) Harris (St. John's East) Hsu Hughes

Lapointe Latendresse Lamoureux Larose Laverdière LeBlanc (Beauséjour) LeBlanc (LaSalle-Émard) Leslie MacAulay Mai Marston Martin Masse Mathyssen May McCallum McGuinty

McKay (Scarborough-Guildwood)

Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)

Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)

Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)

Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)

Mourani Mulcair Nantel Nash Nicholls Nunez-Melo Pacetti Papillon Patry Péclet Perreault Pilon Plamondon Ouach Rafferty Rae Rankin Ravignat Raynault Regan

Raynault Regan
Rousseau Saganash
Sandhu Scarpaleggia
Scott Sellah

Sgro Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind-

sor)

 Sims (Newton—North Delta)
 Sitsabaiesan

 St-Denis
 Stewart

 Stoffer
 Sullivan

 Toone
 Tremblay

 Trudeau
 Turmel

Valeriote- — 133

### **NAYS**

### Members

Adams Aglukkaq Adler Albas Albrecht Alexander Allen (Tobique-Mactaquac) Allison Ambler Ambrose Anders Anderson Armstrong Ashfield Aspin Baird Bateman Bergen

Bateman Bergen
Bemier Bezan
Blaney Block
Boughen Braid

Breitkreuz Brown (Leeds—Grenville) Brown (Newmarket—Aurora) Brown (Barrie)

Bruinooge Calkins Calandra Cannan Carmichael Chong Clarke Crockatt Clement Daniel Davidson Dechert Del Mastro Devolin Dreeshen Duncan (Vancouver Island North) Dykstra Fast Fantino

Findlay (Delta—Richmond East) Flaherty
Fletcher Galipeau
Gallant Gill
Glover Goguen
Goodyear Gosal
Gourde Grewal

Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)

Hawn Hayes Hiebert Hillyer Holder James Jean Kamp (Pitt Meadows-Maple Ridge-Mission) Keddy (South Shore-St. Margaret's) Kenney (Calgary Southeast) Kent Kerr Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings) Komarnicki Lake Lauzon Lebel

Leitch Lemieux Leung Lizon Lobb Lukiwski Lunney MacKenzie Mayes McColeman McLeod Menegakis Menzies Merrifield Miller Moore (Port Moody-Westwood-Port Coquitlam) Moore (Fundy Royal)

Nicholson Norlock Obhrai O'Connor Oliver O'Neill Gordon Opitz O'Toole Paradis Pavne Poilievre Preston Raitt Rajotte Rathgeber Reid Richards Rickford Ritz Schellenberger Saxton Seeback Shea Shipley Shory Smith Sopuck Stanton Storseth Strahl Sweet Tilson Toet Toews Trost Trottier Truppe Tweed Uppal Valcourt Van Kesteren Van Loan Vellacott Wallace Warkentin Watson

Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)

Williamson Wilks Woodworth Wong Young (Oakville) Young (Vancouver South) Zimmer- - 156

### **PAIRED**

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 37 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 38 to 40 defeated.

[English]

The next question is on Motion No. 41. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 42 and 43.

Hon. Gordon O'Connor: Mr. Speaker, if you seek it, I believe you would find agreement to apply the results of the previous motion to the current motion, with the Conservatives voting no.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Translation]

Ms. Nycole Turmel: Mr. Speaker, we agree to apply the vote, and we will vote yes.

[English]

Ms. Judy Foote: Mr. Speaker, we agree to apply the vote and will be voting yes.

[Translation]

Mr. Louis Plamondon: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois votes yes.

[English]

Mr. Bruce Hyer: Mr. Speaker, Thunder Bay—Superior North agrees and will be voting yes.

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party will be voting

(The House divided on Motion No. 41, which was negatived on the following division:)

### (Division No. 720)

#### YEAS

#### Members

Allen (Welland) Andrews Ashton Angus Atamanenko Aubin Avala Bélanger Bellavance Bennett Blanchette Blanchette-Lamothe Boulerice Borg Boutin-Sweet Brison Brosseau Byrne Caron Casey Cash Charlton Chicoine Chisholm Choquette Chow Christopherson Cleary Comartin Côté Cotler Crowder Cullen Cuzner Davies (Vancouver East) Day Dewar Dion Dionne Labelle Donnelly Doré Lefebvre Dubé

Duncan (Etobicoke North) Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)

Dusseault Faster Eyking Foote Fry Garneau Garrison Genest Genest-Jourdain Godin Goodale Gravelle Groguhé

Harris (Scarborough Southwest) Harris (St. John's East) Hsu Hughes

Hyer Jones Julian Karygiannis Kellway Lapointe Larose Latendresse LeBlanc (Beauséjour) Laverdière LeBlanc (LaSalle-Émard) MacAulay Liu Mai Marston Martin Masse May McGuinty Mathyssen

McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood) Michaud Moore (Abitibi-Témiscamingue) Morin (Chicoutimi-Le Fjord) Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine) Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)

Mourani Mulcair Nantel Nash Nicholls Nunez-Melo Pacetti Papillon Péclet Patry Perreault Pilon Plamondon Ouach Rae Rafferty Rankin Ravignat Regan Saganash Raynault Rousseau Sandhu Scarpaleggia

McCallum

Scott

Simms (Bonavista-Gander-Grand Falls-Wind-Sgro

sor) Sitsabaiesan Sims (Newton-North Delta) St-Denis Stewart Stoffer Sullivan Toone Tremblay

Trudeau Turmel Valeriote-- 133 Young (Oakville) Young (Vancouver South) Zimmer- — 156 **NAYS PAIRED** 

Members Adler

Aglukkaq Albas Albrecht Alexander Allen (Tobique-Mactaquac) Allison Ambler Ambrose Anders Anderson Armstrong Ashfield Aspin Baird Bateman Bergen Bernier Bezan Blaney Block Braid Boughen

Adams

Breitkreuz Brown (Leeds-Grenville)

Brown (Newmarket-Aurora) Brown (Barrie) Butt Bruinooge Calandra Calkins Cannan Carmichael Chisu Carrie Clarke Chong Clement Crockatt Davidson Daniel Dechert Del Mastro Devolin Dreeshen Duncan (Vancouver Island North) Dykstra

Findlay (Delta-Richmond East) Flaherty Galipeau Gallant Gill Glover Goguen Goodyear Gosal Gourde Grewal

Harris (Cariboo-Prince George) Harper

Hayes Hawn Hiebert Hillyen Holder James

Kamp (Pitt Meadows-Maple Ridge-Mission) Jean

Kenney (Calgary Southeast) Keddy (South Shore-St. Margaret's) Kent Kerr Komarnicki Kramp (Prince Edward-Hastings)

Lake Lebel Leitch Lemieux Leung Lizon Lobb Lukiwski Lunney MacKenzie Mayes McColeman McLeod Menegakis Menzies Merrifield Miller

Moore (Port Moody-Westwood-Port Coquitlam)

Moore (Fundy Royal)

Nicholson Norlock Obhrai O'Connor O'Neill Gordon Oliver O'Toole Opitz Paradis Payne Poilievre Preston Raitt Rajotte Rathgeber Reid Rempel Richards Ritz Saxton Schellenberger Seeback Shea Shipley Shory Smith Sopuck Stanton Storseth Strahl Sweet Toet Tilson Toews Trost Trottier Truppe Uppal Tweed Valcourt Van Kesteren Vellacott Van Loan Wallace Warawa

Weston (West Vancouver-Sunshine Coast-Sea to Sky Country)

Watson

Weston (Saint John)

Warkentin

Williamson Wilks

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 41 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 42 and 43 defeated.

[Translation]

The question is on Motion No. 47. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 48 to 59.

The hon. government whip.

[English]

Hon. Gordon O'Connor: Mr. Speaker, if you seek it, I believe you would find agreement to apply the results of the previous motion to the current motion, with the Conservatives voting no.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Translation]

Ms. Nycole Turmel: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote, and we will vote yes.

Ms. Judy Foote: Mr. Speaker, the Liberals agree to apply and will be voting no.

[Translation]

Mr. Louis Plamondon: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois supports the motion.

[English]

Mr. Bruce Hyer: Mr. Speaker, Thunder Bay-Superior North will be voting yes.

[Translation]

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party also votes yes.

**(1545)** 

[English]

(The House divided on Motion No. 47, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 721)

### YEAS

### Members

Allen (Welland) Angus Ashton Aubin Ayala Bellavance Blanchette Blanchette-Lamothe Borg Boulerice Boutin-Sweet Brosseau Caron Cash Charlton Chicoine Chisholm Choquette Chow Christopherson Cleary Côté Crowder Cullen Davies (Vancouver East) Day Dionne Labelle Dewar Donnelly Doré Lefebyre

Dubé Duncan (Edmonton-Strathcona)

Dusseault Freeman Garrison Genest-Jourdain Genest Giguère Godin Gravelle Groguhé Harris (Scarborough Southwest) Harris (St. John's East) Hughes Jacob Julian Kellway Lapointe Latendresse Larose Laverdière LeBlanc (LaSalle-Émard) Leslie Mai Marston Martin Masse Mathyssen May Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue) Michaud Morin (Chicoutimi-Le Fjord) Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce-Lachine) Morin (Laurentides-Labelle) Mourani Mulcair Nash Nicholls Nunez-Melo Papillon Patry

Sandhu Sellah Sims (Newton-North Delta)

Sitsabaiesan Stewart Stoffer Sullivan Tremblay

Turmel- — 99

Perreault

Rafferty

Ravignat

Rousseau

Plamondon

### **NAYS**

#### Members

Pilon

Quach

Rankin

Raynault

Saganash

Adler Adams Aglukkaq Albas Albrecht Alexander Allen (Tobique-Mactaquac) Allison Ambler Ambrose Anders Anderson Andrews Armstrong Ashfield Aspin Baird Bateman Bélanger Bennett Bergen Bernier Blaney Block Boughen Braid Breitkreuz

Brown (Leeds—Grenville) Brison

Brown (Newmarket-Aurora) Brown (Barrie) Butt Bruinooge Calandra Calkins Cannan Carmichael Carrie Casey Chisu Chong Clarke Cotler Clemen Crockatt Cuzner Daniel Davidson Dechert Del Mastro Devolin

Duncan (Vancouver Island North) Dreeshen

Duncan (Etobicoke North) Dykstra Eyking Fantino Fast Flaherty Findlay (Delta-Richmond East) Fletcher Foote Galipeau

Frv Gallant Garneau Gill Glover Goguen Goodale Goodyear Gosal Gourde

Harris (Cariboo-Prince George) Harper

Hawn Hayes Hiebert Hillyer Holder Hsu James

Jones Kamp (Pitt Meadows-Maple Ridge-Mission) Keddy (South Shore-St. Margaret's) Karygiannis

Kenney (Calgary Southeast) Kent Komarnicki Kramp (Prince Edward-Hastings) Lake Lebel LeBlanc (Beauséjour)

Leitch Lemieux Lizon Leung Lobb Lukiwski MacAulay Lunney MacKenzie Mayes McCallum McColeman

McGuinty McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)

McLeod Menzies Merrifield

Miller Moore (Port Moody-Westwood-Port Coquitlam)

Moore (Fundy Royal) Nicholson Norlock O'Connor Obhrai Oliver O'Neill Gordon Opitz O'Toole Pacetti Paradis Payne Poilievre Preston Rae Raitt Rajotte Rathgeber Regan Reid Richards Remnel Saxton Scarpaleggia Schellenberger Seeback Shea Sgro Shipley Shory

Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)

Sopuck St-Denis Stanton Storseth Sweet Tilson Toet Toews Trost Trottier Trudeau Truppe Tweed Valcourt Uppal Van Kesterer Vellacott

Valeriote Van Loan Wallace Warawa Warkentin Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)

Weston (Saint John) Wilks

Williamson Wong Woodworth Young (Oakville) Young (Vancouver South) Zimmer- - 190

### **PAIRED**

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 47 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 48 to 59 defeated.

[Translation]

The vote on Motion No. 60. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 61 to 71.

[English]

Hon. Gordon O'Connor: Mr. Speaker, if you seek it, I believe you would find agreement to apply the results of the previous motion to the current motion, with the Conservatives voting no.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Translation]

Ms. Nycole Turmel: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote, and we will vote yes.

[English]

Ms. Judy Foote: Mr. Speaker, the Liberals agree to apply and will vote ves.

Adams

### Government Orders

[Translation]

Mr. Louis Plamondon: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois votes yes.

[English]

Mr. Bruce Hyer: Mr. Speaker, Thunder Bay—Superior North votes yes.

**Ms. Elizabeth May:** Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees to apply and will be voting yes.

(The House divided on Motion No. 60, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 722)

### YEAS

### Members

Allen (Welland) Andrews Angus Ashton Atamanenko Aubin Ayala Bélanger Bellavance Bennett Blanchette Blanchette-Lamothe Boulerice Borg Brison Brosseau Byrne Caron Casev Cash Charlton Chicoine Chisholm Choquette Chow Christopherson Cleary Comartin Côté Cotler Crowder Cullen Cuzner Davies (Vancouver East) Day Dewar Dion Dionne Labelle Donnelly Doré Lefebvre Dubé

Duncan (Etobicoke North) Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Dusseault Easter

Eyking Foote
Fortin Freeman
Fry Gameau
Garrison Genest
Genest-Jourdain Giguère
Godin Goodale
Gravelle Groguhé
Harris (Scarborough Southwest) Harris (St. John's East)

 Hsu
 Hughes

 Hyer
 Jacob

 Jones
 Julian

 Karygiannis
 Kellway

 Lamoureux
 Lapointe

 Larose
 Latendresse

 Laverdière
 LeBlanc (Beauséjour)

 LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)
 Leslie

 Liu
 MacAulay

 Mai
 Marston

 Martin
 Masse

 Mathyssen
 May

 McCallum
 McGuinty

 McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
 Michaud

Scott

Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue) Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine) Morin (Chicoutimi-Le Fjord) Morin (Laurentides-Labelle) Mourani Mulcair Nash Nicholls Nunez-Melo Pacetti Papillon Patry Perreault Pilon Plamondon Ouach Rae Rafferty Rankin Ravignat Ravnault Regan Saganash Sandhu Scarpaleggia

Sellah

Sgro Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind-

Sims (Newton—North Delta)
Sitsabaiesan
St-Denis
Stewart
Stoffer
Sullivan
Tone
Trudeau
Valeriote— 133

#### NAYS

### Members Adler

Aglukkaq Albrecht Albas Alexander Allen (Tobique-Mactaquac) Allison Ambler Ambrose Anders Anderson Armstrong Ashfield Aspin Bateman Baird Bergen Bernier Blaney Block Boughen Braid

Breitkreuz Brown (Leeds—Grenville) Brown (Newmarket—Aurora) Brown (Barrie)

Bruinooge Calandra Calkins Cannan Carmichael Carrie Chisu Chong Clarke Clement Crockatt Daniel Davidson Dechert Del Mastro Devolin Dreeshen Duncan (Vancouver Island North) Dykstra Fantino Fast Findlay (Delta-Richmond East) Flaherty Galipeau Gallant Gill Glover Goguen Goodyear Gosal Gourde Grewal

Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)

Hawn Hayes Hiebert Hillyer Holder James

Jean Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)

Truppe

Van Kesteren

Kendy (South Shore—St. Margaret's) Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kent Kerr

Komarnicki Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)

Lake Lauzon Leitch Lebel Lemieux Leung Lizon Lobb Lukiwski Lunney MacKenzie Mayes McColeman McLeod Menegakis Menzies Merrifield Miller Moore (Port Moody-Westwood-Port Coquitlam)

Moore (Fundy Royal)

Trottier

Tweed

Valcourt

Nicholson Norlock O'Connor O'Neill Gordon Obhrai Oliver O'Toole Opitz Paradis Payne Poilievre Preston Rajotte Rathgeber Reid Richards Rempel Rickford Ritz Schellenberger Saxton Seeback Shea Shipley Shory Smith Sopuck Stanton Storseth Sweet Tilson Toet Toews Trost

Vellacott Van Loan Wallace Warawa Warkentin Watson Weston (West Vancouver-Sunshine Coast-Sea to Sky Country) Weston (Saint John) Williamson Wilks Wong Woodworth

Young (Oakville) Yelich Young (Vancouver South) Zimmer- - 156

### **PAIRED**

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 60 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 61 to 71 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 72.

Hon. Gordon O'Connor: Mr. Speaker, if you seek it, I believe you would find agreement to apply the results of the previous motion to the current motion, with the Conservatives voting no.

The Speaker: Is that agreed? Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Translation]

Ms. Nycole Turmel: Mr. Speaker, we agree to apply the vote, and the NDP will vote yes.

Ms. Judy Foote: Mr. Speaker, the Liberals agree to apply the vote and will be voting yes.

[Translation]

Mr. Louis Plamondon: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois votes yes.

[English]

Mr. Bruce Hyer: Mr. Speaker, Thunder Bay-Superior North agrees to apply and will be voting yes.

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, agreeing and voting yes.

(The House divided on Motion No. 72, which was negatived on the following division:)

### (Division No. 723)

### YEAS Members

#### Allen (Welland) Andrews Ashton Angus Atamanenko Aubin Ayala Bélanger Bellavance Bennett Blanchette Blanchette-Lamothe Boulerice Borg Brison

Boutin-Sweet Brosseau Byrne Caron Cash Charlton Chicoine Chisholm Choquette Christopherson Cleary Côté Comartin Crowder Cullen Cuzner Davies (Vancouver East) Day Dion Dewar Dionne Labelle Donnelly Doré Lefebyre Dubé

Duncan (Etobicoke North) Duncan (Edmonton-Strathcona)

Dusseault Easter Eyking

Freeman Garneau Garrison Genest Giguère Godin Goodale Gravelle Groguhé Harris (Scarborough Southwest) Harris (St. John's East)

HsuHughes Hver Jacob Julian Jones Karygiannis Kellway Lamoureux Lapointe Latendresse Larose

Laverdière LeBlanc (Beauséjour) LeBlanc (LaSalle-Émard) Leslie MacAulay Mai Marston Martin Masse Mathyssen May McCallum McGuinty McKay (Scarborough-Guildwood) Michaud

Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue) Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord) Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce-Lachine) Morin (Laurentides-Labelle)

Mourani Mulcair Nash Nicholls Nunez-Melo Pacetti Papillon Péclet Patry Perreault Pilon Plamondon Ouach Rafferty Rae Rankin Ravignat Ravnault Regan Saganash Rousseau Scarpaleggia Sandhu Scott

Simms (Bonavista-Gander-Grand Falls-Wind-Sgro

sor)

Sims (Newton-North Delta) Sitsabaiesan St-Denis Stoffer Sullivan Tremblay Toone Valeriote- - 133

### **NAYS**

### Members

Adams Adler Aglukkaq Albas Albrecht Alexander Allen (Tobique-Mactaquac) Allison Ambler Ambrose Anders Anderson Armstrong Ashfield Aspin Bateman Baird Bergen Bernier Bezan Blaney Block

Braid Boughen Breitkreuz Brown (Leeds-Grenville)

Brown (Newmarket-Aurora) Brown (Barrie) Bruinooge Calandra Calkins Cannan Carmichael Chisu Chong Clarke Clement Crockatt Daniel Dechert Del Mastro Devolin Dreeshen Duncan (Vancouver Island North) Dykstra Fantino Findlay (Delta-Richmond East) Flaherty Fletcher Galipeau Gallant Gill Glover Goguen Gosal Goodyear

Gourde Grewal Harper Harris (Cariboo-Prince George)

Hawn Hayes Hiebert Hillyer Holder James

Jean	Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)	Dewar	Dion
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Dionne Labelle	Donnelly
Kent Shore—St. Wargarets)	Kerr	Doré Lefebvre	Dubé
Komarnicki	Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)	Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Lake	Lauzon	Dusseault	Easter
Lebel	Leitch	Eyking	Foote
Lemieux		Fortin	Freeman
	Leung Lobb		Garneau
Lizon		Fry	
Lukiwski	Lunney	Garrison	Genest
MacKenzie	Mayes	Genest-Jourdain	Giguère
McColeman	McLeod	Godin	Goodale
Menegakis	Menzies	Gravelle	Groguhé
Merrifield	Miller	Harris (Scarborough Southwest)	Harris (St. John's East)
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)		Hsu	Hughes
Moore (Fundy Royal)		Hyer	Jacob
Nicholson	Norlock	Jones	Julian
Obhrai	O'Connor	Karygiannis	Kellway
Oliver	O'Neill Gordon	Lamoureux	Lapointe
Opitz	O'Toole	Larose	Latendresse
Paradis	Payne	Laverdière	LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
Poilievre	Preston	LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)	Leslie
Raitt	Rajotte	Liu	MacAulay
Rathgeber	Reid	Mai	Marston
Rempel	Richards	Martin	Masse
Rickford	Ritz	Mathyssen	May
Saxton	Schellenberger	McCallum	McGuinty
Seeback	Shea	McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)	Michaud
Shipley	Shory	Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)	Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
Smith	Sopuck	Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)	Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
Stanton	Storseth	Mourani	Mulcair
Strahl	Sweet	Nantel	Nash
Tilson	Toet	Nicholls	Nunez-Melo
Toews	Trost	Pacetti	Papillon
Trottier	Truppe	Patry	Péclet
Tweed	Uppal	Perreault	Pilon
Valcourt	Van Kesteren	Plamondon	Quach
Van Loan	Vellacott	Rae	Rafferty
Wallace	Warawa	Rankin	Ravignat
Warkentin	Watson	Raynault	Regan
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast		Rousseau	Saganash
Weston (Saint John)		Sandhu	Scarpaleggia
Wilks	Williamson	Scott	Sellah
Wong	Woodworth	Sgro	Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind-
Yelich	Young (Oakville)	sor)	Simina (Donavista—Gander—Grand Palls—Willd-
Young (Vancouver South)	Zimmer— 156	Sims (Newton—North Delta)	Sitsabaiesan
roung (vancouver south)	Zimmer — 130	Sims (Newton—North Delta) St-Denis	Stewart
	DAIDED		
277	PAIRED	Stoffer	Sullivan
Nil		Toone	Tremblay
The Speakers I dealers N	Motion No. 72 defeated	Trudeau Valorioto 133	Turmel
	The Sneaker: I declare Motion No. 72 defeated		

Valeriote- — 133

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 72 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 73. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 74 and 78 to 80.

**•** (1550)

(The House divided on the Motion No. 73, which was negatived on the following division:)

### (Division No. 724)

### YEAS

Members

Allen (Welland) Andrews Angus Atamanenko Ashton Aubin Ayala Bélanger Bellavance Bennett Blanchette-Lamothe Blanchette Borg Boulerice Boutin-Sweet Brison Brosseau Byrne Caron Casey Cash Charlton Chicoine Chisholm Choquette Chow Christopherson Cleary Comartin Côté Crowder Cullen Cuzner Davies (Vancouver East) Day

NAYS

Members Adler

Adams Aglukkaq Albrecht Albas Alexander Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac) Ambler Allison Ambrose Anders Anderson Armstrong Ashfield Aspin Bateman Baird Bergen Bernier Blaney Bezan Block Boughen Braid Brown (Leeds—Grenville) Brown (Barrie) Breitkreuz Brown (Newmarket-Aurora)

Bruinooge Calkins Carmichael Calandra Cannan Carrie Chisu Clarke Crockatt Chong Clement Daniel Davidson Dechert Del Mastro Dreeshen Devolin Duncan (Vancouver Island North) Dykstra Fast Flaherty Fantino Findlay (Delta—Richmond East) Galipeau Gallant Gill Glover Goguen

Govern	ment Orders		
Goodyear	Gosal	And five or more members ha	wing rison:
Gourde	Grewal	And five or more members no	iving risen.
Harper	Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)	• (1600)	
Hawn	Hayes	( )	
Hiebert	Hillyer	(The House divided on the m	notion, which was agreed to on the
Holder	James		notion, which was agreed to on the
Jean	Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)	following division:)	
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	/D:	37 (725)
Kent	Kerr	(Divisio	on No. 725)
Komarnicki	Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)		
Lake	Lauzon	Y	EAS
Lebel	Leitch		
Lemieux	Leung	M	Iembers
Lizon	Lobb	Adams	Adler
Lukiwski	Lunney	Aglukkaq	Albas
MacKenzie	Mayes	Albrecht	Alexander
McColeman	McLeod		Allison
Menegakis	Menzies	Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)	
Merrifield	Miller	Ambler Anders	Ambrose Anderson
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquir		Armstrong	Ashfield
Moore (Fundy Royal)	)		Baird
Nicholson	Norlock	Aspin Bateman	Bergen
Obhrai	O'Connor	Bernier	Bezan
Oliver	O'Neill Gordon		
Opitz	O'Toole	Blaney Boughen	Block Braid
Paradis	Payne	Breitkreuz	Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Poilievre	Preston	Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)	Brown (Barrie)
Raitt	Rajotte	Bruinooge	Butt
Rathgeber	Reid	Calandra	Calkins
Rempel	Richards	Cannan	Carmichael
Rickford	Ritz	Carrie	Chisu
Saxton	Schellenberger	Chong	Clarke
Seeback	Shea	Clement	Crockatt
Shipley	Shory	Daniel	Davidson
Smith	Sopuck	Dechert	Del Mastro
Stanton	Storseth	Devolin	Dreeshen
Strahl	Sweet	Duncan (Vancouver Island North)	Dykstra
Tilson	Toet	Fantino	Fast
Toews	Trost	Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)	Flaherty
Trottier	Truppe	Fletcher	Galipeau
Tweed	Uppal	Gallant	Gill
Valcourt	Van Kesteren	Glover	
Van Loan	Vellacott	Goodyear	Goguen Gosal
Wallace	Warawa	Goodyear Gourde	Grewal
Warkentin	Watson	Harper	Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—S		Hawn	
Weston (Saint John)	sea to Sky Country)	Hiebert	Hayes Hillyer
Wilks	Williamson	Holder	James
Wong	Woodworth	Jean	Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
Yelich	Young (Oakville)	Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Young (Vancouver South)	Zimmer—— 156	Kent	Kerr
roung (vancouver south)	Zimmer— 130	Komarnicki	Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
n	AIDED	Lake	Lauzon
	AIRED	Lebel	Leitch
Nil		Lemieux	Leung
The Speaker: I declare M	lotion No. 73 defeated. I therefore	Lizon	Lobb
		Lukiwski	Lunney
declare Motions Nos. 74 and 7	8 to 80 defeated.	MacKenzie	Mayes
A (1555)		McColeman	McLeod
<b>●</b> (1555)		Menegakis	Menzies
Hon. Jim Flaherty (Ministe	er of Finance, CPC) moved that the	Merrifield	Miller
		Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitle	
bill be concurred in.		Moore (Fundy Royal)	~ /
The Speaker. The question	is on the motion. Is it the pleasure of	Nicholson	Norlock
<b>The Speaker:</b> The question is on the motion. Is it the pleasure of		Obhrai	O'Connor
the House to adopt the motion	?	Oliver	O'Neill Gordon
		Opitz	O'Toole
Some hon. members: Agree	ed.	Paradis	Payne
		Poilievre	Preston
Some hon. members: No.		Raitt	Rajotte
Some non, members, 190.		Rathgeber	Reid
The Speakers All those in favour of the motion will -1		Rempel	Richards
The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say		Rickford	Ritz
yea.		Saxton	Schellenberger
<b>√</b> ····		Seeback	Shea
Some hon. members: Yea.		Shipley	Shory
Some non, members, 15a.		Smith	Sopuck
The Cheekers All these	agad will plaga gav par	Stanton	Storseth
<b>The Speaker:</b> All those opposed will please say nay.		Strahl	Sweet
		Tilson	Toet
Some hon. members: Nay.		Toews	Trost
··· <b>··································</b>		Trottier	Truppe
The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.		Tweed	Uppal
	,	<del>-</del>	- r r ·

Van Loan Vellacott Wallace Warawa Warkentin Watson Weston (West Vancouver-Sunshine Coast-Sea to Sky Country)

Weston (Saint John)

Valcourt

Williamson Wong Woodworth Yelich Young (Oakville) Young (Vancouver South) Zimmer- - 156

#### NAYS

Van Kesteren

#### Members

Allen (Welland) Andrews Ashton Angus Atamanenko Aubin Bélanger Ayala Bellavance Bennett Blanchette Blanchette-Lamothe

Borg Boulerice Boutin-Sweet Brison Brosseau Byrne Cash Charlton Chisholm Chicoine Choquette Christopherson Cleary Comartin Côté Cotler Crowder Cullen Cuzner Davies (Vancouver East) Day Dion Dewar Dionne Labelle Donnelly Doré Lefebyre Dubé

Duncan (Etobicoke North) Duncan (Edmonton-Strathcona)

Eyking Foote Fortin Freeman Garneau Fry Garrison Genest Genest-Jourdain Giguère Goodale Godin Gravelle Groguhé

Harris (Scarborough Southwest) Harris (St. John's East)

Hsu Hughes Jones Julian Karvgiannis Kellway Lapointe Lamoureux Larose Latendress Laverdière LeBlanc (Beauséiour) LeBlanc (LaSalle-Émard) Leslie

MacAulay Mai Marston Martin Masse Mathyssen May McCallum McGuinty McKay (Scarborough-Guildwood) Michaud

Moore (Abitibi-Témiscamingue) Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord) Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce-Lachine) Morin (Laurentides-Labelle)

Mourani Mulcair Nantel Nash Nunez-Melo Nicholls Pacetti Papillon Péclet Patry Perreault Pilon Plamondon Quach Rafferty Rae Rankin Ravignat Raynault Regan Saganash Rousseau Sandhu Scarpaleggia

Scott Sellah Simms (Bonavista-Gander-Grand Falls-Wind-Sgro

sor) Sims (Newton-North Delta)

Sitsabaiesan St-Denis Stewart Sullivan Stoffer Tremblay Toone Trudeau Turmel

Valeriote- - 133

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

### **BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there have been consultations among the parties and if you seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent for the motion that follows. I move:

That, notwithstanding any Standing Order or usual practices of the House, after 6:30 p.m. on Tuesday, June 4, Thursday, June 6, Monday, June 10 and Tuesday, June 11, 2013, no quorum calls or dilatory motions shall be received by the Chair; and

That, on Tuesday, June 4, 2013, the House shall adjourn when no member rises to speak to the second reading motion of Bill S-14, or at 9:00 p.m., whichever is earlier, and upon conclusion of the debate on the second reading motion of Bill S-14, or at 9:00 p.m., every question necessary to dispose of the said stage of the bill shall be put forthwith and successively without further debate or amendment, and if a recorded division is demanded, it shall be deemed deferred until Wednesday, June 5, 2013, at the expiry of the time provided for oral questions.

The Speaker: Does the hon. government House leader have the unanimous consent of the House to propose the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion, is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. member: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have a further motion. Again, there have been discussions among the parties and I anticipate unanimous consent. I move:

That, notwithstanding any Standing Order or usual practices of the House, when the House begins debate on the second reading motion of Bill C-62, An Act to give effect to the Yale First Nation Final Agreement and to make consequential amendments to other Acts, one member from each recognized party and the member for Ahuntsic may speak to the said motion for not more than 10 minutes, after which the said bill shall be deemed to have been read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development

The Speaker: Does the hon. government House leader have the unanimous consent of the House to propose the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

\* \* \*

### SAFE DRINKING WATER FOR FIRST NATIONS ACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill S-8, An Act respecting the safety of drinking water on First Nation lands, as reported (with amendment) from the committee.

The Speaker: There being no motions at report stage, the House will now proceed without debate to the putting of the question on the motion to concur in the bill at report stage.

Hon. Gary Goodyear (for the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development) moved that the bill be concurred in.

**The Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say

(1605)

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Speaker: Call in the members.

**●** (1640)

[Translation]

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 726)

### YEAS

Adams Adler Aglukkaa Albas Albrecht Alexander Allison Allen (Tobique-Mactaquac) Ambler Ambrose Anders Anderson Armstrong Ashfield Aspin Baird Bateman Bellavance Bergen Bernier Bezan Blaney Block Boughen Braid Breitkreuz

Brown (Newmarket—Aurora) Brown (Leeds-Grenville) Brown (Barrie)

Calandra Calkins Cannan Carmichael Carrie Chong Clement Chisu Clarke Crockatt Daniel Davidson Dechert Del Mastro Devolin

Dreesher Duncan (Vancouver Island North) Dvkstra

Findlay (Delta-Richmond East) Fast Flaherty Fletcher

Galipeau Fortin Gallant Glover Goguen Goodyear Gosal Gourde Harris (Cariboo-Prince George) Harper

Hawn Hayes Hiebert Holder Hyer

James Kamp (Pitt Meadows-Maple Ridge-Mission) Keddy (South Shore-St. Margaret's)

Kenney (Calgary Southeast) Kent Komarnicki Kramp (Prince Edward-Hastings) Lebel

Lemieux Lizon Lukiwski Leung Lobb Lunney MacKenzie Mayes McColeman McLeod Menegakis

Miller Moore (Port Moody-Westwood-Port Coquitlam)

Moore (Fundy Royal) Mourani Nicholson Norlock Obhrai O'Connor O'Neill Gordon Oliver O'Toole Opitz Patry Plamondon Paradis Pavne Poilievre Preston Raitt Rajotte Rathgeber Reid Richards Rempel Rickford Ritz Schellenberger Saxton Seeback Shipley Shory Sopuck Smith Stanton Storseth Strahl Sweet Tilson Toet Trost Toews Trottier Truppe Tweed Uppal Valcourt Van Kesteren Van Loan Vellacott Wallace Warawa Warkentin

Weston (West Vancouver-Sunshine Coast-Sea to Sky Country) Weston (Saint John)

Wong Woodworth Young (Oakville) Yelich Young (Vancouver South)

## NAYS

### Members

Allen (Welland) Andrews Ashton Atamanenko Aubin Avala Bélanger Bennett Blanchette Blanchette-Lamothe Borg Boutin-Sweet Boulerice Brison Brosseau Byrne Casey Chicoine Cash Chisholm Choquette Chow Christopherson Cleary Cotler Côté Crowder Cullen

Davies (Vancouver East) Cuzner Day Dewar Dionne Labelle Dion Doré Lefebyre

Donnelly Dubé Duncan (Etobicoke North) Duncan (Edmonton-Strathcona) Dusseault Evking Easter Freeman Foote

Garneau Garrison Genest Godin Giguère Goodale Gravelle

Harris (Scarborough Southwest) Groguhé

Harris (St. John's East) Hsu Hughes Jacob Julian Jones Kellway Lamoureux Lapointe Larose Laverdière Latendresse LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard) LeBlanc (Beauséjour)

Leslie MacAulay Mai Martin Marston Masse Mathyssen May McCallum

McGuinty McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
Michaud Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord) Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
Morin (Laurentides—Labelle) Mulcair

Nantel Nash Nunez-Melo Nicholls Papillon Péclet Perreault Pilon Ouach Rafferty Rae Rankin Ravignat Ravnault Regan Rousseau Saganash Sandhu Sellah Sgro Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)

Sims (Newton-North Delta)

 Sitsabaiesan
 St-Denis

 Stewart
 Stoffer

 Sullivan
 Toone

 Tremblay
 Trudeau

 Turmel
 Valeriote- — 120

PAIRED

Nil

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

● (1645)

[English]

**The Deputy Speaker:** When shall the bill be read the third time? By leave, now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

**Hon. Bernard Valcourt** moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Greg Rickford (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development, for the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency and for the Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the opportunity to speak to the opposition and to Canadians about why I and the other members of the Conservative government will be supporting Bill S-8, the Safe Drinking Water for First Nations Act, and why I urge all hon. colleagues in the House to vote in favour of a bill that will finally give first nations the tools they need to access safe drinking water on reserve.

It has taken seven years for us to get to this point. For seven years, we have had continuous dialogue and consultations with first nations, including formal engagement sessions, informal discussions, and consultations with community members and leadership, technical experts and department officials. This legislative proposal evolved as we worked together, listening to and accommodating the concerns of first nations living on reserve.

The legislation before Parliament today is the result of hard work and collaboration from coast to coast to coast. It is time to move forward and create the regulations needed to safeguard drinking water in first nations communities.

Right now, there is no such protection for tens of thousands of first nations, so Bill S-8 addresses this urgent need. Until regulations and standards are in place, the safety and quality of water in first nations communities will continue to remain at risk and pose a significant health threat for thousands of individuals living on reserve. It is unfortunate, if not shameful, that the opposition continues to oppose

this bill. It would rather stand by and allow for the current situation to continue to be a reality for first nations across the country.

Currently, laws are in place to protect the safety of drinking water accessed by all other Canadians, except in first nations communities. While it is true that a handful of self-governing first nations have enacted laws dealing with drinking water and waste water treatment, they are very much the exception. The truth is that when it comes to regulating drinking water, residents of most first nations communities are left unprotected. We cannot tolerate this any longer.

Access to safe drinking water is a hallmark of a progressive, modern society. It is a basic form of infrastructure that Canadian communities depend on. Without a dependable supply of water, it is much harder to maintain public health. This is precisely why so much effort and expense are devoted to acquiring and securing consistent access to safe drinking water.

A closer examination of this effort and expense sheds light on the needs that Bill S-8 would address. They are these. Safe drinking water results from a chain of events, such as actively protecting sources, filtering and treating water, and regularly conducting quality tests to ensure that all systems are functioning properly. Like all chains, the one that safeguards drinking water is only as strong as its weakest link.

Regulations represent a key link in the chain. While they vary slightly from one jurisdiction to another, all regulations specify science-based standards for quality testing, treatment protocols and other factors. Municipal utilities that supply water to the public must abide by these regulations. If not, the justice system holds them to account. The penalties can be severe, and rightly so, given that the health and safety of Canadians is at stake. After all, contaminated drinking water can lead to disaster.

That is precisely what happened 13 years ago in the town of Walkerton, Ontario. A combination of operator negligence and lax regulatory standards led to the death of seven people and more than 2,000 people falling ill. The tragedy inspired a series of improvements to Ontario's drinking water regulations. Today, the vast majority of Ontarians trust that the water that comes out of their tap is safe to drink. It is our government's objective that first nations communities can have that same trust in their water systems.

Our government strongly believes that the law should afford all Canadians similar protections when it comes to drinking water. Bill S-8 would provide the authorities needed to develop and establish regulatory regimes for safe drinking and the treatment of waste water in first nations communities. The absence of regulations makes it impossible to ensure the safety of drinking water in first nations communities over the long term.

### **●** (1650)

In fact, several studies have made this point abundantly clear. For instance, seven years ago, the Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development published an in-depth study on the issue. The study concluded that, in most first nations communities, responsibility for the various steps involved in the treatment and delivery of drinking water is diffused among several groups. As a result, it is nearly impossible to hold any single group accountable if something goes wrong; for example, when a pump fails or a water quality test is not done properly.

Here is a quote from that study, "...until a regulatory regime comparable with that in provinces is in place, INAC and Health Canada cannot ensure that First Nations people living on reserves have continuing access to safe drinking water."

It is clear that without regulations there can be no assurance of the safety of drinking water in first nations communities. Regulations lead to accountability. They assign responsibility for specific tasks and for meeting science-based standards. Regulations provide the overarching framework of a drinking water system and guide the efforts of everyone involved in that system synchronously.

Our government appreciates that regulations alone cannot produce consistently safe drinking water. The other links in the chain must also be in place, such as functional equipment, trained operators, reliable sources of drinking water, proper distribution networks, and appropriate standards, guidelines and protocols. That is why, since 2006, this government has made improving drinking water in first nations communities a top priority.

We have made significant investments in water and waste water infrastructure with approximately \$3 billion between 2006 and 2014. As part of Canada's economic action plan version 2012 alone, \$330.8 million is being invested over two years. This money has paid for new treatment facilities, upgrades to existing systems, operator training and distribution networks.

While significant progress has been made, regulations are still not in place. However, as a result of these important investments, the percentage of high-risk water systems has decreased by 8.1% and the percentage of high-risk waste water systems by 2.1%. We have doubled funding for the circuit rider training program, which has helped support and train hundreds of first nations water and waste water system operators.

I will take this opportunity to highlight the important work that Confederation College and Northern Waterworks are doing in the great Kenora riding in upgrading the certifications for first nations community members who go back to their isolated first nations communities with more appropriate, if not higher than required, standards to operate water and waste water treatment facilities in their communities.

These programs have seen significant results. For example, since July 2011, the percentage of first nations systems that have primary operators certified to the level of drinking water systems has increased from 51% to 60%, and the percentage of certified waste water system operators has increased from 42% to almost 54%.

Going forward, as we have stated on numerous occasions, I can assure members that our government will continue to invest in water and waste water infrastructure on reserve. As members can see, Bill S-8 is an essential part of our government's larger comprehensive strategy to improve the quality of drinking water for residents of first nations communities.

There are three essential pillars born out of the extensive consultations and the important work done by a coast to coast to coast consultation process in co-operation with the Assembly of First Nations. These three essential pillars are: capacity, with the ability to report, monitor and maintain infrastructure; continued investment in infrastructure; and the development of a clear regulatory framework, which is the basis of today's debate and discussion on Bill S-8.

The legislation before us would help address the third pillar and establish regulatory regimes similar to those that make the drinking water systems in other communities reliable and safe.

### ● (1655)

Bill S-8 would inspire further progress, not only by establishing regulatory standards but also by extending the collaboration with first nations that continues to generate positive results. When Bill S-8 receives royal assent, our government will continue to work with first nations and other stakeholders to develop regulations on a region-by-region basis. This is important.

Developing regulations by region would enable the government and first nations to partner with municipalities and regional technical experts who deal with the most responsible and the most appropriate forms of water and waste water treatment, which prevail in those regions for a variety of different reasons. This collaborative region-by-region approach would also leverage the value of existing regulations rather than creating entirely new regulations. The most efficient approach is to build upon existing provincial and territorial regulatory frameworks and adapt, where needed, in order to reflect specific local conditions.

We are talking about a very flexible piece of legislation, but let me be clear. This approach would not take jurisdiction away from the first nations, nor would it give a province, territory or municipality jurisdiction over first nation lands. To the contrary, by developing regulations that are comparable to those that exist off reserve, first nations would be better positioned to partner with neighbouring municipalities in the delivery of water treatment services and to cooperate on other matters, such as operator training, business ventures and the adoption of new technologies.

I should add that we are already seeing this. The previous minister of aboriginal affairs and I had an opportunity to tour some water and waste water treatment facilities in Quebec. There we saw water and waste water treatment facilities operating on a reserve for the benefit of that community and the municipality. We also saw communities where water and waste water treatment systems were operating in a municipality or city for the benefit of the reserve. In both instances, there were trained certified operators from both respective communities for the collective benefit of everybody there, better economies and better safety.

There is no question that it will take time to develop and implement regulations across Canada. For this reason, the regulations would be phased in to ensure there is adequate time for the government and first nations to bring drinking water and waste water infrastructure and operating capacity to the levels required to be able to conform with the new regulations. As our government has stated many times in the past, we are not going to roll out regulations until first nations have the capacity to abide by them. Health and safety remain our ultimate goals.

We talked about those three pillars. They support the concept that the pillars not mutually exclusive of each other. They depend on each other to support the kind of framework we are moving forward with first nations on. Namely, if we are going to have legislation, we have to ensure that we have certified operators and that they have the capacity to report, monitor and maintain that infrastructure. Similarly, we have to ensure that they have the infrastructure in place in those communities to be able to meet those standards.

I fully recognize that some first nations do not have the resources needed to help develop these regulations, so back in April 2012 the former minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development sent a letter to all chiefs and band councils confirming that our government would provide the funds needed for eligible activities. We have already provided funding to the Atlantic policy congress to support its researching and analyzing the development of regulations for first nations in the Atlantic region.

In order to continue progress on drinking water in first nation communities, the establishment of an appropriate regulatory regime is required. In the absence of such a regime, investments in infrastructure and training can do little to safeguard water quality. The government has been engaging with first nation partners since coming to government in 2006 and we have continued to engage with first nations on the proposed legislation every step of the way. In fact, this engagement has never stopped.

After the last iteration of the legislation, Bill S-11, died on the order paper, we took action to address some of the concerns that had been raised by first nations and other important stakeholders by making a number of amendments to the current iteration or version of the bill we have before this place.

### **●** (1700)

On the current bill, Bill S-8, we have also continued to consult and we have taken action to address some of those concerns that were raised in regard to the opt-in provision for self-governing first nations. As a result of extensive discussions between stakeholders on this matter, the government brought forward an amendment at committee recommending the removal of this provision from the

### Government Orders

bill. Removing the opt-in provision serves as yet another good example of the positive results produced by ongoing collaborative discussions with first nations and other stakeholders.

The legislation now before us offers a sensible, practical, balanced solution to an urgent problem that threatens the health of tens of thousands of Canadians. The regulations stemming from Bill S-8 will provide residents of first nation communities with the same level of confidence as other Canadians when it comes to their drinking water.

In closing, this is a matter of health and safety. I appreciate my colleagues' debate. I appreciate the points they have raised in previous readings of the bill and the important work of all committee members as we worked through Bill S-8. However, the priority moving forward is to bring the kind of legislation into play that will support and reflect the need to continue making investments in training and to ensure there are certified operators for the infrastructure, which on an ongoing basis needs to be rehabilitated or replaced.

As a result of those two things, we will find over the course of time, hopefully sooner rather than later, that standards for drinking water and waste water treatment on reserve are at the same levels that other Canadians have come to expect from their respective governments. Therefore, I reach across the way and ask my colleagues to join us and support Bill S-8.

Ms. Jean Crowder (Nanaimo—Cowichan, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the parliamentary secretary for outlining the reasons that the government continues to support the bill. It was interesting to hear the parliamentary secretary talk about this being a flexible approach, whereas what we heard from a number of witnesses was that the bill was too vague and raised a number of concerns around a number of issues including liability, consultation and levels of service.

I specifically want to ask the member about consultation because in the preamble of the bill it talks about working with first nations, but nowhere in the preamble does it talk about consultation. With regard to consultation, I wonder if the member would be prepared to commit to developing the terms of reference for developing the regulations in conjunction with first nations. Would the Conservatives actually assign adequate resources for first nations to be at the table to develop the terms of reference and the regulations, and could the member indicate a timeline by which they hope to have the regulations completed?

### **●** (1705)

**Mr. Greg Rickford:** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member not just for that question, but for the important work that she does on the standing committee and specifically in relation to the bill. I also need to say, if only the world were as simple as the NDP member makes it out to be. The consultation process that has taken place over the past seven years, in fact over the past 20 of my own professional career in different regards with first nation communities, I have never seen something done so extensively.

What we have arrived at is the kind of legislation that is flexible. I take exception to the notion of it being vague because the federal regulations will take time. They respect regulations in a given region, specifically in a province. They respect the kinds of treatments that are done in those communities and their corresponding standards. Therefore, a phased-in approach will provide time for government and first nations to bring drinking water and waste water infrastructure monitoring activities, the capacity required to do that to meet those future federal regulations, into place.

Hon. Carolyn Bennett (St. Paul's, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I too have huge concerns as to how a bill like this can be put through when first nations have objected strenuously. As the parliamentary secretary knows, the first nations believe that all that happens with this bill is that the liability gets transferred to the first nations, while the resources for actually fixing the situation rest with the government.

I would like to know from the parliamentary secretary why and how, after the promise at the Crown-First Nations Gathering that things would be done differently, the government is pursuing and persisting with the bill against the objections of the Assembly of First Nations and the first nations that we heard from at committee.

**Mr. Greg Rickford:** Mr. Speaker, it is a lob question. I began my professional career living in isolated and remote first nation communities in 1991. Over the course of some 15 or 16 years, while that party was in power, here is what I came to know. Yes, there were important pieces of infrastructure built on reserve. The problem was that there was not anybody certified to operate them appropriately, so their lifespan decreased immensely.

We know that some communities were on boil-water advisories for decades. We are working to correct that system, and we are doing it with the Assembly of First Nations, which, for the record, embarked on this coast to coast to coast consultation. It worked with technical experts, operators who certify other operators, community colleges and the like, to ensure that we would have that important capacity piece, that critical infrastructure would be developed on the basis that there were actually trained and certified operators to operate that infrastructure, and then finally dialectically that there would in fact be actual regulations to adhere to.

That is a process that is born out of extensive consultation. It was begun and supported by the Assembly of First Nations. There are numerous first nation communities that are actively putting members of their communities in training programs to ensure that, as we move forward, they will have certified operators to operate infrastructure, which will be rehabilitated and replaced based on those certifications, and legislation that provides regulations for them and the federal government to adhere to. I think that is pretty reasonable.

Mr. Brian Storseth (Westlock—St. Paul, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the parliamentary secretary, not only for a great speech but for actually putting his money where his mouth is.

For years, first nation communities in my riding have been waiting for a government to actually stand up and take action on some of these things. The parliamentary secretary and his committee have done a great job on moving legislation through their committee, both in this session and in the last session of Parliament.

In the last seven and a half years, the Government of Canada has invested billions of dollars into water and waste water systems, and

other public-health-related activities. I am happy to see that the government has actually been prioritizing investments into high- and medium-risk systems to address factors. However, one of the concerns in communities such as mine, Saddle Lake and others is the fact that we need to ensure we have capacity, training, and operations and maintenance personnel who are able to look after these facilities and extend their lifespan.

Could the parliamentary secretary tell the House how the proposed legislation would help keep Canada's investments in first nations' water and waste water systems going, not only today but into the future?

**●** (1710)

**Mr. Greg Rickford:** Mr. Speaker, we have the questions in reverse. I get a lob from the Liberal Party, and I get a tough but fair question from a member of this caucus.

However, the member is spot on. He has come to me on a number of occasions and made representations on behalf of the first nation communities in his region. I appreciate his consideration of those, and he is right.

As I had alluded to in answer to the previous question, the lifespan of infrastructure for water and waste water treatment on reserve tends to be shorter than the lifespan of similar infrastructure outside of first nation lands. A big part of the reason for that is that it is often the case that reporting, monitoring and maintenance are missing. We want to be able to support the rehabilitation and replacement of infrastructure with the kinds of certified operators who can identify capacity thresholds, identify malfunctioning, and ensure that testing is done properly. That, for the benefit of taxpayers, is also protecting their investment, ensuring that the considerable amount of money that is being invested in this process is going not just to good use, but is being used effectively.

[Translation]

Mr. Romeo Saganash (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou, NDP): Mr. Speaker, as part of this debate, the Assembly of First Nations, the AFN, passed a resolution in December 2011, dealing with this fundamental issue for all aboriginal communities across the country.

In this resolution the AFN called on the government to guarantee that appropriate funding would be available for any regulations governing implementation; to support first nations in the process of developing their own water supply system; and to work together with the AFN to develop an immediate plan to address the lack of clean and safe water.

Can the minister confirm that this will indeed happen?

[English]

**Mr. Greg Rickford:** Mr. Speaker, we are working toward a three pillar concept in legislation that supports the penultimate goal of safe drinking water and effective, responsible waste water treatment on reserve. That comes from investment specific to this legislation.

As the minister before had done so in his communications, he had effectively said to first nations leadership that we wanted to engage in a process where investments would be made in this kind of infrastructure, but that it had to be done synchronistically with the other pillars that I spoke of at length in my speech and subsequently in questions.

To restate with emphasis, these all go toward the goal of ensuring safe drinking water and effective, responsible, waste water treatment on reserve that meets what other Canadians have come to expect.

Ms. Jean Crowder (Nanaimo—Cowichan, NDP): Mr. Speaker, from the outset, the parliamentary secretary expressed the hope that the official opposition would support the bill.

The NDP will not support the bill, and I will lay out my reasons. Part of that reasoning has to do with the fact that at committee, we presented a number of amendments, none of which were accepted by the government. The problem is that we heard loudly and clearly from a number of witnesses about some very serious concerns about the legislation.

I will start with the report of the expert panel on safe drinking water for first nations. It laid out, even before we got to the stage of debating Bill S-8 in the House and at committee, some conditions it saw as being important for the legislation to move forward. It started out by saying, "Preconditions: provide resources, discuss and deal with high risks". In the report it indicated:

The federal government must close the resource gap. First and most critically, it is not credible to go forward with any regulatory regime without adequate capacity to establish by the regulatory requirements. While attempting to assume that putting a regulatory regime in place would reduce the dangers associated with water systems, exactly the opposite might happen. This is because creating and enforcing a regulatory regime would take time, attention and money that might be better invested in systems, operators, management and governance.

But the problem is more fundamental than the resources that would be lost to creating a regulatory regime. The underlying issue is that the federal government has never provided adequate funding to meet the 1977 policy commitment as comparable facilities on reserves...

Apart from any legal duty, however, we believe that meaningful discussion between the federal government and first nations is necessary if any action to improve the safety of water on reserves is to be effective and responsive.

### It goes on to say:

Deal with high risk communities immediately... Any of the options would take time—probably several years—to reach the ultimate goal of safer drinking water for all First Nations. In the meantime, however, many reserve residents face serious risks from the drinking water available to them, sometimes from collective systems, but very often from individual wells or other water sources.

When government members talk about Bill S-8, they talk about it providing safe drinking water for first nations. When I posed the question for the parliamentary secretary with regard to how long this would take to develop the regulations, there was no answer.

Literally, we can see years before those regulations are developed and implemented. In the meantime, it does not deal with the very immediate risks that a number of first nations have identified. A number of first nations communities have been under boil water advisories for years, not months, not weeks, not days.

When Chief Rose Laboucan, came before the committee, she talked about the fact that they had a \$6 million water plant in their communities and they were consistently off and on boil water advisories. Therefore, it is not just having a water plant in place; it is

### Government Orders

ensuring it is a water plant that is appropriate for first nations communities. This bill, in and of itself, will not guarantee safe drinking water.

I will run through parts of the bill because there are places where we have some serious objections. The first one is right in the preamble, so even before we get into the clauses of the bill. The preamble states that the two departments, Health and Indian Affairs, have committed to working with first nations to develop proposals for regulations to be made under this act. "Working with first nations", that is not language around consultation.

To refer to the report of the expert panel on safe drinking water, it said:

The second precondition is the need for the federal government to assess whether it has a legal duty to consult with First Nations affected by any of the three options. This duty, according to the Supreme Court, "arises" when the Crown had knowledge, real or constructive, of the potential existence of the aboriginal right or title and contemplates conduct that might adversely affect it.

As my colleague from Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou reminds me, it is not only the duty to consult, it is the duty to accommodate. That element around consultation is not outlined in the bill. Nor have we had any satisfactory answers.

The parliamentary secretary rightly pointed out that the bill had been before the House in a number of different iterations. With regard to any kind of comfort about the level of consultation that took place in order to come to this final bill, when the first nations technical services advisory group, an Alberta organization, came before the committee, it talked about what the consultation process looked like.

### ● (1715)

I will quote from its document. It says:

Disappointingly, the Government of Canada has never responded to any of the concerns and issues identified in the Impact Analysis, which has left Alberta First Nations wondering why Canada asked for and funded the Impact Analysis if it never intended to review it, respond to the concerns it raises, or meet with First Nations to discuss it. Sure, there is a legal obligation to consult, but the TSAG is more concerned about the practical implications of Canada's failure to consider the Impact Analysis because it means that Bill S-8 has been developed without any meaningful input from First Nation leaders, communities or water systems operators in Alberta.

In the earlier days, the government talked about the fact that Alberta was in support of the bill. However, when it provided input, as was outlined by the speaking notes from the technical services advisory group, it was disregarded. It did not even hear back as to why its input was disregarded and not considered in this latest version of the bill.

The issue around consultation needs to be clearly spelled out for people to have any kind of confidence that meaningful consultation will take place. In too many pieces of legislation that have come before the House in the last two years, there has not been meaningful consultation. It has been probably the one criticism that has been a thread throughout every bill that has come before the House dealing with first nations.

When it comes to clause 3 of the bill, clause 3 is the section that has what the government likes to call a "non-derogation" clause, but what like first nations like to call a "derogation" clause because it starts out sounding like a non-derogation clause but then it throws in the zinger. At the end of clause 3, it states, "except to the extent necessary to ensure the safety of drinking water on First Nation lands". Essentially, what we have is a non-derogation clause that now becomes a derogation clause.

When the Blood Tribe came before the House, it actually provided a briefing note that said:

In the current version, the abrogation and derogation clause, section 3, is now broader in scope proposing to allow the Act and the regulations to potentially abrogate or derogate from our constitutionally protected Aboriginal and Treaty Rights to the extent necessary to ensure the safety of drinking water on First Nation lands. Rather than protecting such rights, the provision suggests that it can directly violate those rights and disregard Canada's legal obligation to protect Aboriginal and Treaty rights.

That position is reconfirmed by the Canadian Bar Association.

The Canadian Bar Association is also very critical of this derogation clause instead of a non-derogation clause. It said:

We believe that the qualification "except to the extent necessary to ensure the safety of the drinking water on First Nation lands" is in itself an explicit abrogation or derogation of existing Aboriginal or treaty rights pursuant to section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982. The qualification in section 3 of Bill S-8 does not, in our view, ameliorate the constitutional problems identified in our earlier submissions on Bill S-11.

We have been unable to find any precedent or explanation for this proposal which would still, in our view, abrogate or derogate from section 35 rights under the Constitution Act, 1982 in order to provide safe drinking water to First Nations. This provision raises two key issues:

is it necessary to implement the objectives of the bill?

if so, is it constitutionally valid? Can Parliament use its legislative power under section 91(24) to abrogate or derogate unilaterally from the rights protected by section 35?

The attempt to abrogate and derogate aboriginal and treaty rights by statute or regulation would set a dangerous precedent and should not slip by without full explanation and discussion.

In the testimony we heard before our committee from anybody who was a proponent of the bill, nobody could explain why it would be a legitimate use in clause 3 to actually derogate from inherent rights. We proposed an amendment that would have removed the derogation part on clause 3 and it was voted down.

**•** (1720)

I want to turn to testimony we heard from Akwesasne. When Akwesasne came before the committee, they indicated they were in the middle of negotiating an agreement that would give them jurisdiction over some of these areas. They asked that a provision be in the bill that would delay it coming into force for self-governing first nations that were developing their own water codes, or for other nations that were in a similar kind of an agreement.

The case presented for this was say, for example, these regulations were being developed and coming into force just before a first nations would be signing an agreement that would allow them to implement their own drinking water regulations. The first nations could then be covered by Bill S-8, and then there would be a delay before they could actually implement their own drinking water provisions.

We suggested an amendment that was similar to one under the matrimonial real property legislation. In fact, we lifted it right out of that bill. It talked about the fact that for a first nations in the process of becoming self-governing, or with one of these other treaty agreements, that the bill would not come into force for three days after the day.

That would respect and allow the time to complete those negotiations so that a first nations would not be forced to deal with two different pieces of legislation. That, too, was denied, even though it was in the matrimonial real property bill which allowed self-governing first nations to develop their own matrimonial real property codes. It would have been a reasonable thing to insert in this bill.

When the next amendment we put in, we heard consistently from first nation after first nation, and from the expert panel, that resources were absolutely critical. In this case, we asked the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development and the Minister of Health to take into account the capacity of each first nation to comply with the prescribed standards to install their drinking water and waste water systems, and to train the operators of these systems.

Now the reason we inserted that particular amendment was because first nations who testified raised a number of concerns about their capacity to comply with the regulations and what the liability would be for the community if they were unable to comply. It seemed to be a reasonable request to ask that the government assess capacity to comply.

If there is not capacity to comply, then it would seem incumbent upon the government to ensure there are resources available, whether it be for infrastructure or training of operators, to ensure first nations could actually meet the regulations being set out before them. Again, that was denied.

We also proposed an amendment that requires capital infrastructure life cycle planning, so that future capital needs are known and expected and can be appropriately budgeted for at the local, regional and national level.

The parliamentary secretary, in his speech, did point out that there are some challenges with infrastructure in first nations communities with regard to the life cycle, the way the infrastructure was originally put together, and certainly with ongoing operations and maintenance.

The government likes to refer to itself as being fiscally responsible. Any of us who have been in control of large budgets know that what has to be done is not only the fiscal year planning but also the longer term planning, the 5-year, 10-year, 25-year cycles. When dealing with large infrastructure projects, it is essential that this kind of life cycle planning is done.

Asking to establish a system of capital infrastructure life cycle planning, again, seems like a reasonable thing to do, particularly when first nations are going to be told they have to abide by the regulations or else there are penalties and a possibility that property could be seized, as laid out in Bill S-8. However, that amendment was voted down as well.

I see that I only have two minutes left, and I have another 25 minutes worth of notes, so I will try to whip through this.

### **●** (1725)

**The Deputy Speaker:** So that the member is clear, you have two more minutes in this timeframe. You have a total of a little over five and a half minutes, but the House will be moving on to private members' business in less than two minutes.

**Ms. Jean Crowder:** Mr. Speaker, I want to touch on another witness we heard, who was from Metro Vancouver.

Metro Vancouver is a provider of drinking water to a number of first nations communities. They outlined a whole series of problems and indicated very clearly that some of the service providers of water systems, municipalities in particular, were also not consulted on this.

They raised a number of issues around lack of consultation; transfer of responsibilities, which is unknown; changes with bylaw regulation and enforcement; legislative and jurisdictional uncertainties; regulatory authority over Indian reserves, which is unclear; and financial liabilities requiring clarification. They also went on to say that the adequate implementation plan is lacking. I referred to that earlier, that there are simply not enough details in this bill to actually assess a number of factors.

Based on that, New Democrats do not feel this bill should go forward until some of these very serious questions are answered. Liability is certainly one issue, whether it is metro Vancouver, or the first nations communities that are going to have absorb this liability.

#### (1730)

**The Deputy Speaker:** It being 5:30 p.m., the House will proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper.

### PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

## RESPECTING FAMILIES OF MURDERED AND BRUTALIZED PERSONS ACT

The House resumed from April 25 consideration of the motion that Bill C-478, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (increasing parole ineligibility) be read the second time and referred to a committee

Mr. Dan Albas (Okanagan—Coquihalla, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on Bill C-478. I would like to begin by recognizing the member for Selkirk—Interlake for his considerable efforts in bringing this important bill forward. I would also like to share with all the members of this place why Bill C-478 is of great importance to the citizens of Okanagan—Coquihalla.

As some members may well know, Westbank, sometimes referred to as West Kelowna, is a community in the heart of my riding. Many years ago a local Westbank family set off to the back country for a scenic family camping trip. The family was made up of proud grandparents George and Edith Bentley, their daughter Jackie and her husband Bob Johnson, along with their granddaughters Janet, who was 13 at the time, and her 11-year-old sister Karen. The destination was scenic Wells Gray Provincial Park for a two-week camping adventure. We can imagine how close and tightly knit this

### Private Members' Business

family was in planning for two weeks together, enjoying all of the special moments that life brings us.

A little over two weeks later, Bob Johnson failed to show up for work. This would be the first time in over 20 years that Bob Johnson had missed a day of work.

I will apologize to the House in advance. The details I am going to share next are unpleasant. They are vile. They are disturbing. However, I believe they are necessary, for it is precisely these situations that speak to the necessity and importance of Bill C-478.

After the Johnson-Bentley family disappeared, a large-scale search and rescue operation was led by the RCMP. If ever there were a reminder of the challenging and difficult work that RCMP members perform, this would be it. One cannot fathom the shock and horror of finally locating the family vehicle of Bob Johnson after a month of searching. Inside the car were the burnt bodies of Bob, his wife Jackie, and her parents George and Edith.

Sadly, it did not end there. Located inside the trunk were the burnt bodies of the grandchildren, 13-year-old Janet and her 11-year-old sister Karen. All had been executed. They had been murdered: shot in the head with a .22 calibre bullet.

It still did not end there. The RCMP later learned that the monster responsible had first killed the four adults and then abducted the two granddaughters. For six days, this monster did unspeakable things to the girls, before finally murdering them and burning them in the Johnson family car along with their parents and grandparents.

Truly, this is one of the most horrific and disturbing acts imaginable.

In 2008, the monster responsible for these heinous acts, David Shearing, applied for parole, only now he goes by a different name. His name is now David Ennis, assumedly so that if he obtains parole he can more easily disappear into an unsuspecting public.

When citizens in Westbank learned of this parole application, they were shocked, terrified and angry. They were again being victimized by the senseless murder that took away their family, friends, coworkers and neighbours. They took action, and soon a petition with over 9,000 names was sent to the Parole Board of Canada to oppose parole for this monster.

I was elected in 2011, and to this very day I hear from citizens in Logan Lake, Westbank and Merritt that they are fearful of this monster. They fear that he will be paroled and will return to the region where he once lived and committed these disturbing acts that took so many innocent victims. That is why I am here today speaking in strong support of Bill C-478 on behalf of the family, friends and co-workers, who went through the parole process and are forced to revisit this tragedy far too frequently.

I apologize for sharing these details with the House. However, all too often when we talk about bills like Bill C-478, I find the victims are often neglected, if not forgotten.

**●** (1735)

In fact, I have reviewed close to 20 different media stories on Bill C-478, and not one of them mentioned David Shearing, who now goes by David Ennis. However, murdering monsters like David Shearing are certainly not alone. Paul Bernardo, Robert Pickton, Russell Williams and Clifford Olson are other examples of people who have taken lives and continue to haunt the victims through the parole process. I submit that this is wrong and that Bill C-478 is a needed and necessary step to end the ongoing suffering of victims. It cannot and should not be allowed to continue to occur.

I believe it is also important that we recognize what Bill C-478 ultimately proposes to do. Bill C-478 would not guarantee a 40-year sentence, as some media stories have suggested. This bill is specific on applying to those individuals who have committed the most serious of combined crimes that include abduction, sexual assault and murder. This bill does not propose minimum sentences for those who have committed these disturbing acts, but rather would provide new tools for judges in sentencing.

I believe it is also important to recognize that research has indicated that individuals who commit these most serious of crimes have yet to be successful in being paroled. Some would ask why there should be a change of the parole eligibility if the most serious of criminals in fact are not successful at being paroled. The answer from the citizens of Okanagan—Coquihalla is to please stop this ongoing parole process that revictimizes innocent friends, family and neighbours, and causes citizens to live in fear. Bill C-478 would create legal tools that would allow judges the discretion to do precisely that, and that is why I encourage all members of the House to vote in support of it.

Before I close, I would like to share a few further thoughts with my hon. colleagues. In 2011, a life was tragically taken in a senseless and brutal act of domestic violence in my riding. The family members now wear a tattoo of a dragonfly in memory of their lost loved one as they seek justice for this tragedy. A tattoo, much like the scars of loss through victimization, is something that lasts a lifetime.

The final point I would like to share stems from last September. It was in September of last year that a parole hearing was held in Bowden, Alberta for David Shearing. Some 30 years after this horrific event occurred, over two dozen friends and family members of the Johnson and Bentley families were forced to travel a great distance to appear at a parole hearing to relive this brutal act of unspeakable tragedy. Let us all take a moment to reflect on that.

At a time of year when children and families are excitedly getting ready for a new year of school, the Johnson and Bentley families were forced on a journey of great distance, only to arrive in time to relive a life-altering tragedy and face the monster who forever destroyed their families. How many times should the Johnson and Bentley families be forced to make this journey and relive this horror? It should not have to be this way. No family should be forced to endure what has happened to the Johnsons and Bentleys and that

continues to occur as they relive this horrific event over and over at parole hearings.

In closing, I would like to thank the members of the House for taking the time to listen to the concerns of my constituents. This is not a subject or speech that I take any pleasure in sharing. However, there are times where we, as parliamentarians, have an opportunity to speak out on the matters of great concern to the citizens we represent, and this is certainly important to my riding.

Let us never forget the victims. I ask that all members of the House support victims of very serious crimes by voting in favour of Bill C-478.

● (1740)

Ms. Isabelle Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am not a lawyer and I am not a judge, but as a member of Parliament I am a student of the law and a lawmaker. I speak for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine to represent the interests of the people in my riding. This allows me to understand and bring forward the concerns of regular Canadians.

Like my colleagues, I am here to study Bill C-478, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (increasing parole ineligibility).

I have several concerns with this bill and cannot vote in favour of it in its current state. The whole idea of changing sentencing to imprisonment for life without eligibility for parole from 25 to 40 years seems quite arbitrary. In fact, I ask the member opposite who proposed this bill to explain his reason for choosing 40 years. Why should it not be 35, 75 or 100 years? What motivated his decision to change the Criminal Code of this country?

Many of my colleagues opposite will state that they are moved by victims' rights as if this were a black and white issue, but one cannot be either for or against victims' rights. I believe that all parliamentarians care deeply about victims' rights, and the Conservative government does not have a monopoly on that.

The NDP remains sensitive to the extremely difficult situations that victims and their families may have experienced, but Bill C-478 is not a bill about victim care or victim services, and I am not sure that it is even in accordance with the Charter of Rights and the Constitution of this country: the bill is about sentencing, tougher punishments and a Conservative tough on crime agenda.

The Conservative government has developed a tradition of bringing forward measures to amend the Criminal Code through private members' bills, and this is another example. I ask the member opposite who sponsored this bill why he chose to have this issue addressed as a private member's bill when we know that it is not reviewed by the Department of Justice to ensure it is in accordance with the Charter of Rights and the Constitution.

As I mentioned earlier, I am neither a lawyer nor a judge. Therefore, I will refer to the experts and quote Steve Sullivan, first ombudsman for victims of crime, who stated this legislation was nothing but "smoke and mirrors". He said he "did not believe that many judges would sentence a criminal to life in prison for 40 years without the right to parole". Judges simply would not do this. He said that "a life sentence of 25 years already means that a person who presents a danger or a risk will not have access to a parole hearing, although the family must still be present at hearings, and that this would apply to a very small number of criminals, those who abduct, rape and murder one victim".

He pointed out that "such sordid crimes are rather rare" and that "this measure would be used a few times a year at best, but would not change anything for the victims' families".

If the law works as it is currently and it is used by judges efficiently, why suggest Bill C-478, if not for a political agenda? [*Translation*]

I would also like to quote two other experts who spoke to this bill. They lead me to believe that this is not a bill that we as parliamentarians should support. I would like to share what Michael Spratt, president of the Criminal Lawyers' Association of Ontario, had to say. According to him, Bill C-478 is superfluous and does nothing for the victims of crime.

For 10 minutes, the government member has been saying that the purpose of this bill is to protect victims' rights. I am sorry, but this changes absolutely nothing for victims. It extends the punishment, that is true. However, it does not change the fact that the victim suffered the crime.

I used to work as a teacher in a prison. I know that the current system will not make things any better for the victims as long as we do not have a better rehabilitation system, a better system for helping inmates not to reoffend, and as long as we do not have psychologists.

**●** (1745)

On the contrary, criminals will be kept in prison longer. We will wait until they have learned better tricks and then we will release them. Prisoners teach each other their tricks. They tell each other everything they did and they make plans. Often this is because they are not getting psychological help and they have nothing else to do. Then we release them. If we wait an extra 15 years will that really change anything? I am not so sure.

According to Michael Spratt, even if the purpose of the bill is to spare families from having to attend parole hearings, the truth is that a person who commits first degree murder has to serve a minimum of 25 years before he is eligible for a parole hearing.

Mr. Spratt says that second degree murder cases have hearings every two years. He adds that, by extending the period of ineligibility for parole from 25 years to 40 years—and why not 100 years while we are at it—there is a big chance that we will encounter constitutional challenges or that we could be violating the charter. According to him, the result would likely be that people would no longer plead guilty, which would jam up the justice

system. Any hope for rehabilitation and any related incentives would be lost.

Prisons should be full of hope for rehabilitation. We send people there to have them pay for a crime they committed against society; everyone understands that principle. However, rehabilitation is the important part of the process. I do not believe that an extra 15 years in prison will make someone a better citizen when they are released, yet that is what the goal should be.

Michael Spratt added that there could be a disproportionate impact on third parties, such as people who join a gang and have to go through an initiation. He said that the bill does not do anything for victims of crime and their families.

I would like to share what the Canadian Bar Association said about this bill:

Finally, the CBA Section does not believe that Canadians would benefit from a system where individuals are condemned to spend their entire lives behind bars, with no hope of ever being released. Even those convicted of homicide, the most serious of all crimes, should know there is some slim possibility, after serving lengthy periods of their sentence behind bars, of being released into the community and contributing to society, provided that their behaviour while incarcerated makes them deserving of such a privilege.

All of the experts agree that rehabilitation is important. That is the impression I get from these texts.

Our prison system is designed to make criminals serve a sentence and pay society back for the crime they committed with years of their life. However, I will say it again: no one is going to help these victims, despite what the Conservatives are saying. Instead, this bill will add 15 years to a prisoner's sentence but will not provide additional rehabilitation services or education for prisoners who are released from prison and who could give back to society.

The quote continues:

Further, release does not erase the fact that those convicted offenders are still serving life sentences. They continue to be subject to appropriate supervision, and to suspension and potential revocation of parole for a minor breach, or even in anticipation of any breach to protect society.

What these experts are saying is very clear. The president of the Criminal Lawyers' Association of Ontario, the first ombudsman for victims of crime and the Canadian Bar Association therefore oppose this bill. These are experts who must be trusted.

To conclude, the government claims that the purpose of Bill C-478 is to support victims of crime, but a deeper look will show otherwise. According to case law, this affects very few offenders already serving a life sentence, and it will benefit very few families. The Conservatives are still trying to pull the wool over our eyes, as they often do. They have—through a backbencher, no less—introduced a bill that may conflict with the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

For all these reasons, I must oppose this bill. I hope all my colleagues in the House will do the same.

• (1750)

**Mr. Massimo Pacetti (Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to Bill C-478.

As my colleagues have already said, this bill amends the Criminal Code to provide that a person convicted of the abduction, sexual assault and murder of one victim is to be sentenced to imprisonment for life without eligibility for parole until the person has served a sentence of between 25 and 40 years as determined by the presiding judge after considering the recommendation, if any, of the jury.

[English]

As my Liberal colleague, the member for Halifax West, stated during the last debate on the bill, we Liberals will be supporting this matter at second reading. We support the principle behind the legislation—that is, we agree that those who are convicted of abduction, sexual assault and murder of one victim should not easily receive parole.

[Translation]

Many community organizations, including the Canadian Resource Centre for Victims of Crime, also support this bill.

[English]

While we are fortunate that such brutality is rare in Canada, we know all too well that this evil does exist. Just this time last year, the nation was gripped with headlines of Luka Magnotta, who is alleged to have killed, raped and dismembered his victim. He is presently awaiting trial on charges including murder and committing an indignity to a body.

Also at this time last year, a sentence was handed down in the case of Michael Rafferty of Woodstock, Ontario, who along with Terri-Lynne McClintic was arrested and charged in the abduction and murder of eight-year-old Victoria Stafford. Both are serving life sentences with no chance of parole for 25 years, Rafferty having been found guilty of first degree murder, sexual assault causing bodily harm and kidnapping.

[Translation]

These names and these cases, like those of Paul Bernardo, Russell Williams and Clifford Olson, clearly prove that this evil does exist in Canada and force us to evaluate the need to amend our Criminal Code accordingly.

[English]

Of course, the question might arise as to whether the existing regime is sufficient. All these individuals I have named have been punished, and many will not be out for parole for quite some time.

The answer is that this bill, as the mover noted, is not about punishment. Indeed, it does not increase penalties for any of the associated offences. What Bill C-478 does, however, is extend the period of parole ineligibility to relieve grieving families of the burden of having to relive their awful torment every two years once the offender becomes eligible to seek parole. Indeed, the bill is about ending the re-victimization of families.

It should be noted that the 40-year period that the bill speaks to is not a requirement. Judges are given necessary discretion on this particular point.

That is not to say that the bill is a flawless piece of legislation. These being private members' bills produced with the limited resources that we have as members of Parliament, there are going to be some flaws. Hopefully, at committee we will work hard to make sure that these are perfect bills when they come out of committee.

My colleagues from the NDP have raised concerns regarding its compliance with the charter and with the Rome statute. I am sure these will be questions put to the technical witnesses at the justice committee for which they will undoubtedly have well-researched answers. Surely amendments could then be moved if needed to clarify both our desire to comply with our domestic and international obligations and our desire to achieve our aim of a longer period of parole ineligibility for certain types of offenders.

It is not often that I am able to address the House on matters of criminal justice policy. I am delighted to do so today and I am delighted that the bill before us is not one of the usual mandatory minimum penalty bills that the Liberal Party opposes on policy grounds.

Much of the discussion in the House on justice policy of late has focused on the idea of victims' rights. I am proud to be part of a party that takes the rights of victims seriously and has matched this commitment in word and in action.

(1755)

[Translation]

On November 1, 2005, the Government of Canada established the National Office for Victims at Public Safety Canada. This office is a single point of contact for victims who have concerns about offenders and questions about the federal correctional system and Canada's justice system.

The office provides victims with information and provides input on policy and legislative initiatives. It also attempts to educate members of the criminal justice system about victims' issues.

[English]

Further, although it has perhaps been overlooked in the current debate over Bill C-54, the Liberals proposed the initial amendments to the not criminally responsible regime that permitted a victim to read a victim impact statement at a review board hearing and required courts or review boards to advise a victim of his or her right to submit a victim impact statement at the initial disposition hearing for the accused.

Before closing, I must address one troublesome aspect of the bill as it is before us, not in substance but in form; namely, it is a piece of private member's business that has been endorsed by the Prime Minister and Minister of Justice as a worthwhile and necessary change to the law, yet it is something that would have been adopted much faster had it been introduced and advanced as government legislation. Indeed, why was this not part of the crime omnibus bill, Bill C-10? Or, more pertinently, why was this amendment not included in 2011 when Parliament debated Bill S-6, the serious time for the most serious crime act? Surely the government will agree these are serious crimes that deserve serious time.

My point is that the government has had ample opportunity to make this change to the law without having to use private members' hour to advance its agenda. It is a troubling trend because the use of private members' bills limits debate and circumvents charter review, something which is completed by the Department of Justice for only government bills and not private members' bills like Bill C-478.

Another troubling trend is that the Conservatives' justice agenda focuses on punishment without bearing in mind as well the need to adopt preventative measures designed to reduce the number of victims in the first place. Wow. For some types of offences, we should focus on root causes of crime, such as poverty, lack of education, and lack of access to affordable housing. For other types of crime, we should be looking at mental health initiatives for early screening and detection such that individuals may be diverted into the treatment programs they need.

Regrettably, changing sentencing and parole rules, however welcome some changes may be, does not prevent victimization. We must ensure a holistic approach is taken to justice, one that seeks to prevent crime, one that seeks to adequately punish the offender, and one that seeks to better reintegrate offenders into society once they have served their sentences.

In short, there is much more to be done, and Bill C-478 is not a magic bullet to solving the problem of crime in this country. However, as I stated at the outset, I believe the principle behind this bill has merit and thus I will be voting to send it to committee for further study and review.

Mr. David Sweet (Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—West-dale, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to speak in support of the private member's bill proposed by the member for Selkirk—Interlake this evening.

Bill C-478, the respecting families of murdered and brutalized persons act, addresses a critical flaw in the current parole process, the revictimization of victims and their families, most particularly when it comes to the most heinous of crimes of murder, abduction, and sexual assault. These are the most heinous of crimes.

Four weeks ago when I stood to speak to my own private member's bill which deals with fairness for victims of violent offenders, I spoke about my experiences when I attended the Parole Board of Canada hearings with two constituents and their extended families in 2010 and 2011. To say it was an experience of raw emotion would be a vast understatement. I do not think words can accurately describe the range of emotions that existed in that room. There was the anger and frustration, the injustice and fatigue of having to go through the process once again. More than anything else, there was the overwhelming grief, sorrow, and pain of loss.

While I can only draw on what I saw on those two separate occasions, what I saw told me very clearly that a loss or losses which occurred three decades previous seems like only yesterday to a victim or a victim's family.

I met the week before last with the Federal Ombudsman for Victims of Crime, Ms. Sue O'Sullivan. She agrees it is a revictimization inflicted by the parole process and is most disheartening according to the countless victims her office has interacted with to date.

### Private Members' Business

In July, my constituents will be attending the next Parole Board of Canada hearing of the murderer of their sister, niece and nephew, and I will once again accompany them to observe the process. However, I have no doubt that the day will trigger all the emotions again, and my constituent will weep openly from the moment she begins to read her victim impact statement. I suspect she and her parents are already experiencing periods of great sadness and anxiety in anticipation of that day.

I talk about what I saw in those Parole Board hearings once again in this debate on Bill C-478 because I think it illustrates the issue of revictimization. Just as my colleague from Okanagan—Coquihalla had a very painful personal experience with a victim's family with respect to a murderous crime, so have I. Our stories are representative of thousands of victims and families, and this grows substantially every year.

The triple murder was the subject of the Parole Board hearings I attended with my constituents, fortunately not matters that included abduction and sexual assault. I can only imagine how much more emotionally taxing that would be on the families. I can only imagine it would be exponential no doubt.

In the specific types of cases that Bill C-478 addresses, those of abduction, sexual assault, and murder, the parole process is particularly cruel because it is unnecessary. The criminals who commit those types of crimes are never granted parole. They are so sadistic that the intent of the law is to lock them up for life to keep them off the streets.

Whether it is Paul Bernardo, Robert Pickton, or Clifford Olson, we as a society know that parole will never and must never happen. However, under the current law, the Parole Board of Canada must hold a parole hearing for these depraved murderers every two years after the 25-year parole ineligibility period has expired.

Clifford Olson, though now dead, was never going to get out of jail, nor should he, yet the families whose lives he changed forever had to face him every two years. They would be doing that today still, if not for his death. That is beyond cruel because it is completely unnecessary.

If we pass Bill C-478, the judge and the jury will have the discretion to extend the parole ineligibility period from 25 years to 40 years. That does not mean they will automatically choose the period of 40 years, but it will give the judge, as a professional determining the sentence for the crime, the tools to do so if she or he feels that should be the case in the best interests of society; if she or he feels it is warranted, given the inherent evil that would drive an offender to commit such a crime; if she or he feels this will spare the families of the victim, or in all too many types of cases, the victims from being victimized again and again.

### **●** (1800)

As has been noted already in this debate, 40 years is what the maximum parole ineligibility period would be if each of the three crimes of abduction, sexual assault, and murder were treated consecutively; that is, 25 years for murder, 10 years maximum for abduction, and 4.6 years maximum for sexual assault.

The problem is clear and the solution proposed by the hon. member for Selkirk—Interlake in Bill C-478 is straightforward. It prevents further pain and suffering and it is just. I applaud him for bringing this bill forward.

As I have said many times before, I believe one of the fundamental responsibilities of the state is to keep its citizens safe. Those who abduct innocent victims for sex and then murder them have committed an unspeakable crime. We cannot give the families back their son or daughter, husband or wife, cousin, niece or nephew, but we can prevent them from being revictimized by the process.

Before closing, please allow me to reiterate some of the comments from victims that I referred to a few weeks ago, because it is the voice of those victimized that has been missing from this debate in the past, and it is what we must listen to in consideration of Bill C-478.

This was stated in the *Toronto Star* on April 9, 2007:

"Families have already been victimized once. They shouldn't have to be victimized every two years. Having to face a loved one's killer and to read what he did to her and how her death has affected our lives is something nobody should ever have to do once, never mind twice."

In reference to the Clifford Olson case, which I spoke about already this afternoon, a journalist in the *Vancouver Province* said:

Olson, 70, who seems to take pleasure in revictimizing the families of those he killed, is automatically eligible for parole every two years until the day he dies.

In that same newspaper, the mother of one of Olson's victims put it quite simply:

"To have to relive this [parole hearing] every two years, it's so inhumane. It really is."

Let us not forget those words as we continue to consider Bill C-478 and its efforts to prevent those unnecessary hearings in cases that really are the worst of the worst.

I have appreciated the opportunity to speak to Bill C-478. I thank my colleague for putting the bill forward. I hope that all members of this House, after thinking it through and understanding clearly what this means, will vote for Bill C-478.

### • (1805)

### [Translation]

**Mr. Jonathan Genest-Jourdain (Manicouagan, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, today I will continue to talk to the Canadian public about my observations on the sectarian nature of the process the government has used to enact public policy since it took power.

I wish to point out to Canadians that Bill C-478 on increasing parole ineligibility is nothing more than the Conservative government's nth attempt to introduce measures to amend the Criminal Code by means of private member's bills from the back benches, which are in fact very vocal at the moment.

Over the past two years, I have noticed that the government has used many different tactics to introduce programs that are first and foremost of interest to very specific social classes and segments of Canada's population, and to influential lobby groups that have the government's ear.

Some may find private member's bills particularly useful, in part because there may not be public approval, and also because the government is not as involved as it would be with a formal government bill.

Private member's bills are all too often introduced to sound out public opinion and to please a very specific segment of the population and the lobby groups, as I already mentioned. They are also used to boost the party's popularity, all with a view to electioneering and marketing.

I have noticed far too often that the Conservatives see public policy enactment and implementation as a form of commodity trading or marketing. The government views public policy as a corporation would. This has happened far too often with advertising for the 2013 and 2015 economic action plans. I do not know the exact title, but it is copyrighted. In short, the advertising campaigns and the associated hype give us a hint of how much effort has been made on the marketing front to publish, fine tune and polish their image.

However, they are not fooling anyone. People with natural curiosity can clearly see what the government is really trying to do. When the advertising shows green fields, families and streams—and people know full well that the economic action plan focuses on extracting natural resources—many are stunned.

This backbench private member's bill does nothing to burnish the Conservatives' image, which clearly needs a great deal of polishing and chrome, because their popularity is in free fall at the moment. I want to remind everyone of this and will continue to hammer the point home. The timing is good. The conditions are right.

I would like to reiterate one more time, even though all my colleagues already agree, that the Conservatives' image is definitely now in decline. That is why we are trying to rally the membership base that has supported us from the outset—

### **●** (1810)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): Order. The hon. member for Selkirk—Interlake on a point of order.

[English]

**Mr. James Bezan:** Mr. Speaker, I know it is rare to have filibusters take place in private members' business. It is important that we respect the rules of the House, which means the debate has to be relevant to what is taking place. None of the comments that have been made in the last minute and a half have been relevant to Bill C-478. I would ask that the member be brought to order and that he follow the rules of the House.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton):** I thank the hon. member for Selkirk—Interlake for his intervention.

It is true that members should be sure to keep their comments relevant to the question before the House. In hearing the hon. member, he is making some connections in respect of his arguments. Having said that, I will leave it with the hon. member to make sure that he brings his arguments around specifically to the question that is before the House in the course of his arguments.

The hon. member for Manicouagan.

[Translation]

**Mr. Jonathan Genest-Jourdain:** Mr. Speaker, I understand that this has been a rather long day. As well, some rather lively discussion is taking place at this time. If the Canadian public had access to all this shilly-shallying, it would be an excellent thing.

In line with the Conservatives' idea of developing and adopting public policies with which they can make political and media hay, the bill under consideration will have only a tenuous connection with reality in the courts of this country.

I remind members that I am, first and foremost, a criminal lawyer. I am therefore going to substantiate my argument by using concrete, empirical examples, much as some may not like it.

In Canada, there are not many incidents associated with offenders convicted of abduction or sexual assault followed by murder. When I say "not many", that does not mean there is not very heavy media coverage associated with the very limited number of such cases.

The Conservatives' idea is that they are going to make political hay; they are going to try to start it all up again and engage in sensationalism, since these cases get very good coverage. They are simply going to try to polish their image by showing they are on the side of victims and they are going to do something. There is only a very tenuous connection with reality in the courts and on the incidence of this kind of case.

I handled several hundred cases when I worked for legal aid, and several hundred more when I opened my own private practice, but I have never had to handle this kind of case. In 2007, after I was called to the bar, I handled some fairly sordid homicide cases, the details of which I will spare you. Nonetheless, I have never had to take on a case involving an abduction or a sexual assault followed by a murder. That type of case is quite rare.

I would note that in this kind of case, one or two incidents a year are observed in the case reports, in the whole of Canada, and the individuals are already sentenced to imprisonment for life. We therefore cannot help but draw conclusions and make certain inferences: that this is simply publicity hype and a desire to curry favour with groups that are clearly identified in advance.

In the context of this analysis, we also need to weigh the risks associated with initiatives relating to the imposition of maximum sentences. If Canada no longer bases its rules on a 25-year maximum, people will argue that various combined offences should be treated the same way.

When I am writing my speeches, I wonder how my practice is doing. I do intend to return to my practice in the near or distant future. I wonder how thick my Criminal Code is going to be when I go back into court. What will my criminal law practice be like? Will my criminal practice, for me as defence counsel, be significantly

Private Members' Business

different as a result of the very substantial amendments that have been promulgated in recent years?

Over the past little while, we have been going off on this continuous and very pronounced and deliberate march to the right. I have some acquaintances with whom I worked for years, and over the summer I am going to do some research in order to get an answer, and I am going to ask some Crown prosecutors to verify whether their practices and the measures and directives that have come their way have been altered in the last two years.

I will hold back some of my observations, given the potentially controversial nature of this subject.

I submit this respectfully.

**●** (1815)

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): Resuming debate. Accordingly, I invite the hon. member for Selkirk—Interlake for his right of reply. The hon. member has five minutes.

Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to reply to the comments that have been made in the House over the last two hours of debate. I want to thank those members who have spoken out in favour of my bill and the importance of it and how it stands up for victims and the revictimization that they face every time they have to attend an unnecessary parole board hearing.

I have to take a great deal of exception with some of the statements that were made by members across the way, that this is a government bill. That is an insult to my staff, who have worked on this bill so diligently. It is an insult to the Library of Parliament researchers and drafters, who helped in the drafting process. I can tell members that those types of comments are not at all helpful to the overall decorum of this place when it is trying to minimize us as private members in bringing forward business.

As I said in my opening comments, the catalyst for going forward with this bill goes back to 2009, when I first started thinking about what was happening with the Tori Stafford case, with the capture of Michael Rafferty and Terri-Lynne McClintic and the overall result of having them sentenced to life imprisonment.

While that was taking place, we were listening to the Clifford Olson saga as he was dying in prison from cancer and all the stories about how he re-victimized the families of his victims over and over again by making them appear at these unnecessary parole board hearings.

It is important that we respect one another in this place. Making those types of comments that minimize our role in this chamber as being puppets for the government is deeply disturbing. At some point in time, I may be requesting an apology from the members who made those statements.

Some of the comments revolved around the constitutionality of Bill C-478. I can tell members that is a concern that I had. I wanted to ensure that if we were going to draft a bill, it was not going to be struck down by the courts under a charter challenge. It would give full power and discretion to the judges, to the judiciary, to make the decision whether or not they wanted to increase parole ineligibility from 25 years up to a maximum of 40 years. They would have the power, either through a jury process or on their own, to make a decision whether or not parole ineligibility could be anywhere between 25 and 40 years.

It is important to know that these are the most depraved and sadistic murderers in Canadian society. These are the people who go to jail and are never again released. I think that is something that we have to take special note of. This is not about stiffer penalties and more punishment, because these murderers never ever are given parole ineligibility. Also, to ensure that this bill was constitutional, I wanted to fashion it after Bill C-48, which passed in 2011 just before the last election. That bill was proven to be constitutional and charter-compliant and so I fashioned our bill after that process.

Now, as was pointed by some members here, that maybe it is not perfect in its terms because it was a private members' bill, it was drafted by Library of Parliament and my staff working together. We are willing to accept any amendments that would improve the technical aspects and the legality of Bill C-478.

I have also taken note that some people said that victims' rights groups are not supporting this bill. I can tell members that Victims of Violence, led by Sharon Rosenfeldt, supports this bill; that Yvonne Harvey and the Canadian Parents of Murdered Children support this bill; the Association of Families of Persons Assassinated or Disappeared supports this bill; and the Canadian Resource Centre for Victims of Crime supports this bill.

Also, I heard from the NDP members in the first hour of debate that this bill would violate international law. They kept talking about the Rome Statute. However, I can tell members that the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court applies only to genocides, crimes against humanity, war crimes and the crime of aggression.

This is a domestic bill, domestic law, and the power completely lies with the country and Parliament can make these decisions.

To point out the hypocrisy of the NDP, it supported Bill C-48 in the last Parliament. Why would it not support this bill, which is fashioned in the same format as Bill C-48 and would even go further in addressing the most depraved, sadistic murderers who go out and abduct children, abduct individuals, sexually assault them and then violently murder them? Those are the people we want to ensure we address. We want to ensure that the families of those victims would not have to be re-terrorized by these horrific individuals.

**●** (1820)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton):** The question is on the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon, members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton):** Pursuant to an order made on Wednesday, May 22, the division stands deferred until Wednesday, June 5, at the expiry of the time provided for oral questions.

\* \*

[Translation]

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed the following bill, to which the concurrence of the House is desired: Bill S-16, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (trafficking in contraband tobacco).

### **GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[English]

### FIGHTING FOREIGN CORRUPTION ACT

The House resumed from May 24 consideration of the motion that Bill S-14, An Act to amend the Corruption of Foreign Public Officials Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): When the House last had this motion before it the hon. member for Scarborough—Guildwood had nine minutes remaining for his comments.

Hon. John McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Cambridge for that enthusiastic applause and possibly one or two others as well. However, I would be surprised if the member for Cambridge and others actually remembered what I was talking about two weeks ago when question period interrupted the profundities of my speech.

Let me say that we support Bill S-14. We think it is a good bill insofar as it goes. Regrettably, we do not think it goes very far. The thrust of my speech was to link Bill S-14 with Bill C-474, the sunshine bill sponsored by me, which would actually be the evidence base for Bill S-14. Bill S-14 becomes far stronger if one brings in the evidence. As such, one would actually succeed in getting prosecutions.

In my previous remarks I talked about how aggressive the Americans are with respect to prosecutions in corruption. The numbers are something in the order of, for the same period of time, 277 prosecutions in the United States for corruption whereas in Canada we only had two. In this respect, the Americans are world leaders and not only world leaders in terms of the aggressiveness with which they prosecute companies that engage in corrupt activities. They do not shy away from prosecuting some of the most recognized companies in the world that trade on U.S. stock exchanges. Therefore, not only is their prosecution aggressive but their legislative agenda is also aggressive.

They have passed the Cardin-Lugar amendment to the Dodd-Frank bill, which basically states that if mining or extractive companies secure a concession they would have to disclose to the U. S. Securities and Exchange Commission who they have paid, how much they paid, when they paid it, the frequency of the payments, the currency of the payments, and all other considerations in securing that concession. My sunshine bill, Bill C-474, mirrors that legislation. It is something that both President Obama and Prime Minister Cameron want to achieve at the next G8.

I had summarized all of this and talked about the decline in Canada's reputation and went on to discuss the incongruity of the government's position to, on the one hand, support S-14, which we think is a good idea, and to be opposed to the sunshine bill, Bill C-474, on the other.

My newest seatmate as of today, my colleague from Mount Royal, would say that there is a seeming incongruity with the government's position in supporting Bill S-14. It says that it wants to combat corruption, yet by opposing Bill C-474 it is saying that accountability is not important. I cannot reconcile the disparity easily. Perhaps it lies in the simple fact that Bill C-474 is not a Conservative bill. It is a bill that the parliamentary secretary and other Conservatives have claimed would overburden Canada's extractive sector, leaving our companies at a competitive disadvantage and so forth, when this was in fact contradicted by witnesses at the foreign affairs committee.

I have to take note that a number of mining companies and mining associations have come out and said that they not only support Bill S-14 but they certainly support the principles and indeed the mandatory aspects of Bill C-474. Some Canadian companies have enthusiastically taken up the issue of corporate accountability. Business leaders, such as the president of the Mining Association of Canada, Pierre Gratton, believes that corporate transparency mechanisms are not only the right thing to do but they are also good for business.

All of the investors agree. The last thing that investors want is to be embarrassed as they see their investments decline in value on the front pages of *The Globe and Mail*. Therefore, industry is on side

### Government Orders

with Bill C-474. It is certainly on side for Bill S-14. Most responsible extractive companies are on side with the EITI initiative. These are good insofar as they go.

#### • (1825)

Canada as a nation supports the EITI transparency international initiative, but it has not joined. The Government of Canada has declined to join the EITI, which is quite regrettable because we are the country that is of foremost importance with respect to the extractive sector.

Business, in this instance, is actually ahead of the government in terms of a desire to impose a mandatory regime upon itself. Not only is it a good thing to do, it is good for business. Joe Ringwald of Selwyn Resources said that it is important to become a leader in this and to gain reputational advantage. He also said that Canada has become a laggard on this issue.

Industry has generally taken a favourable tone to this legislation and a number of players want transparency, particularly with many of the projects where there is money going to foreign governments and sometimes more money going to foreign governments than to shareholders. The idea of financial transparency has both public and private sector support. As I say, the industry is certainly on side. The NGOs, as might be expected, are on side. Civil society is on side. I would dare say the public is on side. The only issue that we appear to have here is that the government does not want to legislate in this area.

It is going to be a very difficult issue at a difficult time for the Prime Minister when he goes to Great Britain for the G8. Clearly, Prime Minister Cameron wants a clear, mandatory statement with respect to legislation on the extractive sector. He wants other issues agreed on as well, as does President Obama, who is highly supportive of the Cardin-Lugar amendment. They are binding their own companies to this initiative.

Starting September 1, any company that trades on the U.S. stock exchange will be bound by this legislative initiative. The irony is that if we want to find out about a major gold company, Barrick, for example, including who they pay and what they pay for their concessions around the world to foreign governments, including the foreign government of Canada, we will have to go to the New York Stock Exchange to the Securities and Exchange Commission and look at the published reports to see what and who got paid. It seems to me that Canada as a nation, given its position as the number one mining country in the world, should be a little bit ahead of the curve, instead of behind it.

Internationally, the Prime Minister is going to have to do some tap dancing in Northern Ireland, and explain to his colleagues at the G8 why Canada is not supportive of the sunshine bill.

I see that my time is just about finished. I would like to say in conclusion that the incongruity of the government's position in presenting Bill S-14, which is a good bill, but not supporting Bill C-474 is something that the Prime Minister is going to have some difficulties explaining when he meets with his colleagues this month in Northern Ireland.

### **●** (1830)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the other day, I was at a school in the north end of Winnipeg, the Garden City Collegiate, where I met with a number of students. It was interesting how the area of discussion was regarding, among other things, the sunshine bill, of which I know the member is the sponsor. I was provided with a couple of petitions. This is coming from young people. If I may, I would just read very briefly the two major points on them. In essence, they say:

—petitioners request that the House of Commons legislate that the standards for Canadian Mining Companies operating outside of Canada be the same as the standards they must reach operating inside of Canada. This would include....

They then go on to list off some things. Another petition states:

—petitioners request that the House of Commons legislate standards for the identification of the source of these minerals (tin, tungsten, tantalum (coltan) and gold), in much the same way that diamonds are now regulated....

The point is that we have a group of young students going to school in Winnipeg's north end and they have caught on to a very important issue, which the member has been talking a great deal about.

I wonder if he might want to provide some comment in terms of the type of support that he believes is out there for the government to take action today in dealing with this very important issue?

#### (1835)

**Hon. John McKay:** Mr. Speaker, I remember well a telephone interview I did with one of the students from that collegiate. She phoned me about six weeks ago to talk about it. What I noticed is that these kids are pretty darn sharp. She asked me very pointed questions with respect to the sunshine bill and I hope I answered her questions well, but this is not an isolated example.

I have done a number of interviews and met with quite a number of students across the country at both the high school and university levels. This is a broadly-supported bill. Canadians, particularly young Canadians, are keenly interested in knowing that the companies their parents work for are acting in an ethical fashion. It is of great importance.

My colleague made reference to the fact that I had been promoting this bill for a while, but I go back to another bill that I was also promoting on corporate social responsibility. It is interesting what we have learned in the four years or so that I have been on this file. One thing companies now tell me is that when they do interviews with prospective employees, whether it is for their law, accounting or communications departments, just name a department, they get to choose the best and brightest because these are the premier companies in our nation.

The kids reverse the interview. They ask the people doing the interviews what the company's corporate social responsibility program is because they do not want to just shill for a company that does not have a serious corporate social responsibility program. The kids at this high school in North Winnipeg are highly reflective of my experience over the number of years I have been on this file.

### [Translation]

Mr. Jonathan Tremblay (Montmorency—Charlevoix—Haute-Côte-Nord, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I think that this bill deserves to be studied in greater depth.

Does the Liberal member believe that the committee should determine whether the facilitation payments rule should come into force at the pleasure of the cabinet, as is currently the case, or whether the decision should rest with Parliament?

[English]

**Hon. John McKay:** Mr. Speaker, that is a good question. My quick reaction is that the facilitation payments should come into effect upon the passage of the legislation. They should not be left to the cabinet regulatory environment. Facilitation is a facilitation is a facilitation, and some people would call it a bribe. If, in fact, it is not legislatively mandated, the working of the regulation might work to be counterproductive to the intention of the bill. As I say, the intention of the bill is good. Unfortunately, all it does is bring us up to the regulatory environment of others. Since we are the lead nation in mining activity, we would rather hope we are ahead of the curve.

Karin Lissakers, former president of Revenue Watch, stated publicly that Canada was out of step with other countries on upping its game. If facilitation needs to be legislated, let us legislate it.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, I have a follow-up question with regard to the whole issue of social corporate responsibility and how important it is for the government to play a leading international role. To what degree does the member feel Canada is playing second fiddle, possibly even third fiddle, to other nations in the world on this issue?

**Hon. John McKay:** Mr. Speaker, unfortunately our track record on this file is not as robust as one would like.

In 2011, the Prime Minister was invited to sign a transparency initiative, which was a robust transparency initiative by his colleagues in the G8, and he declined to do so. As a consequence, there was no statement that came out of the G8 which would have, at that point, moved the Cardin-Lugar amendment up everyone else's legislative agenda.

Here we are two years later. It is the same issue. It is even more important now. We have had a series of embarrassing incidents for Canada.

I do not know about other members, but I do not particularly feel good about seeing Canadian companies engaged in bribery and other kinds of scandals.

The government has had two years to kind of catch up to the rest. To this point, it has not done anything except for Bill S-14. I do not want to be entirely negative here. There have been some discretionary educational initiatives that the government has tried to put forward.

Sometimes we just have to bring the hammer down and the government has thus far declined to do that. The United States has brought the hammer down. The U.K. is in the process of bringing the hammer down. The EU has brought the hammer down. Australia is in the process. When we put all that together, what we have is, in effect, 85% of the extractive sector that will have a robust legislative environment if in fact we join in.

It is hypocritical on our part to say that those countries that are subject to a lot of corruption should clean up their act, if in fact we have legislative holes in ours. Right now Canada is the big hole in the fence. We need to rectify that. It can be rectified in this chamber and quite quickly. The only way, in my judgment, that is done is not only in passing Bill S-14, but in passing Bill C-474 as well.

#### **●** (1840)

Mr. Dean Allison (Niagara West—Glanbrook, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to rise today to speak to this very important initiative. With recent events around the world, especially in the Middle East and Africa, it is clear that the fight against global corruption is as timely today as it has ever been. Indeed, developments in our own courts highlight that combatting foreign bribery is significant to Canada. Bill S-14 is an expression of our government's commitment to doing exactly that. I will be using my time today to address the inclusion of the facilitation payments amendment.

Before I continue with my speech, I need to let you know, Mr. Speaker, that I will be splitting my time with the member for Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound.

I would also like to update the House on the three convictions that have already been made under the Corruption of Foreign Public Officials Act, which Bill S-14 seeks to amend. While these recent court decisions are evidence of the effectiveness of Canada's anticorruption laws and a reminder that corruption is not a Canadian way of doing business, we have been asked to do more, and so we will.

First, I wish to note and thank members of the other place for their support of the bill. Indeed, Liberal Senator David Smith agreed that adopting the measures of Bill S-14 would send an important signal to the international community that we took our commitments seriously and would act on them.

I also wish to thank my colleagues for providing the detailed background on the CFPOA and the six amendments that would answer the call for heightened diligence. Taken together, they certainly demonstrate a broad approach to fighting unethical business practices.

As the Minister of Foreign Affairs has clearly stated, our government is committed to positioning Canada as a reliable supplier of the resources emerging markets need to grow. Canadian companies can compete with the best in this environment and will win fairly. These amendments would ensure that Canadian companies would continue to act in good faith in the pursuit of freer markets and expanded global trade.

I wish to remind my colleagues that a facilitation payment is a "grease payment", paid to foreign public officials to do something that he or she is already obliged to do, such as deliver mail on time. It is specifically not supposed to allow the person paying to gain a

#### Government Orders

business advantage in any way. Otherwise, the payment would be a bribe and it would be a crime to make the payment.

We have heard some concern that the elimination of the facilitation payments defence may create a competitive disadvantage for Canadian companies with international markets, given that legislation in other countries still contain the facilitation payments defence.

Let me be clear. Those who make facilitation payments are not allowed to receive any kind of business or competitive advantage from their payment. Payments that are made to receive a business advantage are bribes and these payments are already illegal under the CFPOA. They are also illegal under the legislation of every OECD country.

It is also important for hon. members to note that there is good reason to delay the coming into force of the elimination of facilitation payments exception. Canadian companies will need time to adjust their own practices and internal policies, if they have not already done so, to prohibit the use of facilitation payments in their habitual operations. This time to adjust is all the more important given that some other countries continue to allow facilitation payments.

We on this side of the House have been clear that our priority is to create the conditions for Canadian businesses to succeed in the pursuit of our aggressive pro-trade agenda. I reiterate our position that corruption does the opposite. It hinders economic growth and long-term prosperity. It fosters an environment conducive to allowing other crimes to flourish. We expect our companies to abide by the laws of the countries they operate in, as well as to act in accordance with Canadian laws and ethical standards and practices.

For Canadian companies operating in developing countries, this legislation is even more important. As the minister noted before the Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade, on February 28:

It is not just about values and ethics. It is also about ensuring that we see meaningful development in developing economies. It is important that we see meaningful development and that this development benefits the people. Corruption, particularly in developing economies, is a real problem. It is basically tapping money that could otherwise go toward the public good, to the benefit of the people in these countries, so it is not just an ethical question but also very much a development question.

Foreign bribery weakens economic prosperity by corroding the rule of law that is the basis for market freedom.

## • (1845)

Bill S-14 provides us with a robust tool for creating the conditions for Canadian businesses to play by the rules and for Canadian companies to be successful across the globe. It involves encouraging responsible and ethical conduct. It involves positioning our country as a reliable supplier of the resources that emerging markets need to grow.

As I mentioned at the outset, I would now like to use some of my time to provide the House with some details on the three convictions that have already been made under the CFPOA. These convictions highlight just how seriously our government takes its commitment to prosecute those involved in foreign corruption and bribery. I would like my colleagues to keep in mind that there are also two cases pending, as well as 35 ongoing investigations.

As others have noted, penalties are increasing substantially with each new conviction, and the adoption of these amendments means that those engaging in corruption will be penalized even more severely.

Griffiths Energy International Inc., based in Calgary, Alberta, pleaded guilty on January 22, 2013, to a charge under the CFPOA related to securing an oil and gas contract in Chad. Griffiths will pay a total penalty of \$10.35 million.

Similarly, Niko Resources, another Calgary-based company, entered a guilty plea on June 24, 2011, for one count of bribery. The company admitted that through its subsidiary Niko Bangladesh, in May 2005, it provided the use of a vehicle valued at \$190,984 to AKM Mosharraf Hossain, then the Bangladeshi state minister for energy and mineral resources, in order to influence the minister in his dealings with Niko Bangladesh. In June 2005, Niko Resources Ltd. paid travel and accommodation expenses for the same minister to travel from Bangladesh to Calgary to attend the GO Expo oil and gas exposition, and paid approximately \$5,000 for the minister to travel to New York and Chicago to visit his family

As a result of the conviction, Niko Resources Ltd. was fined \$9.5 million and placed under a probation order, which puts the company under the court's supervision for three years to ensure that audits are completed on the company's compliance with the CFPOA. The Canadian Trade Commissioner Service has placed a hold on providing services to Niko during the period of court supervision.

Finally, Hydro Kleen Group, based in Red Deer, Alberta, entered a guilty plea on January 10, 2005, to one count of bribery and was ordered to pay a fine of \$25,000. Along with its president and an employee, the company had been charged with two counts of bribing a U.S. immigration officer who worked at the Calgary International Airport. The charges against the director and the officer of the company were stayed. The U.S. immigration officer pleaded guilty on July 2002 to accepting secret commissions. He received a sixmonth sentence and was subsequently deported to the United States.

In closing, I wish to address the importance of the timely passage of Bill S-14. This is signature legislation that has given Canada good marks with domestic stakeholders and at the OECD working group on bribery in 2013. We have invested a lot of credibility in Bill S-14.

We are due to report back to the OECD in the near future regarding the adoption of the bill, and further delays would have implications that go beyond the scrutiny of the OECD. Regardless of the merits of recent domestic developments, Canada would be criticized on the domestic and international stages for not meeting our commitments. I think this alone speaks to the importance of passing the bill at second reading today, and I urge my hon. colleagues to lend it their full support.

**●** (1850)

[Translation]

Mr. Philip Toone (Gaspésie—Îles-de-la-Madeleine, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for his interesting comments. It is true that the bill deserves additional debate. The next step will be to send it to committee, and the House has the NDP's support to do so.

For many years now, or at least since the Conservative government has been in power, no one in Canada has been convicted of taking a bribe or paying a bribe to a foreign company, as set out in the bill.

What changed the government's mind? Can we really believe that it is going to go forward and attempt to do away with this practice? Apart from the bill itself, does the government really intend to do that? Over the past five years, we seem to have had a great deal of difficulty in understanding what the government wants.

[English]

**Mr. Dean Allison:** Mr. Speaker, I mentioned in my speech the three recent convictions that have been processed under this act.

I want to state that the OECD had some concerns about our legislation, and so we are bringing this bill forward, to tighten that up a little bit more. There are a number of things we propose to amend that would help to increase times and make sure that the RCMP is directly responsible for looking into and creating charges.

I know that this is timely, and even though we have probably not processed many in the past, as we move ahead, we look forward to being tougher on these individuals.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as was illustrated earlier, there is a wide belief that in fact there is unethical, unacceptable behaviour that takes place within the corporate world, and at a great cost to many communities in certain areas of the world.

There is an expectation that Canada would play a stronger leadership role in ensuring we are doing what we can. My colleague talked about the sunshine bill earlier, which is an important private member's bill that would have gone a long way in dealing with this issue in a clear fashion.

Can the member indicate to what degree the government is genuinely open to receiving amendments to the legislation that would enable it to be stronger legislation going forward?

## **●** (1855)

**Mr. Dean Allison:** Mr. Speaker, as we look at fighting foreign bribery, I think Canadians recognize that Canadian companies around the world do a great job. Are there some bad actors? Yes, there certainly is from time to time. However, in any opportunity I have had to speak with ambassadors around the world, they look to Canada for leadership and they look for help, whether it is with their own legislation in developing countries or on how they can tighten legislation that may affect them.

I would say to the hon. member that this is something that will strengthen what has already been in place for a certain amount of time. We realize that there are probably some gaps there that we could fill, which is why we are looking at moving forward with that.

I have a couple of quotes that talk about support for the bill.

Ian Pearce, the chief executive officer of Xstrata Nickel, said, "As a Canadian-based company with operations and projects around the world, we applaud the government's efforts to combat corruption and bribery. As part of the Xstrata Group, we have a commitment to the highest standards of personal and professional ethical behaviour, and we have a policy of zero tolerance towards any form of bribery or fraud".

I also have a quote from a former Liberal cabinet minister, John Manley, regarding the amendments to the Corruption of Foreign Public Officials Act. On Tuesday, February 5, 2013, he said, "Good corporate citizenship at home and abroad is essential to Canada's economic success. These latest measures aimed at eliminating corruption and bribery, will strengthen Canada's already strong reputation for good governance and ethical business practices".

Mr. Larry Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound, CPC): Mr. Speaker, to get up after my colleague from Niagara West—Glanbrook is filling big shoes, but it is a pleasure today to speak to Bill S-14. On February 5, the Minister of Foreign Affairs announced our government's efforts in taking further steps to combat corruption and bribery.

Through the introduction of Bill S-14, which includes a number of amendments to the Corruption of Foreign Public Officials Act, we are redoubling our fight against bribery and corruption, strengthening Canada's anti-corruption laws and placing Canada at the leading edge of countries taking robust action against corruption, action that will benefit Canadian companies at home and abroad.

The Corruption of Foreign Public Officials Act, CFPOA, is not new. In fact, Canada has had anti-corruption legislation in place since 1999. We passed it primarily in response to the OECD's anti-bribery convention. It is a good law that has already produced several convictions. However, we have identified a number of ways in which we can make it better. These can be found in the six amendments proposed in the fighting foreign corruption act.

Others before me have briefly explained each of these amendments, so I would like to focus particularly on that which proposes to clarify the scope of the CFPOA. This specific but important amendment, the elimination of the words "for profit" from the definition of business, would clarify that the scope of the CFPOA is not limited to bribes paid by for-profit enterprises or in the course of profitable business. Eliminating the words "for profit" from the

#### Government Orders

definition of business ensures that the net is cast as widely as possible. By removing the for profit requirement from the definition of business, we expand the scope of the CFPOA.

We believe this will translate into two advantages in our fight against corruption. First, we wish to seize the opportunity to target those who pay bribes on behalf of companies that may or may not earn a profit during a given year. Second, we would also target organizations whose main purpose is not for profit as well as those whose main purpose is to generate a profit. In other words, we would treat all organizations the same way in the context of foreign bribery. Whether or not an entity is capable of generating revenue and earning a profit, and whether an entity conducts business in anticipation of profit, they would receive the same treatment under the CFPOA.

With respect to the first scenario, a company not earning a profit on a given year, a gap currently exists in the legislation. This gap does not support enforcement or prosecution. A company may try to escape the application of the law by conducting their business in a manner to establish that no profit is reflected in their books. This might be accomplished by way of strategic planning and the application of appropriate accounting methodologies. There is no reason that clever accounting should make the payment of bribes legal.

Our amendment would go a long way to ensuring the act applies to all questionable activities related to bribes, by ensuring that all business activities are captured regardless of the anticipation of profit from those specific activities.

With respect to the second scenario, an entity's reason for being is either profit or not for profit. All entities should be treated in the same manner. The fight against corruption cannot be won if we make exceptions for certain organizations and not for others. If we continue with unequal treatment, we do nothing more than shift the focus of bribery transactions to the not-for-profit sector.

In addition, if we close only the gap for the for-profit sector, we would have a realistic expectation that the number of newly created not-for-profit entities would increase. Why? They would increase in order to escape detection. In other words, we would continue to have an enforcement issue in our fight against corruption and it would simply shift to the not-for-profit sector. The focus would be on determining whether the not-for-profit entities are really that: not for profit. We do not have the resources for this, nor should we. We can be more fair, more strategic and more cost-effective if we simply treat everyone the same.

#### **●** (1900)

We have a realistic expectation that by closing these two gaps by simply deleting the words "for profit" from the definition of "business", we would facilitate enforcement and prosecution. After all, timely and responsive enforcement can enhance investigations and facilitate successful prosecution. In the end this is what we want: to successfully prosecute those involved in the corruption of foreign public officials.

Our government's top priority is to secure jobs, growth, and long-term prosperity. It involves pursuing an aggressive trade agenda and creating the conditions for Canadian companies and businesses to succeed. However, our government expects Canadian companies to play by the rules and compete fairly. As such, the legislation that is before us signals our commitment to fighting corruption and bribery.

These amendments would further deter and prevent Canadian companies from bribing foreign public officials and would reinforce Canada's good name. These amendments would help ensure that Canadian companies continued to act in good faith in the pursuit of freer markets and expanded global trade.

I want to read a few statements in support of this bill.

Ian Pearce, chief executive officer of Xstrata Nickel, said that as a Canadian-based company with operations and projects around the world, they applaud the government's efforts to combat corruption and bribery. He said that as part of the Xstrata group, the are committed to the highest standards of personal and professional ethical behaviour, and have a policy of zero tolerance toward any form of bribery or fraud.

Janet Keeping, chair and president of Transparency International Canada, said that Transparency International Canada is delighted that the federal government is moving to strengthen the Corruption of Foreign Public Officials Act in accordance with Canada's international obligations and encourages the government to ensure that the RCMP have the resources necessary to enforce the CFPOA effectively. She said that legal changes of the kind proposed are only as good as the government's commitment to making the law meaningful on the ground.

On Tuesday, February 5, 2013, the Hon. John Manley, former Liberal MP, said, regarding amendments to the Corruption of Public Officials Act, that good corporate citizenship at home and abroad is essential to Canada's economic success. He said that these latest measures, aimed at eliminating corruption and bribery, will strengthen Canada's already strong reputation for good governance and ethical business practices.

We have this bill before us and as I said earlier, from time to time we review many pieces of legislation in this House. At some point all legislation needs to be reviewed because, while it may be good at one point, circumstances change, and there are people out there who lay awake at night looking for loopholes and thinking of ways to skirt the system.

I certainly urge all my colleagues on all sides of the House to support this bill. If I happened to have a bunch of people from my riding here tonight, I would certainly want them to see all parties in this place stand to support this bill at the end of the night.

I would be happy to take any questions.

**(1905)** 

[Translation]

Mr. Jonathan Tremblay (Montmorency—Charlevoix—Haute-Côte-Nord, NDP): Mr. Speaker, at the moment, the rule on facilitation payments is applicable at the cabinet's pleasure.

Does the member agree that the committee should determine whether cabinet or Parliament should decide?

[English]

Mr. Larry Miller: Mr. Speaker, I think I understand the question.

We discuss many issues in this House and there are decisions that are made by governments, made first by cabinets through discussion. Some decisions are made at committee and recommendations come back to this House in committee reports. This is a bill that ended up before the whole House, and rightly so. We all have a chance to speak to it and debate it. Who cannot support something that provides balance?

As I said in my speech, not-for-profit and for-profit organizations were being treated basically in two different manners. It does not matter what we deal with in this place, we should always look for balance and equity at all levels, and this bill goes a long way toward that.

[Translation]

Mr. André Bellavance (Richmond—Arthabaska, BQ): Mr. Speaker, even though we are in favour of the principle underlying this bill, I have some questions.

I have a specific question for the member who just spoke about paragraph 5(1)(b) of Bill S-14, which says that a permanent resident who commits an offence under the Corruption of Foreign Officials Act outside Canada is not deemed to have committed that offence if the person does not return to Canada. That could last for years, and on the day the person returns, he or she could face certain charges under the act.

I would like my colleague to state whether a Canadian resident would receive the same treatment as a permanent resident. In the United Kingdom, care was taken to place limits on this provision. Bill S-14 is different from what is found in other countries.

[English]

**Mr. Larry Miller:** Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that I totally understand the member's question. I think he may be looking for a needle in a haystack.

The bottom line is that if that individual he speaks of comes back here, whether the individual is a permanent resident or a citizen of Canada, the expectation would be that the individual would be treated the same way under the law.

If the member has concerns about a loophole, he certainly should bring it to our attention and it could be looked at.

Those are the only comments I can make on that.

## **●** (1910)

[Translation]

Mr. Philip Toone (Gaspésie—Îles-de-la-Madeleine, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. I thank my colleague for his interesting observations, but would like to ask him a question.

Knowing as we do that the government has made significant cuts to the RCMP, where will the funds come from to finance this bill? [English]

**Mr. Larry Miller:** Mr. Speaker, there is always so much "gravy", as we like to call it, in government.

In our term, over the last seven years, this government has eliminated or decreased 150 taxes. I do not know whether the member is trying to imply that because it may be tough to find the money to enforce this, we should let bribery go on. I do not believe that is the way we should deal with it, and neither does this government.

Mr. Alex Atamanenko (British Columbia Southern Interior, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am splitting my time with the member for La Pointe-de-l'Île.

It is always a pleasure to be in a full house. Everyone has flocked to the House of Commons to hear my speech tonight.

This bill is a start. Obviously, New Democrats recommend that the bill go to committee so it can be analyzed, witnesses can be brought in, some of the points ironed out, and hopefully make the bill stronger.

There are four main changes to the Corruption of Foreign Public Officials Act contained in the bill. It increases the maximum sentence of imprisonment applicable to the offence of bribing a foreign public official from 5 to 14 years. It eliminates the exception for so-called facilitation payments where a foreign official is paid to expedite the execution of his or her responsibilities. It creates a new offence for falsifying or concealing books or records in order to conceal bribery of a foreign official. It establishes a national jurisdiction that would apply to all of the offences under the act, such that Canadian nationals could be prosecuted for offences committed overseas.

One of the issues the committee might want to look at is how this would affect various groups and NGOs overseas that are trying to function in a country in which corruption is everywhere. We have seen films in which people are trying to advance through checkpoints and through no fault of their own, they have to pay bribes at illegal roadblocks or whatever, in order to deliver the aid. This bill would certainly tighten up the reaction to that corruption. I am wondering how we would address that situation. Obviously, a strong message would have to be sent to the government of that particular country. I am sure the committee will be looking at that.

There are a couple of points I want to emphasize. One is that we have long supported clear rules requiring transparency and accountability by Canadian individuals and corporations overseas. This bill complements legislative efforts by NDP MPs to encourage responsible, sustainable, and transparent management practices. We acknowledge that the lack of enforcement in Canada with respect to bribery can be considered, to an extent, a national embarrassment.

#### Government Orders

We are pleased that the government is finally responding to this problem. It took a long time, but at least we are on the right track.

Most Canadians want our companies to be successful and responsible representatives of Canada. Canadian companies want clear and consistent standards for international business. In other words, why would we allow an official of a Canadian multinational to act differently in another country than we would allow here? That is what this bill is trying to enforce. We need to enforce loophole-free regulations that will create a level playing field for all companies while ensuring environmental, labour, and human rights protection of which we can all be proud in this country.

We have certain values and standards in this country when we deal with each other. We need to ensure that when we are doing business in other countries, we apply the same values and standards. That is one of the points this bill is driving at.

## • (1915)

## [Translation]

In a report released in 2011, Transparency International ranked Canada as the worst of all the G7 countries with respect to international bribery. I say this is disgraceful. The organization pointed out that Canada rarely, if ever, enforces its negligible anti-corruption legislation.

Since then, the government has started trying to address this national embarrassment. However, since 1999, there have only been three convictions, two of them in the past two years. When I read that, I was surprised. It seems that we should be in first place with regard to corruption and our fight against corruption.

By eliminating the facilitation payments exception, the bill will bring Canada's practices in line with 36 of the 39 other OECD countries. That is a good idea.

However, while the rest of the bill comes into effect on royal assent, the rules on facilitation payments will come into effect at an unknown later date, as cabinet wishes.

I am wondering about this point and I hope we will discuss the bill's mechanism in more detail in committee.

In the United States, the rule on accounting records is already used in civil matters by the Securities and Exchange Commission. Canada has no equivalent regulatory authority, but there is a similar rule in criminal law.

I would also like to point out that the bill is of particular importance for the mining industry, where the NDP has been and is still an ardent defender of accountability. I can cite, for instance, Bill C-323 from the member for Burnaby—New Westminster, which seeks to permit people who are not Canadian citizens to initiate tort claims based on violations of international obligations in Canadian counts.

Furthermore, I can cite Bill C-486 from the member for Ottawa Centre, I think, which requires companies that use minerals from the Great Lakes Region of Africa to exercise due diligence.

The political elite that benefits from corruption, particularly in countries and industries where corruption is rife, is made up primarily of men, which is interesting. At the same time, it is primarily women who lack government protection.

We support this bill and we believe that it must be sent to committee to facilitate discussion, as I just mentioned.

The bill will amend the definition of the term "business" to include the non-profit organizations I mentioned earlier. At committee stage, members will have to study the impact of this provision on charitable organizations and humanitarian relief agencies, which can sometimes be required to make a payment to accelerate the provision of essential aid or to actually obtain aid, something that I also mentioned at the beginning of my speech.

The committee should also determine the impact of making these activities indictable offences that are subject to imprisonment of up to 14 years, because it is a threshold over which conditional discharges, absolute discharges and conditional sentences become impossible. Therefore, the committee really must determine whether 14 years of imprisonment is the right direction to take.

I am going to stop here, and I look forward to all the questions.

• (1920)

Mr. Jean Rousseau (Compton—Stanstead, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his speech.

Once again, why is this bill even necessary, given the large number of mining and oil and gas industries in Canada that are involved in operations abroad? Why did it take 14 years to introduce this legislation, and why is it coming from the Senate?

We want to support the bill so that it is referred to committee and can be discussed at greater length and in more detail, particularly with regard to changes such as generally accepted accounting principles.

Once again, why is this bill, which is essential to ensure fairness in that industry, coming from the Senate?

**Mr. Alex Atamanenko:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question.

In the seven years that I have been here, I have noticed that the large multinational corporations in Canada put a great deal of pressure on the various levels of government to avoid having any legislation, because it is not to their advantage. That is why I am pleased that there is finally a bill that really deals with this issue.

In Canada, we have always had rules, and we still do. Rules exist. Multinational corporations do not follow the rules willingly, but since these rules exist, they comply with them. Corporations in other countries do not have to follow rules, because there are none.

It is therefore up to us to impose rules on our corporations, so that they will comply with them.

**Mr. André Bellavance (Richmond—Arthabaska, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleague on his excellent speech.

I want to ask him whether he shares my view on this government's way of doing things. Personally, I do not quite share my colleague's optimism when he says that the government has taken some positive action. I think that the government is reacting rather than being proactive.

Let me explain. We are aware of the incident involving SNC-Lavalin in Libya. Three Alberta companies were also recently involved in wrongdoings or offences abroad. I think the government took a "marketing" approach, as it always does. That is how I describe its behaviour. In the end, the government reacts because the media has reported on these incidents. However, as my colleague so clearly explained, this is already well known, because Canadian mining and gas companies have done bad things and violated various laws.

Why did the government not react and, more importantly, why did it not take action sooner? Why did it wait until it no longer had any choice because the media had a hold of certain stories?

I would like to hear the hon. member's comments on this issue.

(1925)

**Mr. Alex Atamanenko:** Mr. Speaker, I greatly appreciated my colleague's question, and I very much enjoyed working with him on the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food in the good old days.

I think the member should put the question to the other side of the House. I do not understand the reason for this delayed response. In my opinion, this is not a proactive government. It takes action in response to scandals and pressures instead of taking an appropriate and fair moral stance to try to prevent the problems that arise in the world.

That is what a social democratic government would do.

Ms. Ève Péclet (La Pointe-de-l'Île, NDP): Mr. Speaker, once again, I feel a bit sick as I rise in the House to debate a bill that has come from the Senate.

I will echo my colleague's remarks by saying that the government has no reason to be proud of itself right now. It did not even act; it was the Senate that did so. If the Senate had not decided to introduce this bill, would the government have adopted measures such as these? I very much doubt it.

The bill comes from an unelected and undemocratic chamber, and, as we know, that chamber has been in the headlines in recent weeks as a result of corruption-related scandals. In my view, it is ironic to talk about corruption when the bill comes from the Senate. Some senators are currently under investigation by the RCMP, but that is another matter.

The bill stems from the report published by Transparency International, which ranked the Canadian mining and oil and gas industries second and third among sectors in which acts of corruption are most likely to be committed. This is rather important for a country such as Canada, which has between 75% and 80% of all global mining exploration and extraction companies. If that industry ranks second or third for acts of corruption, and Canada has approximately 80% of all those companies, that means the bill is crucial for Canada.

Canada has more extraction companies than any other country in the world. It often makes the headlines as a result of acts of corruption, human rights violations and breaches of environmental standards. Consequently, I think it is essential for us to take action. I am pleased to rise in the House to say that the NDP will support the bill so that it is referred to committee.

It is important to note that, in its report, Transparency International ranked Canada last among the G7 countries in combating corruption. It is important to say that. The government needs to realize that it is time to take action. Since 1999, there have been only three convictions under acts passed to combat corruption. It is true that the legislation was in force, but it was barely complied with and barely enforced. This bill is therefore extremely important. It is time for the government to open its eyes and do something to combat corruption.

The Conservatives themselves have fallen victim to scandals, and it is time to act. If they want to show their good faith, let them act today.

The NDP has always supported corporate social responsibility. For example, my colleague from Burnaby—New Westminster introduced Bill C-323, which would permit persons who are not Canadian citizens to initiate tort claims based on violations of Canada's international obligations. My colleague from Ottawa Centre also introduced Bill C-486, which requires companies using minerals originating in the Great Lakes Region of Africa, a highly unstable region that has suffered many conflicts, to exercise due diligence and comply with OECD standards respecting conflict minerals.

The bill will support all the New Democratic Party's initiatives to ensure that Canada's private and public sector representatives comply with Canadian legislation. The criteria that Canada is required to meet must also be met by Canada's international representatives.

## **•** (1930)

Consider, for example, the recent events in Bangladesh, where the death toll is unfortunately rising every day and now stands at more than 1,000. That event has shed light on the problems of businesses operating internationally, whether they come from Canada or any other country. Deficiencies in the enforcement of anti-corruption legislation in Canada are extremely numerous. Non-governmental organizations single us out in reports and criticize our international activities, and I hope that all members of Parliament are as embarrassed about that as I am.

As I know from speaking to many of them, Canadians want our businesses to represent Canada in a respectable, transparent and responsible manner and to have clear, coherent international business

## Government Orders

standards. It is important for Parliament to let those companies do business but also to provide them with a clear, coherent framework so they know what to expect when they do business internationally.

Enforcing loophole-free regulations will therefore level the playing field for all companies, while protecting the environment, employment and human rights, something that we can be proud of. For example, the bill will bring Canada's rules and criteria in line with those of 36 of the 39 OECD member countries. It was time that happened. Our standards and practices had not been consistent with those of the majority of OECD member countries since 1999. This bill will help harmonize regulations.

However, the payment rules will come into force only when cabinet wishes. This part of the bill should come in for particular scrutiny when examined in committee. Cabinet should not be responsible for deciding when an act comes into force. If this bill is passed by Parliament, it should come into force immediately.

Environmental and labour standards, for example, are not always effective in developing countries. They often vary with the freedom of expression and demands of the local populations. It is therefore difficult for populations to call for government accountability when revenues are low. If we as Canadians want to invest in other countries, we must set an example. Accountability is important.

Canada's international leadership is vastly undermined by all the Canadian companies involved in corruption scandals. I could name several in South America, Asia and Papua New Guinea. It is time to take action and restore Canada's international image.

The addition of a national jurisdiction based on the nationality of businesses is also very important. This standard is recognized in international law. Businesses that have their headquarters and operations in a country are considered as having the nationality of that country. This therefore obviates the need for investigators to establish connections or find evidence of the offence committed in Canada. An offence may have been committed entirely outside the country, hence the importance of creating this nationality jurisdiction, which will enable investigators to bring people who commit crimes to justice.

It is therefore very important for Canada to ensure that Canadian businesses abide by international standards and respect human rights and that they not be corrupt.

I look forward to my colleagues' questions.

(1935)

**Mr. Jean Rousseau (Compton—Stanstead, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague, the hon. member for La Pointe-de-l'Île, on her excellent speech.

To me, one thing is missing from this bill that could become law in the future. When we talk about corruption, we are also talking about working conditions. For example, we can talk about attracting businesses here by promising the working conditions we have in Canada, by telling these people that they can do what they want, that it is no problem, that enough workers are available and they can go ahead with their plans.

The hon. member spoke very eloquently about human rights, but there is also the matter of labour rights. There is a great deal of corruption. This may need to be defined. Nonetheless, this corruption might exist when we are attracting businesses. Canadian businesses that represent Canada abroad accept working conditions that would never be tolerated in Canada.

I think that allowing businesses to exploit a situation outside the country under the Canadian banner and under lesser working conditions constitutes corruption, and it would be unacceptable here.

Ms. Ève Péclet: Mr. Speaker, I will try to answer my colleague's question.

I would say that it is important to distinguish between the violation of international standards and corruption, which is also a violation of international standards. No country will say that corruption is legal.

However, it is important to know that Canadian companies try to have clear and coherent standards. The government is wrong when it claims that these companies are more likely to comply with Canadian standards because they are abroad.

On the contrary, creating nationality jurisdiction is key. A Canadian company that has its assets in Canada is subject to Canadian law even if it operates in another country.

For example, I am a Canadian citizen, but that does not mean that I will no longer be subject to Canadian laws when in another country. In fact, the definition of a number of crimes has been changed in the Criminal Code in order to ensure that people who commit crimes abroad can be found guilty in Canada.

Therefore, it is very important to ensure that Canadian companies respect human rights, no matter where in the world they operate.

Mr. Jonathan Tremblay (Montmorency—Charlevoix—Haute-Côte-Nord, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I believe that with this bill the government is trying to capitalize on events in the news without really thinking about what should be done to remedy the situation.

Remedying a situation requires human and financial resources. However, the government is making cuts in all areas that deal with corruption.

How can this government achieve excellent outcomes if it is making cuts everywhere? I am thinking of the Canada Revenue Agency, for example.

• (1940)

Ms. Ève Péclet: Mr. Speaker, we have put our finger on another problem.

As I said in my speech on witness protection, the government has passed legislation in Parliament, and that makes sense, since that is why members are elected and serve in Parliament. The Conservatives passed a bill so they could look good, which is their trademark, but this legislation has to be implemented.

I think the Conservatives may have partly forgotten the role of government. Indeed, its role is to pass bills. However, it is also to provide resources for the stakeholders on the ground and to implement these bills.

As I said, it is all well and good to pass a bill that will ensure that corruption is punished more severely, but the people on the ground still have to get the resources they need to ensure that criminals are prosecuted and convicted for their crimes.

[English]

**Mr. Dave Van Kesteren (Chatham-Kent—Essex, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the Minister of International Cooperation.

It is my pleasure to rise this evening to participate in the debate on the fighting foreign corruption act. In my view, Bill S-14 is signature legislation. Since its introduction on February 5, the proposed changes have given Canada good marks both from domestic stakeholders and from the OECD working group on bribery.

These positive comments from groups such as Transparency International were given with the strong caveat that proposed amendments be adopted. Canada has invested a lot of credibility in getting this bill tabled, and we are to report back to the OECD in the near future regarding its adoption.

As others have stated before me, the issue of foreign corruption is as timely as it has ever been, and our government remains committed to seeing this legislation enacted as quickly as possible. It is my hope that this commitment is shared by all opposition parties and members of the House.

The OECD has just published on its website the report that Canada submitted to the organization's working group on bribery, as well as the working group's own summary and conclusion. As part of the OECD's peer review mechanism, Canada was called upon to submit a written report detailing the progress it has made over the past two years in responding to all of the recommendations and follow-up points previously identified by the working group on bribery.

The written report details the significant progress made by Canada in terms of investigations and prosecutions of the foreign bribery offence; the awareness-raising efforts undertaken by numerous government officials, agencies and crown corporations; and the amendments to Canada's foreign bribery legislation, the corruption of foreign public officials act, or CFPOA.

The lead examiners for Canada's evaluation stated that they were extremely impressed with our results. They indicated that Canada should be very proud of what it has achieved in such a short period of time. They also signalled their strong support for Bill S-14, stating that should this bill be adopted by Parliament, Canada would be deemed to have fully implemented most of the significant recommendations made to it by the working group on bribery.

The working group on bribery also concluded that as it stands, Canada has already fully implemented nine out of the total of 18 recommendations and subrecommendations, including those that touched on resources for foreign bribery prosecutions and investigations, awareness-raising, building relationships with provincial securities commissions and due diligence in government contracting. In addition, five of the 18 recommendations were deemed to be partially implemented. Another three of the 18 recommendations were held to be not implemented, but will be fully implemented if and when Bill S-14 is adopted by Parliament.

This is positive reinforcement. Members can rest assured that it only strengthens our desire to see Bill S-14 passed as quickly as possible.

I would now like to provide a brief summary of some of the key conclusions made by the OECD's working group on bribery.

The first relates to a recommendation that Canada amend the offence of bribing a foreign public official in the CFPOA so that it is clear that it applies to bribery in the conduct of all international business, not just business for profit. The elimination of the words "for profit" from the definition of "business" is vitally important, as it would ensure that the CFPOA is not limited to bribes paid to forprofit enterprises or just in the course of business that is currently profitable. I am pleased to report that this recommendation would be considered fully implemented if Bill S-14 is passed in its current state within one year of tabling.

A second recommendation requested that Canada take appropriate measures to automatically apply, on conviction for a CFPOA violation, the removal of the capacity to contract with a government or receive any benefit under such a contract, consistent with the domestic bribery offence in the Criminal Code. This was assessed to be fully implemented as a result of the change in policy in 2012 by Public Works and Government Services Canada.

**●** (1945)

The third recommendation urged Canada to take such measures as may be necessary to prosecute its nationals for bribery of foreign public officials committed abroad. I am pleased to report that with the nationality jurisdiction clause included in Bill S-14, this would be considered fully implemented once the bill has passed in its current state and within one year of tabling.

The last recommendation I wish to mention specifically calls on Canada to find an appropriate and effective means for making companies aware of the CFPOA, including the defence for reasonable expenses incurred in good faith and the defence of facilitation payments.

It also calls on Canada to increase efforts to raise awareness of the CFPOA in industries at high risk for bribing foreign public officials and individuals and companies operating in countries where there is a high risk of bribe solicitations, as well as municipal and provincial law enforcement authorities. This was assessed to be fully implemented.

Should members choose to read the report and the OECD findings on their website, I think they would be delighted to hear some of its conclusions. Here is a sample:

Canada has continued the enforcement momentum...Canada now has two additional and major convictions against companies in the oil and gas sector under its Corruption of Foreign Publics Officials Act.

The WGB also welcomes significant steps taken by Canada to improve the CFPOA and address three main Phase 3 recommendations through Bill S-14....Bill S-14 also repeals the exception in the CFPOA for facilitation payments...Canada has therefore now fully implemented Recommendation 6.

A number of federal departments, agencies and crown corporations play key roles in Canada's two-pronged approach to foreign bribery: that of enforcement and prevention. Bill S-14 reflects what

#### Government Orders

we believe is the will of Canadians and of Canadian businesses and stakeholders.

In considering the OECD's recommendations and in preparing our response to them, the government consulted widely, including a January 2012 session hosted by the Department of Foreign and International Trade. At that time, over 30 expert stakeholders from Canadian businesses, law firms, academic institutions and non-governmental organizations participated.

It provided an opportunity for full discussion on concrete steps that would be taken to improve the enforcement of the CFPOA as well as an opportunity to further encourage Canadian companies to prevent bribery before it happened and to detect it if it occurred.

We are pleased with the WGB strong positive endorsement of the significant progress made by Canada on investigations and prosecutions of the foreign bribery offence, the awareness raising efforts undertaken by numerous government departments and on the proposed amendments to CFPOA in Bill S-14.

As the Minister of Foreign Affairs stated on the day Bill S-14 was introduced:

Canada is a trading nation. Our economy and future prosperity depend upon expanding our trade ties with the world. This, we hope, is a good faith sign that Canada's good name retains its currency.

In conclusion, failing to adopt Bill S-14 would send the wrong signal about Canada and Canadian companies. For this reason, I urge all members to support this important legislation.

**●** (1950)

Mr. Philip Toone (Gaspésie—Îles-de-la-Madeleine, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my colleague's presentation was fairly elaborate and had a lot of interesting points.

We note that in the bill we redefine business. That is probably a good idea. It will be clear now what constitutes a business and what the bill would actually be addressing, what form of business. However, it does lead the question of, and the member had mentioned it in his presentation, facilitation payments.

How will we ensure that any non-profits especially, any Canadian company really, but especially non-profits will not have to unduly pay consequences for the fact that they had to pay facilitation payments?

Mr. Dave Van Kesteren: Mr. Speaker, first, we need to talk about what a facilitation payment is. I guess we would call it a "grease payment". It is a payment made for something that should be given, regardless. In other words, if a government official is supposed to give, or provide for a mining company, a report before it can begin its business, it is maybe a little bit of a grease payment. It gets the guy working a little bit faster, gets that thing happening quicker and gets them a little up on the competition.

We have added to this bill the provision that that would become illegal. In the past bill, there was a provision for that sort of thing; it was for something that was not business related, just part of the regular goings on. That will no longer be the case.

However, we will give them an opportunity to implement this. I believe there is a period of a year's time for that to take place. Once that takes place, this, too, will become part of the Criminal Code and will no longer be acceptable.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is important that we recognize that whether it is bribery, kickbacks or corruption, it does occur. A very small percentage of Canadian companies cause issues related to that whole area.

We have seen attempts in the past. I made reference to my colleague's attempt through the sunshine bill and other efforts to try to deal with this so that Canada could be playing a much stronger role, as opposed to following the lead of other nations. There is a high expectation for Canada to have a legislative process.

My question is for the member. To what degree is the government prepared to entertain amendments that would give this legislation more teeth and which would ultimately have it receive wider support outside of Canadian borders?

**Mr. Dave Van Kesteren:** Mr. Speaker, there are six amendments that will take place and will enhance the current legislation, the CFPOA.

This is a progressive movement. It is something the OECD has recommended for all nations. Canada is a leader, and Canada will continue to be a leader as we move forward and implement more changes. As Canadians, we will always be proud of business conducted outside the countries. Our companies will also be able to benefit from that gain, as well as the nations they conduct their business in.

• (1955)

Mr. Greg Rickford (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development, for the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency and for the Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it sounds like Canada is on the right track.

Given our international reputation in these regards, does the member not think that some of this fighting corruption starts right here at home? More pointedly, does the member believe that the Leader of the Opposition, who has had some knowledge of corruption for more than 17 years and has not come clean with Canadians, might be a starting point in a discussion?

**Mr. Dave Van Kesteren:** Mr. Speaker, we conclude from this piece of legislation that it is wrong to use bribes. It is wrong to offer bribes and to accept bribes. The biggest reason is that the rule of law is foundational upon any community, government, organization to move forward. If we do not have those basic principles, that makes it impossible. We encourage that abroad, but of course we also encourage that as much here at home, too.

Hon. Julian Fantino (Minister of International Cooperation, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to participate in the debate on Bill S-14, the fighting foreign corruption act.

This legislation highlights our government's intent to take further steps to combat corruption and bribery. The amendments included in Bill S-14 would ensure that Canadian companies continue to act in good faith in the pursuit of freer markets and expanded global trade.

Introduced in the other place on February 5, I am pleased that the legislation is moving quickly. It is my hope, as I am sure it is the hope of most reasonable people, that it will make its way through the chamber as expediently as possible and soon thereafter be enacted. I hope that members will agree that the fighting foreign corruption act sends a strong signal that corruption is not the Canadian way of doing business and highlights our own expectations that other countries follow suit.

Bill S-14 makes a number of amendments to the Corruption of Foreign Public Officials Act, which has been in force since 1999. Canada passed that act to implement our international obligations under the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, or OECD, Anti-Bribery Convention, and two more anticorruption conventions passed by the Organization of American States and the United Nations.

Canada has long been committed to the OECD Anti-Bribery Convention and the efforts of, in particular, the OECD working group on bribery. In fact, in February, Canada submitted to the secretariat our follow-up report on the implementation of the convention. We are also required to report annually to both houses of Parliament. The issue that we want to stress is that we are committed to continuing to remain open and transparent in communicating our government's actions in fighting foreign corruption.

Despite our commitment to this issue, over the last number of years, international anti-corruption bodies and Canadian stakeholders have urged us to strengthen our laws. The OECD working group on bribery issued a report in March 2011 that raised specific concerns with regard to the strength of Canada's current legislation. As I have previously stated, we were pleased to submit a report to them earlier this year highlighting Bill S-14, which shows distinct progress.

Another important stakeholder in the fight against corruption is Transparency International, which also recently came forward to make the case that Canada could do more. I am pleased to tell the House that, following the introduction of Bill S-14, Janet Keeping, chair and president of Transparency International, said that Transparency International Canada was delighted that the federal government is moving to strengthen the Corruption of Foreign Public Officials Act in accordance with Canada's international obligations, and encourages the government to ensure that the RCMP have the resources necessary to enforce the particular act effectively. She also said that legal changes of the kind proposed are only as good as the government's commitment to making the law meaningful on the ground.

Canada's former Foreign Affairs minister, John Manley, also complimented these recent steps. He said that good corporate citizenship at home and abroad is essential to Canada's economic success, and that these latest measures aimed at eliminating corruption and bribery would strengthen Canada's already strong reputation for good governance and ethical business practices.

For those unfamiliar with the act, the CFPOA makes it a crime in Canada to bribe a foreign public official to gain a business advantage abroad. It is a comprehensive step against the corruption of foreign officials, especially when read in conjunction with existing offences in the Canadian Criminal Code.

#### • (2000)

It makes it possible to prosecute, say, a conspiracy to commit or an attempt to commit such a bribery. It covers aiding and abetting the commission of bribery, an intention in common to commit bribery, and counselling others to commit bribery. Laundering property and the proceeds of crime, including the proceeds of bribery offences, as well as the possession of property and proceeds, are already offences under the Criminal Code. The new offences being created in the CFPOA will also be captured by these Criminal Code provisions once they are in force.

Bill S-14 proposes to make six amendments to the corruption of foreign public officials act.

First, there is the introduction of a nationality jurisdiction which allows Canada to prosecute foreign bribery by Canadians or Canadian companies based on their nationality and regardless of where the bribery takes place in the world. Currently we can only do so after proving a real and substantial link between the offence and Canadian territory.

The second amendment would specify which authority can lay charges under the act. In this case, the RCMP would be the entity. In 2008, the RCMP international anti-corruption unit was established, which is dedicated to raising awareness about and enforcing the CFPOA. Currently this act does not place a limit on who is able to lay charges, but this amendment will ensure that a uniform approach is taken across the country. It highlights our government's faith in the work of the unit, and it sends a strong signal to Canadian businesses that they should contact the RCMP if they have a problem with foreign bribery.

The third amendment being proposed by Bill S-14 seeks to clarify the scope of the act by eliminating the words "for profit" from the definition of business. This would ensure that the CFPOA is not limited to bribes paid by for-profit enterprise or just in the course of business which is currently profitable.

Under Bill S-14, we are also proposing to increase the maximum penalty under the act to a maximum jail term of 14 years. The foreign bribery offence under this act is currently punishable by a maximum of five years' imprisonment and unlimited fines. The possibility of unlimited fines will remain as is.

In developing these amendments, our government was well aware of the implications they would have for Canadian businesses operating abroad. The global economy is still in a fragile state, and the number one priority for our government is securing jobs, growth and long-term prosperity for Canadians and Canadian businesses.

#### Government Orders

That is why in January 2012, the Department of Foreign Affairs undertook consultation in the form of a workshop on new ideas for Canada's fight against foreign bribery. Over 30 stakeholders, as my hon. friend alluded to earlier, participated in this event, and these were from businesses, academia, non-government agencies and various other governmental departments.

At that time, Canadian stakeholders unanimously supported increasing penalties under the act to deter Canadian companies from engaging in foreign bribery. For this reason, and as I have already stated, Bill S-14 proposes to increase the maximum jail time from a maximum of five years' imprisonment and unlimited fines to a maximum of 14 years' imprisonment and unlimited fines.

The fifth amendment included in the fighting foreign corruption act creates a new "books and record" offence. Although there are already offences under the Criminal Code that criminalize falsification of books and records, they are not specific to foreign bribery. The penalties are stated.

The last item, and perhaps most significant amendment being proposed by Bill S-14 would eliminate the so-called "facilitation payments" exception under the CFPOA. Currently the CFPOA states that payments made to expedite or secure the performance by a foreign public official of any act of a routine nature do not constitute bribes for the purposes of the CFPOA.

I hope we all will see the merit and worth in this leadership role that Canada has taken in fighting corruption at home and abroad.

• (2005)

[Translation]

Mr. Philip Toone (Gaspésie—Îles-de-la-Madeleine, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the minister for his speech.

Based on how he presented the bill, it is clear that we should support it so that it can be referred to committee and debated further. It deserves our attention and support, at least at second reading.

[English]

The member mentioned that the bill would send a signal that wrongdoing should be denounced, that people who witnessed wrongdoing should report it to the RCMP.

Would the bill also an effect on our ministries here in Canada when exaggerated payments are being brought to the fore? For example, Public Works was looking into buying a couple of arctic explorers. We are not even going to get the ships, we are just going to get the design, for \$100 million. Other countries, such as Norway, got two ships for the same price. Then, for example, the F-35s, where we would be paying \$38 billion for planes that would not even work in our Arctic.

Would the bill have any impact on the government's incredible waste and, quite frankly, questionable tactics?

**Hon. Julian Fantino:** Mr. Speaker, the member has convoluted a whole bunch of issues into what appears to be somewhat of a displeasure with the attempt, the content and the intent of the bill. We are not talking about legitimate business deals, whether we like them or not. We are talking about corrupt practices.

I would caution the member that he needs to do his homework with respect to the F-35 file or any other purchases that the Canadian military is making in the context of good business practices. This is not about that. This is about corrupt practices. Your own leader should be answering to this kind of issue.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): I would remind hon. members to address their comments to the Chair rather than their colleagues.

The hon. member for Richmond—Arthabaska.

[Translation]

Mr. André Bellavance (Richmond—Arthabaska, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the minister has read us the contents of the bill.

It does indeed contain some measures that would be very important to the police.

However, he has not told us what is not in the bill. In view of his former occupation, he could certainly argue that there are changes to be made, particularly with respect to the resources available to the police. That would be a very important change. Everyone agrees that anti-corruption legislation is needed. We will therefore refer the bill to committee, where we hope to be able to make some changes to improve it.

The police need adequate and effective resources. They are not incompetent, but they often do not have the resources they need. I think that the minister is in a good position to pressure cabinet on this point.

[English]

**Hon. Julian Fantino:** Mr. Speaker, obviously, a lot of this work is labour-intensive and, no doubt, we are looking at some international aspects to this particular piece of legislation or the enforcement of same.

No doubt, resources will be required. I am confident that with the passage of this legislation there would be the capacity and the ability within the RCMP, which has been mandated to deal with this issue, to enable the legislation to truly have a deterrent effect on those who are intent on this kind of activity and to ensure that those who do engage in it pay the appropriate price to society.

• (2010)

Mrs. Joy Smith (Kildonan—St. Paul, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the minister for this very important bill on corruption. Just listening to the comments here in the House, I know this minister has a lot of experience on the justice side and a lot of expertise in this area.

Based upon some of the comments I have heard, I would like the minister to comment on an example of what corruption would be. I think this is very important because I think members opposite are confused about what real corruption is.

**Hon. Julian Fantino:** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for her insightful and, no doubt, very focused question on the issue.

Very simply stated, I think it is along the lines of what of our Prime Minister was alluding to today, with respect to the leader of the NDP, who apparently was the recipient of an offer of a bribe. Those issues are the kinds of things that we are talking about.

A diversion from ethical, honourable, legal activity, causing people to do something that otherwise would be illegal, improper and certainly against the laws of the land, would be very clearly an illegal activity under this bill, as well.

**Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with my hon. colleague from LaSalle—Émard.

I am pleased to speak to Bill S-14, An Act to amend the Corruption of Foreign Public Officials Act.

In looking at this bill, and given the record of the government, I find myself yearning to have a companion bill introduced in the House that would be entitled, "an act to amend the corruption of domestic public officials act". There is a whole host of things we could be dealing with.

In terms of domestic corruption, we could be trying to deal with \$90,000 payments to senators made by officials in the Prime Minister's Office allegedly to cover up illegal activity. We could be investigating Canadian senators fraudulently claiming housing and living expenses. We could be looking into people like Arthur Porter, another Conservative and a former appointment made by the Prime Minister to the CSIS oversight board, who apparently helped himself to millions of taxpayer dollars in Montreal and fled to South America. We could be looking into Conservative candidates like Peter Penashue, who spent over the election limits and effectively bought his seat by cheating. We could be looking into robocalls where the Conservative database was used to commit election fraud. Then we watched the Conservative Party try to obscure things and fight against any attempt to bring transparency into that procedure.

There is domestic corruption of public officials galore with the Conservative government. I look forward to the government introducing a bill that would attack corruption and finally clean up politics in this House for Canadians, but unfortunately, that is not the bill before us. We are dealing with foreign public officials.

The NDP, being a party that stands for ethics and transparency in Canadian politics, is proud to support this bill for referral to committee.

This bill makes four main changes to the Corruption of Foreign Public Officials Act. First, it increases the maximum sentence of imprisonment applicable to the offence of bribing a foreign public official from 5 to 14 years. Second, it eliminates an exception for so-called facilitation payments—there is a euphemism if I have ever seen one—where a foreign official is paid to expedite the execution of their responsibilities. The government calls it a facilitation payment, but I call it a bribe. Third, the bill creates a new offence for falsifying or concealing books or records in order to bribe or conceal bribery of a foreign official. Fourth, it establishes a nationality jurisdiction that would apply to all of the offences under the act, such that Canadian nationals could be prosecuted for offences committed overseas.

Again, New Democrats have long supported clear rules requiring transparency and accountability by Canadian individuals and corporations overseas, which usually have been opposed by the Conservatives, unfortunately. This bill complements legislative efforts by New Democrat MPs to encourage responsible, sustainable, and transparent management practices.

**•** (2015)

[Translation]

In Canada, our inability to enforce anti-corruption laws is a source of embarrassment to the country. We are pleased that the government is finally looking into these problems, but it is deplorable that it has taken so much time and that Canada had to be condemned and discredited before the government took any action.

[English]

Canadians want Canadian companies to be successful and responsible representatives of Canada. We want Canadian companies to have clear and consistent standards for international business. Enforced loophole-free regulations would create a level playing field for all companies while ensuring environmental, labour and human rights protection of which we all can be proud.

In a 2011 report, Transparency International ranked Canada as the worst of all G7 countries with regarding to international bribery, with "little or no enforcement" of the scant legislation that exists. Since then the government has been responding to this national embarrassment. However, there have only been three convictions since 1999, two of which were in the last two years. I would like the government to get tough on corruption. When there have been only three convictions since 1999, that is hardly being tough.

By repealing the facilitations exception, this bill would bring Canada into line with the practices in 36 of 39 other OECD countries. However, while the rest of the bill would come into effect at royal assent, the rules on facilitation payments would take effect at an unknown future date at the will of cabinet.

The books and records rule is already being enforced in the United States at the civil level by the Securities and Exchange Commission, but Canada has no equivalent regulator. While criminal law achieves the same effect, we should be increasing our efforts in this regard.

This bill is particularly relevant to the extractive industry, where the NDP has been and remains the strongest advocate for accountability in the House. Examples include my hon. colleague

#### Government Orders

from Burnaby—New Westminster's Bill C-323 as it then was, which would allow lawsuits in Canadian courts by non-Canadians for violations of international obligations; and my colleague from Ottawa Centre's Bill C-486, requiring public due diligence by companies using minerals from the Great Lakes Region of Africa.

I point out that the mining bill was opposed by the Conservative government and 13 Liberals failed to show up for the vote, which led to the narrow defeat of that bill by six votes. Again, Canadians can only count on the New Democrats to bring corporate social responsibility of Canadian mining companies into international normative standards in the House.

[Translation]

The political elites that profit from corruption, particularly in those countries and sectors where corruption is most problematic, consist mainly of men. At the same time, it is primarily women who lack government protection.

[English]

While we support the bill for referral to committee, we do have some concerns. It would amend the definition of a "business" to include not-for-profit organizations. The New Democrats believe this clause should be carefully studied at committee, in relation to its impact on charitable and aid organizations, which may, in the world we live in, have to make occasional payments in order to expedite or achieve delivery of essential assistance. We must take great care around that.

The committee should also study the consequences of establishing an indictable offence, punishable by up to 14 years in prison, as this is the threshold at which conditional or absolute discharges or conditional sentences become impossible.

Finally, the committee should study whether the rule on facilitation payment should take effect at the whim of cabinet, as is in the current text of the bill, rather than when ordered by Parliament.

Here are some key facts and figures to consider.

There have been three convictions, as I have mentioned, under Canada's foreign bribery law since it took effect in 1999: Hydro Kleen Group was fined \$25,000 in 2005 for bribing a U.S. immigration officer at the Calgary airport; Niko Resources was fined \$9.5 million in June 2011 because its subsidiary in Bangladesh paid for a vehicle and travel expenses for the former Blangladeshi state minister for energy and mineral resources; and, Griffiths Energy International was fined \$10 million in January of this year, after it agreed to pay \$2 million to the wife of Chad's ambassador to Canada and allowed her and two others to buy shares at discounted prices in exchange for supporting an oil and gas project in Chad.

We all are watching the newspapers as we see the difficulties that SNC-Lavalin has got itself into in terms of allegedly paying bribes to foreign officials to secure contracts abroad, in the millions of dollars.

The Transparency International Bribe Payers Index in 2011 ranked the oil and gas and mining industries as the fourth and fifth most likely sectors to issue bribes. This should be of great concern to Canadians because Canada is a world centre for mining and oil and gas industries and companies. These companies, among all sectors as stakeholders, should want to establish very clean, high-level regulations and rules regarding acceptable corporate conduct. Moreover, the mining and oil and gas industries are the second and third most likely to engage in grand bribery targeting of high-ranking officials and politicians. This makes a bill like Bill S-14 especially important in these sectors.

#### **●** (2020)

## [Translation]

The fact that the government does not enforce the anti-corruption laws is a national shame. We are pleased that it is finally paying attention to these problems. It is nevertheless deplorable that it has taken so much time, and that Canada had to be condemned and discredited before the government took any action.

### [English]

For business, for the environment and labour and for Canada's international reputation, we urge that this bill go through Parliament and I urge the Conservatives to make the amendments necessary to get the support of all parties in the House.

## [Translation]

Ms. Hélène LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard, NDP): Mr.Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for his speech and work as the NDP's international trade critic.

It has become increasingly important for all companies, wherever they may be in the world, be it in Canada or abroad, to respect the social contract.

They have a responsibility to respect the communities where they set up business. I would like the member to elaborate on this issue.

I would like him to say more about the matter.

## [English]

**Mr. Don Davies:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this moment to thank my hon. colleague from LaSalle—Émard for the fine work that she does in the House and for her contributions to the debate, which are always of very high quality and perceptive.

What the question really raises is the fact that in an increasingly interconnected global world, what Canadian companies do abroad matters. It has always mattered, but never has it been so fundamentally important to Canada's reputation on the world stage that our corporations act above reproach, that we set a standard on the world stage for conducting business in a legal and ethical manner. It is only by doing that, by showing an example here in the Canadian Parliament, by requiring high standards for Canadian corporations acting abroad, that we can legitimately urge other countries to carry the same standards in their jurisdictions as well.

What we all want in the House is for the standards of ethics and legality to improve in Canada and around the world. I think we can start by passing laws like this and by putting some teeth into these laws as well.

Mr. Greg Rickford (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development, for the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency and for the Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the member's speech. We have had versions of this debate in a previous session, when a private member's bill was brought forward around corporate social responsibility with a particular emphasis on the mining companies. I know the diminishing caucus of the New Democrats with respect to mining might explain why they are more focused on government intervention.

When I attended the PDAC conference this year or the year prior there was a lot of excitement about e3 Plus, a program that inspires and sets out a framework for the corporations, particularly mining and energy companies, to act responsibly when abroad, and sets the balance to keep corporate operations here in Canada, particularly for our mining companies.

I was wondering if the member could comment on what his proposals might be or what his thoughts are on letting the industry do some self-regulation when it comes to corporate social responsibility, rather than this paternalistic kind of approach that he is advocating.

## **●** (2025)

**Mr. Don Davies:** Mr. Speaker, what I see diminishing in the House is the integrity and credibility of the Conservative government over the last two months. All Canadians just have to open up a newspaper to see that.

I do not know what the member is talking about. We have members on this side of the House, such as the hon. member for Nickel Belt, who were miners. We have people on this side of the House, such as the hon. member for Acadie—Bathurst, who worked in the mines of this country. We do not take any lessons from the Conservatives about experience or what is healthy for the mining industry.

What is important is that corporate social responsibility is an issue. Right now we have a serious investment by a Canadian mining company in Chile, which has been halted by the Chilean courts, the Pascua-Lama mine, because of environmental degradation and violations of Chilean law. We just heard from a Greek delegation about a Canadian company's mining operations in northern Greece, which are causing great concern.

It is time that we recognize that Canadian mining companies play a very important role in our economy. However, they benefit from having strong laws and ethics applied to them too, and the whole world would also benefit from watching Canada expect more from our corporations. It is good for business, it is good for Canadians and it is good for Canada's reputation.

#### [Translation]

Ms. Hélène LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard, NDP): Mr.Speaker, I rise this evening in the House to talk about Bill S-14, the Corruption of Foreign Public Officials Act.

I cannot ignore the fact that this bill has come from the Senate, where there is still a lot of commotion over ethics issues. It is, therefore, ironic that this bill, which deals with the corruption of foreign public officials, originated in the Senate.

As has been previously mentioned, the NDP will support the bill at second reading, because we think it is important. As industry critic, I believe that Canadian industries and companies operating abroad must focus on three pillars. The same could be said of companies operating here, in Canada. Reference is often made to economic development, which is often the only pillar on which development is based. Economic development is intended to be profitable, and good for the economy, period.

The two other pillars, which must form the basis for the development and establishment of industries or companies, seem neglected. One of these pillars is social responsibility. When an industry is developed, social responsibility must be a focus. It is imperative that there be the social guarantee to be able to open a business in a particular locality.

This is the case with many mining companies. However, other types of companies also establish themselves abroad and they must ensure, at the very least, that the surrounding communities have a stake in potential impacts, and that they be able to participate in the establishment of the business in question. They can do this by, for example, providing labour, however this labour must be paid, working conditions must be good, and health and occupational health and safety must be a concern.

In fact, there seem to be a large number of articles written on Canadian companies that have established themselves abroad, and also companies that outsource offshore, where there is no respect for working conditions, occupational health and safety, and a number of other factors.

We agree that under our current system, it is important for companies to be able to establish themselves and survive economically. However, we can no longer ignore this type of social responsibility, which must be taken into account. In other words, responsible working conditions must be provided.

## Government Orders

I shall now turn to the last pillar. The environment must also be respected. A business cannot set up just anywhere, nor can this be done in just any old fashion, without taking into consideration the impact on the environment. Also, this issue is often raised in articles around the world. Reference is made to Canadian companies, among others, that have set up businesses abroad and do not respect the environment. They justify their actions by saying that there is no environmental regulation, and that they will do business anywhere, and any way they see fit, yet it is absolutely crucial that measures be taken to protect the environment and, in doing so, protect the surrounding communities. All of this is part of a framework of responsibility that must be developed.

## • (2030)

Often, in order to set up business and circumvent these two principles of social and environmental responsibility, unfortunately, and regrettably, payments make it possible to break the rules that are enforced and put in place here. They are not enforced abroad.

As we have stated, when ethics rules, standards and laws are established, the same should be applied abroad. In fact, even more should be done when a business is established abroad because Canada's good name is at stake. We have an international reputation to uphold.

I think that Canadian industries and companies that set up business abroad are responsible corporate citizens. However, there have been, and still are, cases involving certain Canadian business people who have failed to demonstrate their sense of responsibility and ethics.

In my opinion, the bill will establish rules that everyone will have to follow. This goes without saying in a society such as ours, where law and order are respected. We also respect working conditions, human rights, and environmental laws. However, we are sometimes left wondering, especially when the Conservative government violates a number of environmental protections put in place over the years in order to protect the environment. We should ensure that businesses operating abroad continue to adopt our Canadian practices.

The New Democrats have always encouraged Canadian businesses abroad to be transparent and responsible. That is a top priority. In fact, Canadians generally want their businesses to represent Canada abroad in a more respectable and responsible way. Moreover, Canadian businesses want clear and consistent standards for international trade for Canadian businesses operating abroad. When cases of corruption are uncovered, it is these businesses' reputations that are tarnished.

As I already mentioned, the NDP will support the bill at second reading. We also want Canada to restore its reputation as a responsible corporate citizen and businesses operating abroad to focus on the three pillars that I mentioned: respect for human rights, working conditions, occupational health and safety, compliance with environmental standards, and consideration of the economic dimension. However, that dimension does not exist in isolation. It must be based on more than one pillar.

That is all the speaking time I had at my disposal. My time went by very quickly. I hope that I have covered the issue. I look forward to answering my colleagues' questions.

#### **•** (2035)

Mr. Jonathan Tremblay (Montmorency—Charlevoix—Haute-Côte-Nord, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have this lasting feeling that the bill is yet another attempt by the government to use current issues to score political points, without really thinking about what should be done to solve this problem.

It takes both human and financial resources to successfully fight corruption. With all the cuts at the CRA and in other federal programs, both at the international and national levels, how can we fix these problems with the bill if there is no additional human and financial resources?

**Ms. Hélène LeBlanc:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question, because this is an issue I did not have time to address.

I think we agree that the bill has very good intentions. The issue is how to take action. I think the hon. member has raised this point before. A large number of cuts were made. We wonder how this bill can be implemented, how we can ensure that there is more than the three convictions obtained since 1999.

A number of issues were reported in the media. They relate to things like the environment, working conditions and Canadian companies put on trial abroad.

How are we going to implement the bill when we know that this government has made major cuts to several agencies?

Ms. Paulina Ayala (Honoré-Mercier, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we are talking about corruption. However, we do not talk about the fact that Canadian companies are reported as being responsible for the persecution of unions in countries where they are doing business, and are even involved in criminal activities.

I wonder if my colleague could elaborate on this issue.

## **●** (2040)

Ms. Hélène LeBlanc: Mr. Speaker, as I said, corruption may involve paying public officials. However, there are other types of crime committed by companies such as, for example, not complying with labour standards or working conditions like those in Canada where health and safety standards are in place. There is also the violence against workers who must work in truly deplorable conditions.

I thank my colleague for raising this issue.

## [English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, while we do support this bill and its ultimate passage, we would love to be able to see the bill get even stronger in terms of the potential for amendments, whether by Liberal members of Parliament or NDP members of Parliament, or whether it is private members' bills on the order paper.

Is the idea of trying to enhance the legislation by amendment something the member would like to see the government accept? [Translation]

**Ms. Hélène LeBlanc:** Mr. Speaker, of course, we can always hope that, at some point, this government will want to improve the bills presented here, particularly when they are reviewed in committee, when experts are heard and when amendments are proposed. That is certainly our role.

I think the opposition has played it very well so far by presenting amendments precisely to improve the legislation. That is what we want, because we raised some issues during the debates here.

It is going to be very important to be able to propose amendments in committee to improve the bill. We strongly hope that the government will listen to reason, pass these amendments with enthusiasm and show an openness that it has not displayed so far.

**Ms. Paulina Ayala (Honoré-Mercier, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, we are very pleased that this bill was introduced, but it is disappointing that it came from the Senate.

Last year, other bills on the same topic were rejected. Now, a door has opened. This bill addresses corruption of foreign public officials. The NDP is in favour of clear rules requiring that Canadians and Canadian businesses abroad be accountable and responsible.

We will support this bill so that it can be sent to committee. However, there needs to be some ambition here. This bill is lacking many components that would implement basic standards to ensure that companies doing business overseas respect human rights and are congenial. Those standards would allow Canada to become a model country in doing business overseas.

During a Senate committee meeting on February 28, 2013, the Minister of Foreign Affairs said the following:

...our government's priority is encouraging jobs, growth and long-term prosperity...It is reflected in the need to position Canada as a reliable supplier of resources which emerging markets need to grow...

We need to position our country as a reliable resource. We need to be a model country, but there is still work to be done in that regard. I would like to talk about what is happening with certain Canadian countries abroad. I will just give a few examples.

We sometimes think that things are wonderful everywhere. We talk about corruption elsewhere without looking in our own back yard. For example, there are Canadian public servants who receive bribes. Turn on the television and you might be shocked to see what is happening here in Canada.

There have been some examples on television, on the CBC. For example, the RCMP investigated a Canadian mining company's activities in Mexico. The story did not end well. The people in the concerned area in Mexico did not want the Canadian mining company, Blackfire, to set up shop in Chiapas, and that resulted in criminal activity.

In March 2010, the coalition MiningWatch Canada informed the RCMP and provided proof that money had been paid to the mayor of Chicomuselo. However, nothing really came of it because the RCMP also needs the means to investigate. Bills are great, but it is hard if there is no money to implement them.

Finally, the Mexican spokesperson in this story was killed. No one knows who killed him, but he was a harsh critic of a Canadian company. The company was accused of killing him, but no one could prove it. It is odd that this man, who fought to defend his land and ensure that the mining company conducted its business properly, got himself killed. That gives us food for thought. Just go to Radio-Canada for the source.

As far as Guatemala is concerned, last year we welcomed a group of people who came to talk to us about the way Canadian companies operate in these countries. They were talking about the involvement of security staff from Canadian companies in recent acts of violence that could result in civil suits.

I am talking about Tahoe Resources, a Vancouver-based company. This company sets up in a region without consulting the people who live there, those who will have to live with the impact of its activities on the environment and the water they consume.

These Canadian companies are giving us a bad name because the people are not going to say it was the Canadian company's fault; they are going to blame Canadians. We have to be careful. Yes, it is a matter of corruption, but the problem is even broader than that. We have to be more ambitious and draft a bill to crack down on offending companies.

• (2045)

Tahoe Resources' project heightened the conflicts in the region. Civilian security officers came down on the community and hurt people, some seriously. We do not want that. We want good relations.

As members said earlier, our government's priority is to promote jobs, growth and long-term prosperity, but not by destroying our neighbouring countries. I have another example: the police search of SNC-Lavalin.

Nonetheless, I will close on a note of hope. Earlier, one of my colleagues was talking about Pascua-Lama in Chile. This is another Canadian company. The local people demonstrated for months, but the company kept operating. The same people went to court and won. The government had no choice. It had to put an end to the activities of the Canadian company. The company was unable to set up there because it had no consideration for the local people.

This brings me to another point. In Spanish we say that we must have *un acuerdo social*, *une licencia sociale*. We must get along socially. It is similar to a driver's licence, but it is social license. It means that these companies, except for the corruption issue, are very honest. That is what we hear. They must consult people and explain to them how their mining activities may affect their lives. Before doing anything, they must secure social license. Otherwise, this leads to conflicts in the country, and they do not want that.

We signed free trade agreements with these countries and we do not want to create problems there. We want wealth for both sides.

## Government Orders

In Chile, a court ruling forced one of the largest gold companies in Latin America, the Pascua-Lama mine, to stop all its activities. The Chilean justice felt that the project did not meet environmental standards. It is a good thing the country had some environmental standards. In the end, the company will not leave. It is now negotiating to resume its activities next year. That is great. We should not expect this to happen overnight.

This is a good bill and the NDP will support it, but we must go further. We must be more ambitious. Canada has an opportunity to be a role model. For a long time, the United States was always mentioned as a role model. If Canada creates jobs, if it establishes mines elsewhere, if it develops a policy with a minimum of social agreements that respect people's way of life—and not just the environment—it may become a role model, and other countries will open their doors to us. We will be proud of what we will be doing abroad.

The bill is particularly important for the mining industry, of which the NDP is a strong supporter. In the past, Bills C-323 and C-486 were not passed. The time has come to retrieve them and to read them. Then, perhaps members opposite will realize that we were not so wrong and that the NDP was right on target, because it was able to look a little further, instead of thinking only about the money going into the companies' pockets. Moreover, these companies often do not even pay taxes in the countries where they settle.

I invite all hon. members to be more ambitious and to dream of a country that can behave like a good big brother and be a role model. This is a start, but it is not the end. We must go further.

**●** (2050)

[English]

Mr. Colin Carrie (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to the speeches from the NDP, and I want to point out that every opportunity the NDP has to criticize Canadian companies, Canadian jobs and Canadian workers around the world, it seems to take those opportunities to put down Canadian companies, Canadian job opportunities and Canadian initiatives.

Throughout her speech, the member talked about examples. I am wondering if she is aware that as Canadian companies go around the world to different countries, quite often in these countries they actually have higher standards than the countries themselves. Our companies are working to increase the economic viability of the countries they are operating within. They are actually raising the level of economic development and wages in these countries. If Canadian companies do not do that, it is going to be companies from other countries that do it, and they may not have the absolutely high standards that we do.

As Canadians, we want to see our companies out there in the world. I would argue with her that we are leaders. We have some of the best companies in the world in development.

She has stated that the New Democrats would like to support this bill. I wonder if she could put forward the amendments they would be considering so we could have a look at them instead of having them dropped on us during committee. I would like to see how she would improve the bill because I think the bill is very good the way it is.

[Translation]

Ms. Paulina Ayala: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question.

In the past, some members of my party introduced bills on this subject, but they were not approved, which is a shame.

Canada does indeed have high standards, but these apply only when companies are based in Canada and not when they are based abroad, unfortunately.

I provided examples and mentioned that people had been killed, in addition to talking about conflicts. These examples have even been reported in the newspapers. In Chile, for example, the company acknowledged having lost the case, but indicated it would renew negotiations with the locals. Operations will therefore resume, but with some basic standards.

I therefore propose adding to the bill the fact of having a social agreement, consent among the locals at the site where the Canadian company will be operating. If there is consent, there is no problem. Alternatively, if there is no consent, violence will occur, and this is what should be avoided.

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to be fairly clear on the position of the Liberal Party of Canada on this legislation. We see it as a step forward, but we also see it as a lost opportunity, in that the government could have done a whole lot more. We have seen that demonstrated. In particular, a member of Parliament from the Liberal caucus brought in the sunshine bill that would have had more of an impact. Ideally, I would love to see some of these amendments to give the bill more strength.

We recognize that whether it is bribery, corruption or kickbacks, these types of things occur and have a devastating impact on many countries around the world. Even though we have 95%-plus in terms of excellent companies that contribute in many different ways to many different countries, a small fraction of companies cause a great deal of concern, and we should all be concerned. This is the reason we believe that the legislation is necessary.

Canada needs to play a stronger leadership role, and bringing forward legislation is one of the ways we can do that. We hope to see the government being open to amendments. Would the member not agree that the government would be best advised to accept amendments to enhance and give strength to Bill S-14?

• (2055)

[Translation]

**Ms. Paulina Ayala:** Mr. Speaker, the member did not ask a question, he made a comment.

We fully agree that this is indeed a first step. I think the people on the other side of the House agree as well. The fact still remains that we can improve the bill and go further. I want to emphasize that we need some ambition.

I think Canada will lead by example. If it can sit at the table and talk to people from other countries as equals, a bright prosperous future will open before all of us. We must continue in this direction. This is a first step.

Mr. Philip Toone (Gaspésie—Îles-de-la-Madeleine, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her very interesting speech. I would also like to congratulate her for the exemplary work she does in her riding. I would like her to keep up the good work.

Her speech was very interesting, especially because she highlighted the problems that we see outside Canada. That is the impetus for the bill that is currently before us.

Sometimes the problems that we have to solve abroad originate here. We must not hide the fact that Canadian corporations working abroad do not always act ethically. I believe that this bill could do much to defend the rights of people outside Canada.

We believe in our Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. We also believe that people who live outside Canada should have fundamental rights and that we have an obligation to protect them.

It is true that Canada's reputation abroad is sometimes dubious or is declining. Canada withdrew from the Kyoto protocol and the UN Convention to Combat Desertification. On a number of occasions, Canada has shown that it is not interested in protecting rights outside the country. I believe that my colleague made some very interesting points about that.

Does my colleague believe that the bill is enough to restore Canada's international reputation? Do we have to do more?

Ms. Paulina Ayala: Mr. Speaker, this is just a first step. I know that full well.

I see the work being done with ParlAmericas and with friendship groups in other countries. However, even the members who are part of other associations feel we could be going further. It is a first step, but it is not enough.

This bill lacks ambition. They need to be more ambitious, and they need to listen to members on the other side of the House. They need to listen to the opposition. We have plenty of good proposals. They need to listen to us. That is what democracy looks like: working together and not simply saying that because they have a majority, they can do whatever they want. We have very good ideas and we will share them for everyone's benefit.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): It being 9 p.m., pursuant to an order made earlier today, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the second reading stage of the bill now before the House.

[English]

The question is on the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Barry Devolin): I declare the motion carried. Accordingly, the bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development.

(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to a committee.)

**●** (2100)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin):** It being 9 p.m., pursuant to an order made earlier today, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 9 p.m.)

# **CONTENTS**

## Tuesday, June 4, 2013

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS		Mr. Sullivan	17617
<b>Government Response to Petitions</b>		Ms. Crockatt.	17618
Mr. Lukiwski	17613	Mr. Godin	17618
	17015	Ms. May	17618
Committees of the House		Motion agreed to	17619
Veterans Affairs	15.10	Third Reading	
Mr. Kerr	17613	Bill S-2. Third Reading	17619
Mandatory Disclosure of Drug Shortages Act		Mr. Hillyer	17619
Mrs. Sellah	17613	Suspension of Sitting	
Bill C-523. Introduction and first reading	17613	(The sitting of the House was suspended at 11:32 a.m.).	17620
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and		Sitting Resumed	
printed)	17613	(The House resumed at 11:53 a.m.)	17620
Canada Elections Act		Mr. Hillyer	17620
Mr. Lamoureux	17613	Mr. Dubé	17621
Bill C-524. Introduction and first reading	17613	Mrs. Truppe	17621
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and		Ms. Michaud	17621
printed)	17613	Ms. Ambrose	17621
Petitions		Mr. Dusseault	17623
<b>Employment Insurance</b>		Mr. Lamoureux	17623
Mr. Godin	17613	Ms. Michaud	17624
Development and Peace		Mr. Dusseault	17625
Ms. Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)	17614	Mr. Lamoureux	17625
West Island Rail Line		Mr. Dubé	17626
Ms. Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)	17614	Mrs. Truppe	17627
Genetically Modified Organisms		Mr. Lapointe	17627
Mr. Valeriote	17614	Mrs. Aglukkaq	17628
Motor Vehicle Safety		Ms. Michaud	17629
Ms. Chow	17614	Mr. Lamoureux	17629
Parks Canada		Mrs. Ambler	17629
Ms. Chow	17614	Ms. Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)	17631
Genetically Modified Alfalfa	45244	Mr. Sweet	17631
Mr. Miller	17614	Mr. Dusseault	17631
Questions on the Order Paper		Mr. Sweet	17633
Mr. Lukiwski	17614	Mr. Jacob	17633
		Mr. Gravelle	17633
GOVERNMENT ORDERS		Mr. Rickford	17634
Family Homes on Reserves and Matrimonial Interests or		Mrs. Hughes	17635
Rights Act		Ms. Bergen	17635
Bill S-2—Time Allocation Motion		Mrs. Hughes	17637
Mr. Van Loan	17614	Mr. Garneau	17637
Motion	17614		
Mr. Cullen	17614	STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS	
Mr. Valcourt	17615	Captain Jonathan Snyder	
Mr. Dubé	17615	Mr. Albas	17638
Mrs. Block	17615		17036
Mr. Dusseault	17615	Environmental Stewardship	
Ms. Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)	17616	Ms. Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)	17638
Mrs. Smith	17616	1989 Tiananmen Square Protest	
Mr. Gravelle	17616	Mr. Adler	17638
Mr. Jacob	17617	Now Waterford Contouriel	
Mrs. Truppe	17617	New Waterford Centennial	17/20
Mrs. Sellah	17617	Mr. Eyking	17638

Mighty Peace Day		Mr. Harper	17643
Mr. Warkentin	17638	Mr. Mulcair	17643
Helen Lu		Mr. Harper	17643
Ms. Chow	17639	Mr. Mulcair	17643
		Mr. Harper	17643
Micronutrient Initiative	17/20	Mr. Mulcair	17643
Mr. Allison	17639	Mr. Harper	17643
Scleroderma		Mr. Mulcair	17643
Mr. Sweet	17639	Mr. Harper	17643
Quebec Week of Disabled Persons		Mr. Mulcair	17643
Ms. Perreault	17639	Mr. Harper	17643
James Kelleher		Mr. Mulcair	17643
	17639	Mr. Harper	17644
Mr. Hayes	1/039	Mr. Mulcair.	17644
Community Organization in La Prairie		Mr. Harper	17644
Mr. Mai	17640	Mr. Trudeau	17644
Samuel de Champlain		Mr. Harper	17644
Mr. Galipeau	17640	Mr. Trudeau	17644
Jane Purves		Mr. Harper	17644
Mr. Brison	17640	Mr. Trudeau	17644
MI. BIISOII	1/040	Mr. Harper	17644
The Senate		Foreign Affairs	
Mr. Opitz	17640	Ms. Péclet	17644
The Senate		Mr. Baird	17644
Mr. Rafferty	17641	Mr. Dewar	17644
New Democratic Party of Canada		Mr. Baird	17644
Mr. Rickford	17641	National Defence	
Wii. Rickford	17041	Mr. Harris (St. John's East)	17645
ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS		Ms. Findlay	17645
ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS		Ms. Findlay.  Ms. Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)	17645 17645
New Member	4=44	Ms. Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)	
	17641	Ms. Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)  Ms. Findlay	17645
New Member	17641	Ms. Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)  Ms. Findlay  Human Rights	17645 17645
New Member The Speaker	17641 17641	Ms. Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue) Ms. Findlay.  Human Rights Mr. Shory.	17645 17645
New Member The Speaker  New Member Introduced Ms. Yvonne Jones (Labrador).		Ms. Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue) Ms. Findlay  Human Rights Mr. Shory Mr. Gosal	17645 17645
New Member The Speaker New Member Introduced		Ms. Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue) Ms. Findlay  Human Rights Mr. Shory Mr. Gosal  41st General Election	17645 17645 17645 17645
New Member The Speaker  New Member Introduced Ms. Yvonne Jones (Labrador).		Ms. Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue) Ms. Findlay  Human Rights Mr. Shory Mr. Gosal  41st General Election Mr. Scott	17645 17645 17645 17645
New Member The Speaker  New Member Introduced Ms. Yvonne Jones (Labrador).  ORAL QUESTIONS		Ms. Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue) Ms. Findlay  Human Rights Mr. Shory Mr. Gosal  41st General Election	17645 17645 17645 17645
New Member The Speaker  New Member Introduced Ms. Yvonne Jones (Labrador).  ORAL QUESTIONS  Ethics	17641	Ms. Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue) Ms. Findlay  Human Rights Mr. Shory Mr. Gosal  41st General Election Mr. Scott	17645 17645 17645 17645
New Member The Speaker  New Member Introduced Ms. Yvonne Jones (Labrador).  ORAL QUESTIONS  Ethics Mr. Mulcair.	17641 17641	Ms. Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue) Ms. Findlay.  Human Rights Mr. Shory. Mr. Gosal.  41st General Election Mr. Scott. Mr. Poilievre.	17645 17645 17645 17645
New Member The Speaker  New Member Introduced Ms. Yvonne Jones (Labrador).  ORAL QUESTIONS  Ethics Mr. Mulcair. Mr. Harper.	17641 17641 17641	Ms. Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue) Ms. Findlay.  Human Rights Mr. Shory. Mr. Gosal.  41st General Election Mr. Scott. Mr. Poilievre.  The Environment	17645 17645 17645 17645 17645
New Member The Speaker  New Member Introduced Ms. Yvonne Jones (Labrador)  ORAL QUESTIONS  Ethics Mr. Mulcair Mr. Harper. Mr. Mulcair.	17641 17641 17641 17641	Ms. Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue) Ms. Findlay.  Human Rights Mr. Shory. Mr. Gosal.  41st General Election Mr. Scott. Mr. Poilievre.  The Environment Mr. Julian. Mr. Ashfield.	17645 17645 17645 17645 17645 17645
New Member The Speaker  New Member Introduced Ms. Yvonne Jones (Labrador).  ORAL QUESTIONS  Ethics Mr. Mulcair Mr. Harper Mr. Mulcair Mr. Harper Mr. Hulcair	17641 17641 17641 17641 17641	Ms. Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue) Ms. Findlay.  Human Rights Mr. Shory. Mr. Gosal.  41st General Election Mr. Scott. Mr. Poilievre.  The Environment Mr. Julian Mr. Ashfield.  Public Safety	17645 17645 17645 17645 17645 17645 17645
New Member The Speaker  New Member Introduced Ms. Yvonne Jones (Labrador).  ORAL QUESTIONS  Ethics Mr. Mulcair. Mr. Harper. Mr. Mulcair. Mr. Harper. Mr. Mulcair. Mr. Harper. Mr. Mulcair.	17641 17641 17641 17641 17641	Ms. Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue) Ms. Findlay.  Human Rights Mr. Shory. Mr. Gosal.  41st General Election Mr. Scott. Mr. Poilievre.  The Environment Mr. Julian. Mr. Ashfield.  Public Safety Mr. Garrison.	17645 17645 17645 17645 17645 17645 17646
New Member The Speaker  New Member Introduced Ms. Yvonne Jones (Labrador).  ORAL QUESTIONS  Ethics Mr. Mulcair. Mr. Harper. Mr. Mulcair Mr. Harper. Mr. Mulcair. Mr. Harper. Mr. Mulcair. Mr. Harper. Mr. Mulcair. Mr. Harper.	17641 17641 17641 17641 17641 17641	Ms. Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue) Ms. Findlay.  Human Rights Mr. Shory. Mr. Gosal.  41st General Election Mr. Scott. Mr. Poilievre.  The Environment Mr. Julian. Mr. Ashfield.  Public Safety Mr. Garrison. Mr. Toews	17645 17645 17645 17645 17645 17645 17646 17646
New Member The Speaker  New Member Introduced Ms. Yvonne Jones (Labrador)  ORAL QUESTIONS  Ethics Mr. Mulcair. Mr. Harper Mr. Mulcair. Mr. Harper. Mr. Mulcair. Mr. Harper. Mr. Mulcair. Mr. Harper. Mr. Mulcair. Mr. Mulcair. Mr. Mulcair. Mr. Mulcair. Mr. Harper. Mr. Mulcair.	17641 17641 17641 17641 17641 17642 17642	Ms. Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue) Ms. Findlay.  Human Rights Mr. Shory Mr. Gosal.  41st General Election Mr. Scott. Mr. Poilievre  The Environment Mr. Julian Mr. Ashfield  Public Safety Mr. Garrison Mr. Toews Ms. Doré Lefebvre	17645 17645 17645 17645 17645 17645 17646 17646 17646
New Member The Speaker  New Member Introduced Ms. Yvonne Jones (Labrador).  ORAL QUESTIONS  Ethics Mr. Mulcair. Mr. Harper. Mr. Harper. Mr. Harper. Mr. Harper.	17641 17641 17641 17641 17641 17642 17642	Ms. Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue) Ms. Findlay.  Human Rights Mr. Shory. Mr. Gosal.  41st General Election Mr. Scott. Mr. Poilievre.  The Environment Mr. Julian. Mr. Ashfield.  Public Safety Mr. Garrison. Mr. Toews Ms. Doré Lefebvre Mr. Toews	17645 17645 17645 17645 17645 17645 17646 17646
New Member The Speaker  New Member Introduced Ms. Yvonne Jones (Labrador).  ORAL QUESTIONS  Ethics Mr. Mulcair. Mr. Harper. Mr. Mulcair. Mr. Mulcair. Mr. Mulcair. Mr. Mulcair. Mr. Mulcair. Mr. Mulcair.	17641 17641 17641 17641 17641 17642 17642 17642	Ms. Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue) Ms. Findlay.  Human Rights Mr. Shory. Mr. Gosal.  41st General Election Mr. Scott. Mr. Poilievre.  The Environment Mr. Julian. Mr. Ashfield.  Public Safety Mr. Garrison. Mr. Toews. Ms. Doré Lefebvre Mr. Toews  Search and Rescue	17645 17645 17645 17645 17645 17645 17646 17646 17646
New Member The Speaker  New Member Introduced Ms. Yvonne Jones (Labrador).  ORAL QUESTIONS  Ethics Mr. Mulcair. Mr. Harper. Mr. Mulcair. Mr. Harper Mr. Mulcair. Mr. Harper.	17641 17641 17641 17641 17641 17642 17642 17642 17642 17642	Ms. Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue) Ms. Findlay.  Human Rights Mr. Shory. Mr. Gosal.  41st General Election Mr. Scott. Mr. Poilievre.  The Environment Mr. Julian Mr. Ashfield.  Public Safety Mr. Garrison. Mr. Toews. Ms. Doré Lefebvre Mr. Toews  Search and Rescue Ms. Rumbolt-Jones.	17645 17645 17645 17645 17645 17645 17646 17646 17646 17646
New Member The Speaker  New Member Introduced Ms. Yvonne Jones (Labrador).  ORAL QUESTIONS  Ethics Mr. Mulcair Mr. Harper Mr. Trudeau	17641 17641 17641 17641 17641 17642 17642 17642 17642 17642	Ms. Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue) Ms. Findlay.  Human Rights Mr. Shory. Mr. Gosal.  41st General Election Mr. Scott. Mr. Poilievre.  The Environment Mr. Julian. Mr. Ashfield  Public Safety Mr. Garrison. Mr. Toews. Ms. Doré Lefebvre. Mr. Toews  Search and Rescue Ms. Rumbolt-Jones. Ms. Findlay.	17645 17645 17645 17645 17645 17645 17646 17646 17646 17646
New Member The Speaker  New Member Introduced Ms. Yvonne Jones (Labrador).  ORAL QUESTIONS  Ethics Mr. Mulcair Mr. Harper Mr. Trudeau Mr. Harper	17641 17641 17641 17641 17641 17642 17642 17642 17642 17642 17642 17642	Ms. Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue) Ms. Findlay.  Human Rights Mr. Shory. Mr. Gosal.  41st General Election Mr. Scott. Mr. Poilievre.  The Environment Mr. Julian. Mr. Ashfield.  Public Safety Mr. Garrison. Mr. Toews. Ms. Doré Lefebvre. Mr. Toews. Search and Rescue Ms. Rumbolt-Jones. Ms. Rumbolt-Jones. Ms. Rumbolt-Jones.	17645 17645 17645 17645 17645 17645 17646 17646 17646 17646 17646 17646
New Member The Speaker  New Member Introduced Ms. Yvonne Jones (Labrador).  ORAL QUESTIONS  Ethics Mr. Mulcair Mr. Harper Mr. Trudeau Mr. Harper Mr. Trudeau Mr. Trudeau	17641 17641 17641 17641 17641 17642 17642 17642 17642 17642 17642 17642 17642	Ms. Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue) Ms. Findlay.  Human Rights Mr. Shory. Mr. Gosal.  41st General Election Mr. Scott. Mr. Poilievre.  The Environment Mr. Julian. Mr. Ashfield  Public Safety Mr. Garrison. Mr. Toews. Ms. Doré Lefebvre. Mr. Toews  Search and Rescue Ms. Rumbolt-Jones. Ms. Findlay.	17645 17645 17645 17645 17645 17645 17646 17646 17646 17646
New Member The Speaker  New Member Introduced Ms. Yvonne Jones (Labrador).  ORAL QUESTIONS  Ethics Mr. Mulcair Mr. Harper Mr. Trudeau Mr. Harper Mr. Trudeau Mr. Harper	17641 17641 17641 17641 17641 17642 17642 17642 17642 17642 17642 17642 17642	Ms. Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue) Ms. Findlay.  Human Rights Mr. Shory. Mr. Gosal.  41st General Election Mr. Scott. Mr. Poilievre.  The Environment Mr. Julian. Mr. Ashfield.  Public Safety Mr. Garrison. Mr. Toews. Ms. Doré Lefebvre. Mr. Toews. Search and Rescue Ms. Rumbolt-Jones. Ms. Rumbolt-Jones. Ms. Rumbolt-Jones.	17645 17645 17645 17645 17645 17645 17646 17646 17646 17646 17646 17646
New Member The Speaker  New Member Introduced Ms. Yvonne Jones (Labrador).  ORAL QUESTIONS  Ethics Mr. Mulcair Mr. Harper Mr. Trudeau Mr. Harper Mr. Trudeau Mr. Harper Mr. Trudeau Mr. Harper Mr. Trudeau Mr. Harper	17641 17641 17641 17641 17641 17642 17642 17642 17642 17642 17642 17642 17642 17642	Ms. Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue) Ms. Findlay.  Human Rights Mr. Shory. Mr. Gosal.  41st General Election Mr. Scott. Mr. Poilievre.  The Environment Mr. Julian. Mr. Ashfield.  Public Safety Mr. Garrison. Mr. Toews. Ms. Doré Lefebvre. Mr. Toews. Search and Rescue Ms. Rumbolt-Jones. Ms. Findlay. Ms. Findlay. Ms. Findlay. Ms. Findlay.	17645 17645 17645 17645 17645 17645 17646 17646 17646 17646 17646 17646
New Member The Speaker  New Member Introduced Ms. Yvonne Jones (Labrador).  ORAL QUESTIONS  Ethics Mr. Mulcair. Mr. Harper. Mr. Trudeau Mr. Harper.	17641 17641 17641 17641 17641 17642 17642 17642 17642 17642 17642 17642 17642 17642 17642	Ms. Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue) Ms. Findlay.  Human Rights Mr. Shory. Mr. Gosal.  41st General Election Mr. Scott. Mr. Poilievre.  The Environment Mr. Julian. Mr. Ashfield.  Public Safety Mr. Garrison. Mr. Toews. Ms. Doré Lefebvre. Mr. Toews Search and Rescue Ms. Rumbolt-Jones. Ms. Findlay. Ms. Rumbolt-Jones. Ms. Findlay. Pensions	17645 17645 17645 17645 17645 17645 17646 17646 17646 17646 17646 17646 17646

Mr. Menzies	17647	Mr. Storseth	17670
Consumer Protection		Mr. Saganash	17670
	17647	Ms. Crowder	17671
Mr. Dreeshen Mr. Paradis	17647		
	1/04/	PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS	
Royal Canadian Mounted Police		Respecting Families of Murdered and Brutalized Per-	
Ms. Sgro.	17647	sons Act	
Mr. Toews	17648	Bill C-478. Second Reading	17673
41st General Election		Mr. Albas	17673
Mr. Scott.	17648	Ms. Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)	17674
Mr. Poilievre	17648	Mr. Pacetti	17675
Natural Resources		Mr. Sweet	17677
Mr. Richards	17648	Mr. Genest-Jourdain	17678
Mr. Oliver	17648	Mr. Bezan	17679
	170.0	Division on motion deferred	17680
Aboriginal Affairs	15.40	Message from the Senate	
Mr. Genest-Jourdain	17648	The Acting Speaker (Mr. Stanton)	17680
Mr. Valcourt	17648	The Nething Speaker (Wit. Station)	17000
Rail Transportation		GOVERNMENT ORDERS	
Mr. Hyer	17648		
Mr. Fletcher	17648	Fighting Foreign Corruption Act	1=000
		Bill S-14. Second reading.	17680
GOVERNMENT ORDERS		Mr. McKay	17680
Economic Action Plan 2013 Act, No. 1		Mr. Lamoureux	17682
Bill C-60. Report Stage	17649	Mr. Tremblay	17682
Motion No. 1 negatived	17650	Mr. Allison	17683
Motions Nos. 2 and 3 negatived	17651	Mr. Toone	17684
Motions Nos. 6 to 11 negatived	17652	Mr. Lamoureux	17684
Motions Nos. 12 to 15 negatived	17653	Mr. Miller	17685
Motion No. 16 negatived	17654	Mr. Tremblay	17686
Motions Nos. 17 to 19 negatived	17656	Mr. Bellavance	17686
Motions Nos. 20, 24, 26, 27 and 29 to 36 negatived	17657	Mr. Toone	17687
Motions Nos. 37 and 38 to 40 negatived	17658	Mr. Atamanenko	17687
Motions Nos. 41 to 43 negatived	17659	Mr. Rousseau	17688
Motions Nos. 47 to 59 negatived	17660	Mr. Bellavance	17688
Motions Nos. 60 to 71 negatived	17662	Ms. Péclet	17688
Motion No. 72 negatived	17663	Mr. Rousseau	17689
Motions Nos. 73, 74 and 78 to 80 negatived	17664	Mr. Tremblay Mr. Van Kesteren	17690
Mr. Flaherty	17664		17690
Motion for concurrence	17664	Mr. Toone	17691
Motion agreed to	17665	Mr. Lamoureux	17692
Business of the House		Mr. Rickford	17692 17692
Mr. Van Loan	17665	Mr. Toone	17693
(Motion agreed to)	17665	Mr. Bellavance	17693
Mr. Van Loan	17665	Mrs. Smith	17694
(Motion agreed to)	17665	Mr. Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	17694
,	17000	Ms. LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard).	17696
Safe Drinking Water for First Nations Act	.=	Mr. Rickford.	17696
Bill S-8. Report Stage	17665	Ms. LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard).	17690
Mr. Goodyear (for the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development)	17666	Mr. Tremblay	17698
Motion for concurrence	17666	Ms. Ayala	17698
Motion agreed to	17667	Mr. Lamoureux	17698
Bill S-8. Third reading	17667	Ms. Ayala.	17698
Mr. Rickford	17667	Mr. Carrie	17699
Ms. Crowder	17669	Mr. Lamoureux	17700
Ms. Bennett	17669	Mr. Toone	17700
1715. Defined	1/0/0	1v11. 100HC	1//00

(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred	
to a committee.)	17701

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

## SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

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.

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

## PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

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.

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.

Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the following address: http://www.parl.gc.ca

Aussi disponible sur le site Web du Parlement du Canada à l'adresse suivante : http://www.parl.gc.ca