



CANADA

# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 145 • NUMBER 059 • 3rd SESSION • 40th PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Wednesday, June 9, 2010**

—

**Speaker: The Honourable Peter Milliken**

## **CONTENTS**

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

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, June 9, 2010

The House met at 2 p.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

• (1405)

[English]

**The Speaker:** It being Wednesday, we will now have the singing of the national anthem led by the pages.

[Members sang the national anthem]

---

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

### NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

**Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Calgary East, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Canada is working very actively against the proliferation of nuclear weapons. That is why recent allegations about the possibility that the Burmese government is working with North Korea to develop a nuclear program are so concerning.

A North Korean initiative to share nuclear material or technology with Burma or any other nation would pose a grave threat to the security in the region and would be a violation of the terms of the UN Security Council Resolution 1874. We further call upon all members of the international community to re-double their vigilance in ensuring the comprehensive enforcement of all Security Council resolutions pertaining to North Korea.

Canada has already imposed the toughest sanctions in the world on Burma. We call on Burma to co-operate fully with the IAEA and follow its international obligations as a signatory to the nuclear non-proliferation treaty.

\* \* \*

### RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

**Mrs. Bonnie Crombie (Mississauga—Streetsville, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we are constantly reminded of the events against human rights, and religious intolerance around the world.

We remember the invasion of the Golden Temple in Amritsar against the Sikh faith in 1984, then quickly following, the bombing of Air India flight 182 over the shores of Ireland. We still deeply mourn these losses.

Last year, thousands of innocent Sri Lankans lost their lives in defenceless attacks against humanity.

This past Christmas Eve, six members of the Coptic community were shot down for practising their faith.

Not even two weeks ago, Ahmadiyya Muslims worshipping and attending prayers on a Friday in Lahore, Pakistan faced violent and brutal attacks.

We have a duty to defend against religious intolerance and the violation of human rights that these deplorable acts of violence, fear and intimidation represent. I urge all members to join together today in condemning these violent acts and call on all governments around the world to bring justice to the perpetrators to ensure religious freedom for all people.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### ANNETTE SAVOIE

**Mr. Luc Desnoyers (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today to pay tribute to a remarkable woman in my riding and to highlight a very special event. On June 28, Annette Savoie will celebrate her 100th birthday.

In light of this occasion, Mrs. Savoie has started writing her memoirs, in which she will tell the story of her life as it relates to the history of Quebec and the evolution of women over the course of nearly a century. Mrs. Savoie's age has not dimmed her strong ideals or the force of her convictions. Still sharp as a tack, this amazing woman is the very antithesis of what we imagine when we think of growing old.

On behalf of the Bloc Québécois, I wish Mrs. Savoie much happiness and good health for many more years to come.

\* \* \*

[English]

### HARMONIZED SALES TAX

**Mr. Bill Siksay (Burnaby—Douglas, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, Conservatives can still do the right thing on the HST. British Columbians are united in our opposition to the HST. We have mobilized in communities in every corner of the province and are sending a clear message to Conservative and Liberal MPs who supported this tax that they must reverse their position and stop it now. There is time for them to repent.

*Statements by Members*

The Prime Minister and the premiers should sit down immediately, reverse course and stop the HST. The Conservatives thought that they were finished with the HST after they enabled it and rammed it through Parliament back in December, but people in B.C. remember what they have done.

New Democrats continue to stand in solidarity with British Columbians on the HST. We opposed it then, we voted against it at all stages, and we, too, want it stopped now. Conservatives and Liberals imposed the HST on B.C. in perhaps the most notorious action of the only active coalition in this Parliament, the one between Conservatives and Liberals.

\* \* \*

**CITIZENS OF THE YEAR**

**Mr. LaVar Payne (Medicine Hat, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to two outstanding constituents of the Medicine Hat riding, Albert Zagorsky and Talon Chandler.

Albert Zagorsky was recently named citizen of the year by Grasslands Regional Family and Community Support Services. For over 40 years, Mr. Zagorsky has devoted his time and expertise to teach music to thousands of students in the Grasslands area. Albert is an accomplished ambassador to Brooks and the Newell region, which have gained recognition across western Canada thanks to his dedication to music.

Talon Chandler was named junior citizen of the year thanks to the leadership he has taken on at his high school where he serves on the student council as co-president. Talon volunteers his time refereeing local volleyball matches and was recently elected grad class president by a group of 170 students. Positive and outgoing, Talon is constantly looking for ways to lend a helping hand.

Congratulations to both of them.

I also want to welcome the Friendship Force of Medicine Hat, who are in Ottawa today.

\* \* \*

•(1410)

**INDIA**

**Hon. Navdeep Bains (Mississauga—Brampton South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in the days following the assassination of Indira Gandhi, thousands of innocent Sikh men, women and children were slaughtered in the streets of Delhi and other parts of India. A senior researcher at Human Rights Watch writes, "Delhi was a scene of carnage, yet 25 years later the victims are still waiting for justice".

However, it is important to remember that all humanity was not lost as Hindu, Muslim and Christian families risked their lives in order to shelter and rescue their Sikh neighbours from the blood-thirsty organized mobs.

The real issue according to Human Rights Watch is, "The failure of successive Indian governments to bring to justice those responsible for mass revenge attacks on Sikhs after the assassination of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi 25 years ago is a severe blot on India's legal system and democracy".

As Canadians, we will always fight for justice and the protection of human rights, two ideals in any democracy.

India's democracy will be made stronger when it pursues reconciliation and accountability, but none of this will be possible without first making an honest search for the truth.

\* \* \*

**CONTROLLED DRUGS AND SUBSTANCES ACT**

**Mr. John Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, tonight this House will vote for a final time on Bill C-475, my private member's bill that seeks to put a stop to the horror of drug addiction in Canada.

This bill, which criminalizes the procurement of precursors for the manufacture of crystal meth and ecstasy, received unanimous consent in this House at second reading. I ask my colleagues in this House, what could send a stronger message to Canadians than again to pass this bill unanimously?

Canadians are proud that our government is acting to protect its citizens from illegal drugs. Bill C-475, which has been endorsed by the Federation of Canadian Municipalities and the B.C. Association of Police Chiefs along with many municipalities in the riding I represent, would make it harder for Canadians to produce or gain access to dangerous drugs.

For the sake of all Canadians, I implore my colleagues in this House to stand in favour of health, fitness and freedom from drug addiction.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

**QUEBEC ARCHAEOLOGICAL MUSEUM**

**Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, it is with great enthusiasm and pride that I am highlighting yet another wonderful achievement in my riding. Opened almost 25 years ago, the Pointe-du-Buisson Archaeological Park, in Melocheville, has recently become the Musée québécois d'archéologie.

This site, which welcomed the first researchers more than 40 years ago, was Quebec's first accredited archaeological field school. The museum now comprises 17 archaeological sites and a collection of more than 2 million objects documenting the 5,000 years that this land has been continuously inhabited. It is one of the richest sites in the American northeast.

Located in Beauharnois, this important regional cultural not-for-profit organization holds an enviable place when it comes to Quebec's museums. In July 2010 it will unveil a new permanent exhibit on archaeology as well as new equipment. I would invite all of those who are passionate about history and archaeology to visit and discover Quebec's archaeological heritage.

*Statements by Members*

Congratulations to all those who have had a hand in this success. Long live the Musée québécois d'archéologie.

\* \* \*

**LEADER OF THE LIBERAL PARTY OF CANADA**

**Mr. Jacques Gourde (Lotbinière—Chutes-de-la-Chaudière, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Liberal leader is secretly scheming with the NDP and the Bloc to come up with a Machiavellian strategy to overturn the democratic results of the last general election.

By refusing to go along with the people's verdict, the Liberal coalition with the NDP and the Bloc—the famous big spenders coalition—shows that the Liberal leader's ego is more important to him than our country's best interests.

But that should come as no surprise because this is not the first time the Liberal leader has chosen to ignore Canadians' and Quebecers' real concerns. At the height of the global economic downturn, he was the one who wanted to increase taxes.

We all know that the Liberal leader is not interested in the economy. He would rather play partisan politics at the expense of Canadians by making crazy spending promises to be paid for by higher taxes.

\* \* \*

[English]

**HUMAN RIGHTS**

**Ms. Kirsty Duncan (Etobicoke North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, let each of us in this House take a minute to respectfully and solemnly remember the thousands killed, many of them innocent bystanders, in 1984.

Canada is celebrated around the world for our diversity, diversity which would never have allowed such events to occur.

Today we pray for those who were killed, mothers, fathers, siblings, and we pray for those who survived but who have to endure a trauma the rest of us cannot imagine, and for those who bravely risked their lives to save others. We meet to express together what cannot be endured alone. We must continue to work toward ending suffering and building peace.

Let all of us here in Canada pledge our determination to protect human rights as the best way to remember those who lost their lives. Let all of us embody Guru Nanak's message of universal love and peace.

\* \* \*

●(1415)

**FIREARMS REGISTRY**

**Mrs. Shelly Glover (Saint Boniface, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Liberals continue to do nothing but play partisan political games when it comes to the wasteful and ineffective long gun registry. Even members from his own party think this is nonsense.

This is what former Liberal MP, Hec Clouthier, said:

I told [the Liberal leader] the Liberal Party policies and priorities were targeting the major cities and forgetting about rural Canada.

He continued to say that if the Liberal leader continues playing these political games, he could hold his next caucus meeting in a phone booth.

Not even Liberals are fooled by the real motives behind the Liberal leader's decision to whip the vote. It is clear that the Liberal leader has turned his back on rural Canadians, whipped his members to oppose the long gun vote and empower his attack dog, the member for Ajax—Pickering, to hijack the public safety committee.

We call upon all opposition members who voted in favour of Bill C-391 at second reading to stand up for their constituents and vote to scrap the long gun registry once and for all.

\* \* \*

**STATUS OF WOMEN**

**Ms. Chris Charlton (Hamilton Mountain, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Social Planning & Research Council of Hamilton for continuing its important work of tracking and reporting on the basic indicators for women's progress.

The council's most recent report confirms that women in Hamilton still earn significantly less than men. In fact, they only make 73% of men's total income.

However, the picture of poverty in our city is multi-faceted. Single women, visible minority women, newcomer women and aboriginal women have especially high rates of poverty, pointing to the fact that women's poverty is not equally distributed in our community.

Among women who work full time, 7% are earning wages so low that they are still poor. There are more than 4,000 working poor women in Hamilton, and the general poverty rate for women is 20%, significantly higher than the provincial average of 16%.

For senior women, the picture is especially bleak. Older women are more than twice as likely to be living in poverty as older men, and the poverty rate for single female seniors is much higher than for the general population of women 65 years of age and older.

It does not have to be this way. It is time to heed the advice from the UN, whose recent report showed that electing more gender-balanced legislatures leads to policies that improve women's lives. Clearly—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Barrie.

\* \* \*

**MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY**

**Mr. Patrick Brown (Barrie, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Canada has a tradition of ministerial responsibility. That means that cabinet ministers are responsible for what happens in their names and to Parliament. Canadians expect those in charge to account for their staff and this situation is no different.

### Oral Questions

The tradition of ministerial responsibility is as old as Canada itself. That is why Conservative cabinet ministers answer questions in question period and that is why they appear before committees to answer for their offices.

The Liberal leader wants to do away with this tradition. Instead, he wants to import the foreign U.S. committee system that is used as a political weapon to bully, intimidate and to humiliate opponents, something we will not allow.

We hope that all opposition committee chairs will follow the rules and procedures, rather than conduct kangaroo courts as they have been doing.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### THE CONSERVATIVES

**Ms. France Bonsant (Compton—Stanstead, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the extreme right has arrived in Parliament. The ultra-conservative members of the Reform Party, the Canadian Alliance and other right-wing splinter groups have won: they have taken Parliament hostage.

Using their favourite puppet, the Conservative Party, these groups take pleasure in destroying all the gains achieved over the years. I am referring to their position on abortion, the firearms registry and the funding cruelly taken away from the most vulnerable members of our society.

As we near the end of this session, only one conclusion can be drawn: these Reform Conservatives will do everything they can to impose their regressive views. Quebec can always count on a party that, unlike the Liberals and the NDP, will always stand up when it is time to protect these gains. The Bloc Québécois is here to defend the interests and values of the Quebec nation.

\* \* \*

● (1420)

[English]

### RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

**Hon. Gurbax Malhi (Bramalea—Gore—Malton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in June 1984, the most holy place of the Sikh religion, the Golden Temple in Amritsar, and many other Sikh places of worship were dishonoured. Thousands of innocent children, women and men who were there to mark a holy day were killed.

In November 1984, an anti-Sikh pogrom of violence, rapes and killings took place in New Delhi and many other Indian cities, resulting in the deaths of thousands more.

In June 1985, Air India flight 182 was blown up in mid-air and over 300 people died.

I strongly urge the Indian and Canadian governments to take all reasonable measures to ensure that justice prevails for innocent victims' families. Both countries should work together to ensure that such tragedies never happen again.

I would invite all my colleagues to take a moment to reflect upon the many innocent lives lost in 1984 and 1985.

### LIBERAL PARTY OF CANADA

**Mr. Phil McColeman (Brant, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, everywhere we turn, the Liberals are talking about forming a coalition. The member for Ottawa South and the member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine like the idea. The Liberal Party president has come out in support of it. Even Jean Chrétien and Warren Kinsella have said that they like the sound of it.

However, before the Liberals dust off their 2008 website, liberaldemocrats.ca, we should remind them that their coalition is not just with the NDP but also with the Bloc whose goal it is to break up this country.

It is as unacceptable now as it was in 2008 for the Liberal Party to give the NDP co-management of this economy or to share power with a party committed to the breakup of our country.

If the Liberal Party continues with its coalition talk, it should be truthful with Canadians and register the website blocquébécois-liberals-newdemocrats.ca and put that to Canadians.

### ORAL QUESTIONS

[Translation]

### G8 AND G20 SUMMITS

**Hon. Michael Ignatieff (Leader of the Opposition, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we have a fake lake, a boat that does not float and even washrooms 20 km away from the leaders. This attempt to promote Canada is turning us into a laughingstock. The government has not only lost control of the costs, it is being ridiculed around the world.

When will the Prime Minister get this summit under control and when will he pull the plug on this comedy of errors?

**Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, on the contrary, the opposition made the same complaints about the Olympic Games that they are making now. Canada hosted one of the most successful Olympic Games in the world. We will also have a world-class G8 and G20.

[English]

**Hon. Michael Ignatieff (Leader of the Opposition, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is no good hiding behind the Olympics. The government's story keeps changing every day.

Yesterday it was \$2 million for a fake lake, then it was just a fake alley and then it was just \$57,000 for the water. Then the government hired security guards who do not even have approval in Ontario.

Money seems to be gushing out of half a dozen secret slush funds. This thing is out of control.

When will the Prime Minister get a grip and tell Canadians the honest truth about what this boondoggle is costing us?

**Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, we heard all of the same complaints about the cost of the Olympics and we put on a world-class Olympics, just as we will have a world-class G8 and G20.

*Oral Questions*

What the opposition does not want to talk about is the real story here, which is that as we host the G20 we have the lowest taxes on new business investment, the lowest debt of any country, the lowest deficit, the strongest employment growth, the strongest economic growth and the soundest banking system in the world.

• (1425)

**Hon. Michael Ignatieff (Leader of the Opposition, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, let us talk about the economy.

Hungary is in danger, Greece is struggling and Spain is next in line. The world is looking to the G20 and to Canada for economic leadership but, instead of providing it, the Prime Minister seems to think he is running a convention for travel writers.

Why does he not understand that we are throwing away a once in a lifetime opportunity for Canadian leadership?

**Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I answered that question before the Leader of the Opposition even asked it. He should have listened to my answer before he asked the question.

We are leading the developed world in every important economic category. Those guys can talk about a fake lake but what we are learning in these coalition talks is that they have a fake party over there.

**Mr. Mark Holland (Ajax—Pickering, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the largest deficit in Canadian history, apparently, was not enough for those guys. They think an extra \$1 billion of debt to hold one of the most expensive meetings ever held was a good idea.

The government has given up on using security as an excuse for spending tens of millions of dollars on gazebos, fountains, a fake lake, fiddlers and a great wall of plants. Now it says that it is good for tourism.

Does the government think the G8 and G20 journalists sitting around their fake lake work for the *Lonely Planet*?

While the world laughs at Canada's government, the only message getting out is that the Conservatives should not hold meetings on fiscal restraint. Who signed off on this stuff? How did it get so out of control?

**Hon. Jim Flaherty (Minister of Finance, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the people who live in Ajax—Pickering know that our country has the best fiscal situation in the G7. We have the highest credit rating in the G7. We have the soundest financial system. We will have the strongest growth in the G7 not only this year but next year. The people who live in Ajax—Pickering know this well and they can find a replacement for the current member.

**Mr. Mark Holland (Ajax—Pickering, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives inherited that situation and they are working hard to blow it. While the government hides behind security and tourism to justify blowing \$1 billion for a fake lighthouse, a fake lake and other waste, it hides behind a security firm that is not even licensed to work the summits. It has no approval to work in Ontario.

At the same time the Conservatives spin this total mess, they have ignored real security concerns. While they were busy blowing \$1 billion, they said no to a \$50 million tax credit that would have

safeguarded stocks of ammonium nitrate, 1,500 kilograms of which is now missing.

Why could the Conservatives not divert some of this waste to real priorities and protect Canadians instead of just themselves?

**Hon. Vic Toews (Minister of Public Safety, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the safety and security of Canadians is of the utmost importance to this government, yet that member continually denies we have security problems in the country. That is why we are spending money to ensure that our communities are safe and that we have the best plans in place for the upcoming G8 and G20 summits.

We understand there is a police investigation going on, led by the Niagara Regional Police Service. The RCMP is providing assistance as requested and we will be kept informed of development as the investigation continues.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister plans to talk about fiscal restraint at the G8 and G20 summits. But no one would say he is leading by example. First, he had a theme pavilion built for the foreign media at a cost of \$1.9 million. Then he had a fake lake built just steps from Lake Ontario. Finally, he paid the modest sum of \$400,000 to restore an old steamboat that will be ready months after the summits.

Does the Prime Minister realize that this charade is totally ridiculous?

• (1430)

**Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Canada has the healthiest public finances in the western world. We have the lowest deficit of any major developed country. It is true that we are spending \$2 million on a pavilion to promote Canadian tourism, and we have strong support from that very important Canadian industry.

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, to justify this frivolous spending, the Prime Minister says that the G8 and G20 summits will serve as a showcase to attract foreign tourists to Canada.

Does he really think he is going to attract tourists with a fake lake, cardboard decorations and stuffed moose? Is he not afraid that foreign journalists will see this as just a plain old bear trap?

**Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the G20 summit, which will bring thousands of influential guests from different parts of the world, is an excellent opportunity to promote Canadian tourism. We have the support of the Ontario and Canadian tourism industry. I am well aware that the Bloc does not want to promote Canada.

*Oral Questions*

**Mr. Pierre Paquette (Joliette, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, when they were in opposition, the Conservatives railed against the Liberals' waste and patronage. They promised to change things. By buying themselves an artificial lake and flooding the Minister of Industry's riding with projects that have nothing to do with the G8 and G20, they are proving that they are capable, like the Liberals, of the worst abuses and excesses.

Will the government admit that its only concern is to buy the re-election of the Minister of Industry and certainly not to keep spending associated with holding the G8 and G20 meetings under control?

**Hon. John Baird (Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, we have funded infrastructure projects in every region of our country with our economic action plan. Investments in infrastructure and municipalities create jobs. That is the case in Quebec City and in Muskoka; that is the case everywhere. We are very proud of the 300,000 new jobs created in Canada over the past year. And we are not finished; a great deal of work remains to be done.

**Mr. Pierre Paquette (Joliette, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, under the guise of good management, the government requires community groups and festivals, even the smallest festivals, to submit solid business plans to obtain even very meagre grants.

What would have been the government's response if an association had submitted a project to organize an international conference with an artificial lake beside a real lake, with cardboard scenery, virtual surroundings, a steamboat that would be ready after the event, and bear-proof garbage cans?

What would have been the government's response? Once again, with the Conservatives, there is a double standard: do as I say, not as I do.

**Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is quite clear that much of the cost of the G8 and G20 events is due to security. A tiny portion of the cost is for the promotion of not just Ontario, but also Canada. We are proud to be welcoming all these people who will spread the good news about Canada throughout the world.

\* \* \*

**JOBS AND ECONOMIC GROWTH ACT**

**Hon. Jack Layton (Toronto—Danforth, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Liberal-Conservative coalition were working together against the public interest.

They authorized the sale of Atomic Energy of Canada Limited. They initiated the privatization of Canada Post. They cleaned out the surplus in the employment insurance fund, authorizing the theft of \$57 billion from the pockets of workers.

Is the Prime Minister proud of having endorsed the \$57 billion theft by the Liberals?

**Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I have only one question: if the leader of the NDP thinks such terrible things about the Liberals and is accusing them of working with us, why does he want to form a coalition with them?

• (1435)

[*English*]

**Hon. Jack Layton (Toronto—Danforth, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Liberal-Conservative coalition rammed through its 100th confidence motion. Normally we would ask that it at least get a marriage certificate after that, but the Prime Minister got his misguided budget through, thanks to the coalition of the unwilling. What else will this group support? The privatization of the CBC, an extension of the war in Afghanistan? What is next for the coalition?

**Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the leader of the NDP denounces the Liberal Party, which I suppose is a noble cause, but at the same time as he is denouncing the Liberal Party, he is secretly having negotiations to form the coalition with him. I wish he would make up his mind.

**Hon. Jack Layton (Toronto—Danforth, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I really do not need to take lessons in secrecy from the specialists.

Billions are being spent on fake lakes and bloated security, while Canada's first nations deal with the crisis of housing, education and health care. Aboriginal communities in Canada have a tuberculosis rate 35 times higher than non-aboriginal Canadians, suicide 11 times higher than the national average and 19% of our inmates are aboriginal.

Will the government at least put as much effort into that as it has in protecting the banks?

**Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC):** Once again, Mr. Speaker, the government has taken strong action on this. One of the things we will discuss at the G8 is the child and maternal health initiative, which I note has been strongly supported by many international parties this week.

At the same time, I go back, and this is just really the blindness of the NDP. We are not protecting the Canadian banks. We are protecting the Canadian economy.

We are not going to have an economy that is forced to pay for bailouts that happened in other countries. We are standing up for Canada. The leader of the NDP should at least learn to stand up for the things—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

**G8 AND G20 SUMMITS**

**Hon. Marlene Jennings (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is time for the government to disclose the full extent of this huge waste of money, which Canadians of all political stripes find scandalous.

When will the Conservatives reveal the total cost of these summits? When will they disclose the whole budget to Canadians? Canadians have the right to know where their money was spent. When will we get a detailed budget?



*Oral Questions*

**Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, as I said, most of the costs are associated with security-related expenses. Some of the money will be spent on promoting our country. Most importantly, however, all of these expenses, all of that money was budgeted, and that party supported our budget yesterday.

**Hon. Marlene Jennings (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, they say that “Lake Waste” will cost just \$57,000, but we know that is not true. That \$57,000 is for the plastic pool liner and the water to fill it. Their sneaky accounting leaves out all kinds of associated costs: design and construction of the fake lake and the giant screen hanging over it.

When will the Conservatives confess to the true cost of their fake campground?

**Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, once again, we have been very open and transparent about our intention to promote our country. We will create ways to show Canada off to the world, and we will do that in the short time we have. Three thousand media people, a huge number of delegates and TV viewers around the world will see Canada at its best, and our government will make sure that happens.

• (1440)

[*English*]

**Mr. Michael Savage (Dartmouth—Cole Harbour, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians have gone from amazement, to shock, to anger over the Conservatives' billion dollar summits. There is even a contest now to name the fake lake. What would we call it? We have heard the “blue lagoon” or “lake waste” or the “excess pool”.

Given how angry Canadians are, how about we use the phrase coined by a truly great Canadian and call it the “fuddle duddle puddle”, or we could call it exactly what it is. We can call it “lake how in the hell can a country with rising poverty rates squander a billion dollars on a meeting”.

**Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, once again, as I indicated, a majority of these costs are going to security, the security initiatives, for the purpose of protecting the people who are here. An amount of the money will be provided to promote our country to ensure that those people who come to Canada will be able to see Canada. At the same time, those who are viewers and spectators will be able to see Canada under that light.

I have a suggestion. If he is looking for a name for the lake, why does he not call it “lake Gomery”.

**Mr. Michael Savage (Dartmouth—Cole Harbour, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is getting absolutely bizarre. We have learned now that the Conservatives are selling off real lighthouses in Canada, including the famous Peggy's Cove lighthouse, but it is full steam ahead for fake lighthouses to guard the G20 fake lake. Real lighthouses, we do not want that. Fake lighthouses, go to the head of the line. It is like a skit out of Monty Python, except it is not funny.

Governments make choices. How can this one choose to spend billions of dollars on a weekend when child poverty rates are on the rises, people line up at food banks and people are worried about their pensions?

**Hon. Gail Shea (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, on May 27, DFO published a list of lighthouses deemed surplus to the Coast Guard, as required under the Heritage Lighthouse Protection Act.

We have had a lighthouse divestiture process for many years. However, this is the first step under the new act for long-term strengthened protection for very precious, most beloved lighthouses

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

**COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE**

**Mrs. Carole Freeman (Châteauguay—Saint-Constant, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the ethics committee now considers that the Prime Minister's director of communications has been summoned to appear. However, Dimitri Soudas has rejected the motion passed by the committee on Tuesday, and he still has no intention of explaining his behaviour to the parliamentary committee.

Can the Prime Minister tell us if he instructed his director of communications not to appear before the ethics committee despite the motion that was passed on Tuesday?

**Mr. Pierre Poilievre (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the decision has already been made. Our government will continue to respect the tradition that goes back hundreds of years, which states that ministers, and not political assistants, are responsible for explaining and defending the government's agenda.

**Mr. Michel Guimond (Montmorency—Charlevoix—Haute-Côte-Nord, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my colleague's question is of utmost importance because it has an impact on all committee work. I will ask it again because if it was the Prime Minister who ordered Dimitri Soudas not to appear before the committee, he, too, is at risk of being found in contempt of Parliament.

Can the Prime Minister confirm whether he personally instructed his director of communications not to testify, despite the committee's order?

**Mr. Pierre Poilievre (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the government as a whole made this decision. We will continue the tradition that has been followed for more than three centuries, which holds ministers responsible for explaining the government's position in the House and at committees. This tradition is has lasted a long time because it works well in our democracy. And that is our decision.

\* \* \*

• (1445)

**FOREIGN AFFAIRS**

**Ms. Francine Lalonde (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the United Nations Security Council has passed a resolution to impose sanctions on Iran over its refusal to respect the nuclear non-proliferation treaty.

*Oral Questions*

Does Canada—which is campaigning for a seat on the Security Council—intend to demand that Iran comply with that resolution?

**Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, yes.

**Ms. Francine Lalonde (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, we are delighted that the government supports the Security Council's decision. However, should it not also support resolutions 1850 and 1860, which call for the regular flow of humanitarian aid and food into Gaza?

We do not understand how the government can support the resolution concerning Iran, yet dodge the issue when the resolutions have to do with to Israel.

Does the Conservative policy consist of supporting the Security Council's resolutions when it suits them and ignoring the others?

**Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, let us be clear. We fully support the free flow of humanitarian aid to the people of Gaza, but we also support Israel's right to inspect the ships to ensure that weapons and other military equipment do not reach Gaza.

\* \* \*

**BANKING SECTOR**

**Hon. John McCallum (Markham—Unionville, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we are two weeks away from the G20 summit and after more than a year of discussions, the new banking regulations are far from complete.

Instead of working on these regulations, the Conservatives went on a crusade against a global bank tax that never really stood a chance.

What exactly are Canadian families getting out of this billion dollars the Conservatives are spending?

[*English*]

**Hon. Jim Flaherty (Minister of Finance, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that the member for Markham—Unionville would not understand that a tax on Canadian banks would be passed on to Canadian consumers, so what he is actually advocating for is to put a tax on Canadian customers of banks.

What an odd thing to do, given that Canadian banks and Canadian taxpayers were not involved in any kind of bailout, unlike our friends in the United States and Europe. Why would he want to punish customers of Canadian banks?

**Hon. John McCallum (Markham—Unionville, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we are opposed to the global bank tax. The point is that the minister's opposition to this tax was a phony crusade and a calculated distraction.

Countries like Korea, Japan, China, Brazil, Mexico and India were never going to back it. Yet, the government sent ministers all over the world in a show of phony bravado.

Just how much did taxpayers spend for ministerial publicity stunts in Washington, Mumbai and Shanghai to thwart something that never had a chance of getting through in the first place?

**Hon. Jim Flaherty (Minister of Finance, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, just the contrary.

Again, I am surprised that the member for Markham—Unionville, having been employed by the Royal Bank of Canada, would not understand how important it was for Canada and the Prime Minister to show leadership on this issue because there were a few countries that actually wanted to impose this tax on Canadians.

We were not willing and we are not willing to impose this tax on Canadians, which apparently the Liberal opposition wants to do.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

**OIL AND GAS SECTOR**

**Hon. Geoff Regan (Halifax West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Natural Resources has to stop misleading Canadians about liability in the event of a major oil spill. The current rules are clear: automatic liability is limited to \$30 million on the east coast and \$40 million elsewhere. Companies are not necessarily held accountable for 100% of the damages and the cleanup costs.

Will the minister make the necessary legislative changes to make companies 100% liable?

**Hon. Christian Paradis (Minister of Natural Resources, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the members opposite have to stop scaring Canadians. We have one of the most solid systems in the world. We have a strict liability regime. Saying that absolute liability is limited is one thing, but there is also unlimited civil liability. That is what my colleague is not saying.

Again, no project will be approved here unless the regulators are convinced that the health of the workers and the protection of the environment will be ensured.

● (1450)

[*English*]

**Hon. Geoff Regan (Halifax West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, like yesterday, the minister claims there is absolute liability and companies must provide guarantees. Maybe he should read section 167 of the Canada-Nova Scotia Offshore Petroleum Resources Accord Implementation Act because he will see the section sets a cap of \$30 million. There is no guarantee of liability beyond that. The gulf blowout costs are already approaching \$2 billion.

Why will the minister not protect Canadian taxpayers and ensure oil companies assume full liability? Cap the leak, not the liability.

**Hon. Christian Paradis (Minister of Natural Resources, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, we have to be clear here. We enforce world-class standards. Oil and gas rigs in the Canadian offshore, the equipment and operator training must meet these strict standards. Offshore companies must have an emergency response plan and back-up contingency plans approved by responsible regulators before any authorization to drill is issued.

Canadian regulators will not allow any offshore activity unless they are convinced that the environment and the safety of the workers will be protected.

\* \* \*

#### FOREIGN AFFAIRS

**Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions the Iranian leader has expressed hostile feelings toward Israel, indifference toward the United Nations, and blatant disregard for the International Atomic Energy Agency. If Iran's nuclear program is not contained, this situation could quickly turn into the most serious and most dangerous situation our generation will ever have to face. It undermines global non-proliferation efforts, and it undermines global peace and security.

Could the Prime Minister please tell the House what the government is doing to hold Iran to account for its deplorable actions?

[Translation]

**Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Foreign Affairs just said, Canada fully supports the UN Security Council's recent series of sanctions against Iran.

[English]

Our concern about Iran's nuclear program is, of course, a long held position of this government. We welcome the latest round of sanctions voted upon by the United Nations Security Council. Canada will do everything in its power to work with our partners to fully implement those sanctions.

\* \* \*

#### G8 AND G20 SUMMITS

**Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Industry used his office to hawk floor cleaning products, the Prime Minister gave him the thumbs up. When he raided federal coffers to build gazebos, raise sunken boats, and build fake lakes with fake canoes, the Prime Minister said it would put us on the international map. Well, we are on the map now. Thanks to the Mad Hatter of Muskoka, we have become an international laughing stock.

Either the Prime Minister shares the outrage that average Canadians are feeling or he supports his \$1 billion booty run by ShamWow Tony.

**Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, let us be clear here. A good part of the costs for the G8 will involve security matters. Another part will be involving the promotion of Canada, for which we are extremely proud.

I would invite my colleague to get on board to promote Canada and help us do the best thing possible. Of course, we know every time we have something that is put forward in the House, the NDP votes against it.

**Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, he is not going to get his free set of Muskoka steak knives with excuses like that.

#### Oral Questions

Let us be clear. The cost of this shindig would lift every senior citizen in this country out of poverty. Instead, it is being blown on ridiculous ego projects backed by even more ridiculous excuses.

Do the Conservatives really think that changing the name of the fake lake to a reflecting pond, a water feature or an international tourist pavilion will fool Canadians? They have abused our trust. They have abused taxpayers' dollars.

Why are they abusing the intelligence of average Canadians with pitiful endorsements of this discredited minister?

**Mr. Pierre Poilievre (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, that member and his questions are like ShamWow without the wow. This is a member who promised his constituents election after election that he would vote to scrap the wasteful billion dollar Liberal long gun registry. Then, when members of this side tried to hold him accountable, he made insulting comments about them.

Why does he not face the fact that he is in the process of joining with his coalition pals to break his word and break his trust with his own constituents on the gun registry?

\* \* \*

● (1455)

[Translation]

#### AFGHANISTAN

**Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the Conservative government is going before the Federal Court to try to get out of a request from the Military Police Complaints Commission, which is calling for access to some important documents regarding the allegations of torture of Afghan prisoners.

Why is the government using the courts to avoid being held accountable? What does this government have to hide?

**Hon. Rob Nicholson (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, that is not true. It is quite the contrary.

[English]

The government is, of course, party to these actions. It appears before the courts to make sure that all legislation is complied with in this country. I cannot understand why the hon. member would not be supportive of that in all circumstances.

[Translation]

**Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, it is simple. The government is obstructing the Military Police Complaints Commission, and is interfering with its work. Furthermore, it is dragging its feet regarding the agreement to reveal information on the torture of Afghan prisoners.

Mr. Speaker, how can the government claim to respect your decision, when it is doing everything it can to avoid shedding light on its involvement in the torture of Afghan prisoners?

*Oral Questions**[English]*

**Hon. Rob Nicholson (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the hon. member that he discuss this with some of his colleagues. There are ongoing negotiations and ongoing meetings. Those meetings are going well.

We have always indicated, throughout this process, that we want to do nothing to compromise national security or do anything that would jeopardize the men and women who are serving this country. That, of course, should have the support of all hon. members.

**Hon. Ujjal Dosanjh (Vancouver South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this has really nothing to do with transparency, accountability or national security. It has to do with the obstruction of justice by the government. It has been obstructing the commission since February 2007. Now, it wants to obtain a court order to prevent the release of the documents recently found in the shipping container in Kandahar.

Why is the Conservative government hiding things from Canadians? I would like to know what it is hiding in those shipping containers in Kandahar with respect to those documents.

**Hon. Rob Nicholson (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome this member back to his file. He is concerned for Afghan prisoners, but this government has been consistent. We have stood up for national security. We have stood up for the safety of the men and women in uniform. I wish that he would get on his feet for once and praise those individuals who are standing up for what is right in Afghanistan.

**Hon. Ujjal Dosanjh (Vancouver South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we all support our troops, but the refuge that this member is seeking is the refuge of the scoundrel. Ultimately, these are the same documents that Parliament is seeking, pursuant to your order, Mr. Speaker, and the government is currently in discussions with the opposition to make arrangements for that access.

Does this obstructionist application in the courts with respect to the commission mean that Parliament is not going to have access to these documents, contrary to your order, Mr. Speaker?

**Hon. Rob Nicholson (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, that of course, is a bunch of nonsense. This government has been completely co-operative. Good advice is being provided by dedicated public servants on all these matters.

If the hon. member says that he wants to stand up for the Canadian Forces, why have the last 300 questions he has asked on this concerned Taliban prisoners? Why does he not ask a question in support of our men and women in uniform, just to mix it up for a change?

\* \* \*

**ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS**

**Ms. Megan Leslie (Halifax, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, there are fake lakes, gazebos, \$1 billion in security, and yet we stand by and watch as TB rates continue to grow in first nations communities.

The government is well aware of the health crisis. TB rates among aboriginal Canadians are 35 times higher than those of non-

aboriginals, and Health Canada has just cut funding for prevention programs.

The health committee has investigated this issue. We know what the solutions are.

Would the minister commit to act quickly and not let this report languish on her desk for months?

**Hon. Leona Aglukkaq (Minister of Health, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, our government is committed to the health and safety of Canadians. As a minister from the north, I know full well the impact of tuberculosis in our communities.

Our government has almost doubled the spending on the prevention and treatment of tuberculosis in our aboriginal communities. We continue to support health care in the provinces and territories by increasing the transfer payments by 6% this year as well.

The approach we are taking is broader than prevention. We are also investing in housing, nutritious food, clean water, poverty. Bill C-32, the tobacco legislation—

• (1500)

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusking.

**Mrs. Carol Hughes (Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusking, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the government's handling of the HST has shown a continuing disrespect toward Canada's first nations.

The Chiefs Council of the Union of B.C. Indian Chiefs has put its support behind a legal challenge to the implementation of the HST. The Conservatives only agreed to talk to Ontario first nations about the loss of point of sale exemptions after they threatened a summer of blockades and protests.

When will the government start treating first nations as equals instead of as second-tier nations and finally deal with the screw-up on the HST?

**Hon. Jim Flaherty (Minister of Finance, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the member is behind the times on this subject. We have actually had constructive negotiations with the Government of Ontario and the first nations. I expect that we will be able to work out a resolution of the issue over the course of several weeks. We have had discussions of late, most recently on Monday.

I welcome the hon. member to get up to speed on the subject.

\* \* \*

**MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH**

**Ms. Lois Brown (Newmarket—Aurora, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, through the Prime Minister's G8 initiative, our government is working toward saving the lives of women and children by advancing maternal and child health.

Will the Minister for Status of Women please update the House on the response from the international community?

*Oral Questions*

**Hon. Rona Ambrose (Minister of Public Works and Government Services and Minister for Status of Women, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I am proud that the international community is supporting our G8 initiative to save the lives of women and children. In fact, Hillary Clinton recently said:

We commend the Canadian government for focusing attention on this issue by offering a flagship initiative on maternal and child health at the upcoming G8 meeting.

Melinda Gates also praised us by saying:

Canada is proposing a bold but achievable plan that can save countless lives, and I hope all G8 members will lend their strong support.

The international community is supporting us. I wish the opposition would.

**Hon. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, if anyone from the Conservative government actually dared to attend the women's health summit in Washington this week and would take the time to listen, he or she would learn the facts about maternal and infant mortality, evidence-based care, and actual ways to save lives. Here is a fact: 70,000 women die each year in Africa from unsafe abortions.

By continuing to refuse to fund safe abortion services, is the Minister of International Cooperation saying that the lives of these women are not worth saving?

**Hon. Rona Ambrose (Minister for Status of Women, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of International Cooperation is in Washington today to share with the international community how our government is focused on saving the lives of women and children. In fact, in Washington, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton has praised Canada. She said:

We commend the Canadian government for focusing attention on this issue by offering a flagship initiative on maternal and child health at the upcoming G8 meeting.

Secretary of State Hillary Clinton supports us. The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation supports us. Development aid agencies around the world support us. Why does the opposition not support us?

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS**

**Mr. Marc Lemay (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday, my colleague from Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel told the government about the disturbing situation in the community of Kanesatake. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs downplayed the events and essentially said it was up to the municipality to manage the potential crisis. Yet the government can put a stop to this new risk of confrontation immediately, instead of denying the events that led to the 1990 Oka crisis.

When will the government stop being so short-sighted and put in place—

**The Speaker:** The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs.

[English]

**Mr. John Duncan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, CPC):** Mr. Speaker,

we continue to monitor the situation. We are working with the first nation to resolve outstanding issues in the best interests of the Mohawks of Kanesatake and the wider community. We believe that dialogue remains the best venue to resolve this problem.

\* \* \*

● (1505)

**ASBESTOS**

**Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, asbestos is the greatest industrial killer the world has ever known. More Canadians die from asbestos than all other industrial causes combined, yet Canada continues to be one of the largest producers in the world, dumping 200,000 tonnes a year into developing nations such as India and Indonesia, where there are virtually no health and safety protocols.

Instead of being one of the world's cheerleaders and boosters of asbestos, why does the government not stop giving corporate welfare to these corporate serial killers and ban asbestos once and for all, as the rest of the developing nations have? Why does the government continue to give them money and support this killer of an industry?

[Translation]

**Hon. Christian Paradis (Minister of Natural Resources, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, for the past 30 years, Canada has taken a safe approach to using chrysotile asbestos. Moreover, recent scientific journals report that chrysotile asbestos can be used safely.

\* \* \*

[English]

**JUSTICE**

**Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon (Miramichi, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, impaired driving remains the most common cause of death by criminal means. It was just over two years ago that our government's bill, the Tackling Violent Crime Act, received royal assent. Among other things, it closed the loophole that could allow a person involved in the most serious accidents to refuse to provide a breath sample. Today, impaired drivers can be charged with a criminal offence if they refuse to do so.

Could the Minister of Justice please update this House on the status of this file?

**Hon. Rob Nicholson (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is true. Thanks to our Tackling Violent Crime Act, we have tougher mandatory penalties for people convicted of impaired driving. What we also did in that act was finally get rid of the so-called two beer defence.

*Routine Proceedings*

In our efforts to make our streets safer, I am pleased to see that our auto theft bill is back from the Senate. I am calling upon the members of the opposition coalition to put aside their ideological problems and support this important piece of legislation. Canadians deserve safer streets.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

**PRESENCE IN GALLERY**

**The Speaker:** I would like to draw to the attention of hon. members the presence in the gallery of His Excellency Mr. Abdou Diouf, Secretary-General of la Francophonie.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear!

[*English*]

**The Speaker:** I would also like to draw to the attention of hon. members the presence in the gallery of the Hon. Kamalsh Sharma, Secretary-General of the Commonwealth.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear!

---

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

[*English*]

**CHIEF ELECTORAL OFFICER**

**The Speaker:** I have the honour to lay upon the table a report of the Chief Electoral Officer entitled, "Responding to Changing Needs: Recommendations from the Chief Electoral Officer of Canada Following the 40th General Election".

\* \* \*

**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 responses to nine petitions.

\* \* \*

**CANADA CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY ACT**

**Hon. Leona Aglukkaq (Minister of Health, CPC)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-36, An Act respecting the safety of consumer products.

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

\* \* \*

**ELDER ABUSE AWARENESS**

**Hon. Diane Ablonczy (Minister of State (Seniors), CPC):** Mr. Speaker, on June 15, Canada will join countries around the world in marking the fifth annual World Elder Abuse Awareness Day.

I am pleased to say that also on June 15 there will be an International Elder Abuse Awareness Conference in Toronto. The conference will feature presentations on elder abuse initiatives across Canada and around the world. It will also focus partially on youth

and intergenerational activities that promote awareness of elder abuse.

Taking action against this very serious issue begins with education, by teaching all Canadians to recognize the signs and symptoms of elder abuse and where to go for help, and empowerment, by encouraging older Canadians to speak up, individually and collectively.

We are taking steps on these two fundamentals. In budget 2008, we committed \$13 million over three years to help raise awareness about elder abuse and to aid seniors and all Canadians in dealing with this issue.

As part of the initiative, we launched a national elder abuse awareness campaign in 2009. The "Elder abuse, it is time to face the reality" campaign reached out to Canadians of all ages through television, print, and the Internet.

As members know, the priority of this government is always the safety and security of Canadians. Therefore, we see the issue of elder abuse as a very serious one. That is why I am pleased to announce that we will be launching a new phase of the elder abuse awareness campaign across the country in the fall.

The campaign aims to help seniors, as well as all Canadians, recognize the signs and symptoms of elder abuse and exploitation in all its forms—physical, financial, sexual, psychological, and neglect—and to provide important information on the support that is available.

Furthermore, budget 2010 provides an additional \$10 million over two years to the new horizons for seniors program, bringing the program total for the next two years to \$80 million. This enhanced funding will support projects that focus on volunteering among seniors and on raising awareness about the financial exploitation of seniors.

The new horizons for seniors program also has an elder abuse awareness funding component. Through this funding, new educational and awareness resources about elder abuse will be available. These will again help improve quality of life, safety, and security for seniors and will enable non-profit organizations and coalitions to raise awareness on a national or regional level.

As the Minister of State for Seniors, I am proud of the work this government is doing to empower older Canadians. On June 15, I encourage all Canadians to focus on ways to join in the fight against elder abuse.

•(1510)

**Hon. Judy Sgro (York West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, June 15 is World Elder Abuse Awareness Day and, as the official opposition critic for seniors, I am particularly pleased to address this matter today.

I should also add that as a GTA MP, I am very pleased that the University of Toronto will be the host site for the International Elder Abuse Awareness Conference next week, a conference predicated on the statement, “World Day...Five Years Later”.

In essence, the statement celebrates past successes in addressing elder abuse but ponders what is yet to be done. As a legislator, I can say that strides have been made during the past few years but there is still much to do.

For example, as far back as 2003, then Liberal MP, Diane Marleau, presented Bill C-439, an act to establish the office of the ombudsman for older adult justice and the Canadian older adult justice agency. That legislative package was one of the first to raise the issue of elder abuse to the national stage. It was also part of an effort to underscore the looming issues associated with an aging population, issues that need our immediate attention.

If we fail to address these issues with a comprehensive national vision, we risk the long-term sustainability of national social programs, we promise to hinder our productivity and, worst of all, we will have failed in our moral obligation to protect an important segment of our society.

In the next 20 years, a large portion of our society will have celebrated their 65th birthday. Statistics Canada estimates that Canada's population over the age of 65 could reach an unprecedented 10.9 million by 2036. With this, as the Canadian population continues to age, new financial and logistical challenges will emerge; issues that include elder abuse, poverty and quality of life.

In a country like Canada, it is unacceptable that senior citizens anywhere would be subjected to abuse, poverty and squalor during their retirement years. Governments and societal agencies must take the lead and be prepared to step up and do their share. Resting on our laurels should never be a substitute for future action.

We must consider and implement private and public retirement savings options, stiff and unwavering Criminal Code penalties for those who abuse, mistreat or deceive the elderly, and decisive interventions when issues of ill health, poverty and isolation are identified.

Like the delegates who will attend the International Elder Abuse Awareness Conference next week, I am anxious to take the steps, along with my party, that are required to end elder abuse in Canada and around the world.

In the spirit of co-operation that should more often permeate this place, I would urge rapid government action to effectively tackle these important issues and I would offer my support for the same.

•(1515)

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Carole Freeman (Châteauguay—Saint-Constant, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I must point out that June 15 is World Elder Abuse

### *Routine Proceedings*

Awareness Day. Our fathers, mothers, grandfathers, grandmothers, uncles and aunts are the ones who built our society. They laid the groundwork for the development of Quebec society, which moved into the next stage with the Quiet Revolution. They are the ones who ensured that our family history will be passed down from generation to generation. What could be better than hearing our elders recount their version of our history?

However, despite the respect that most of us have for seniors, there are unfortunately far too many cases of mistreatment, which can go as far as physical or emotional abuse, fraud or neglect. The mistreatment of seniors is a taboo subject. Some experts estimate that 10% of seniors are subject to mistreatment. They cannot or choose not to inform the authorities or loved ones who can help them. Some witnesses keep quiet, do not know what to do, or do not have the wherewithal to react appropriately.

In Quebec, the SOS abuse information package launched in January 2010 provides stakeholders and seniors with a host of abuse detection tools as well as material on prevention, training and intervention. The Association québécoise de défense des droits des personnes retraitées et préretraitées and the Réseau québécois pour contrer les abus envers les aînés launched their project in January 2008 through Quebec-wide consultations. The results are now available in the 18 administrative regions of Quebec and close to 1,300 stakeholders are benefiting from it.

The Bloc Québécois is proud to acknowledge today the support provided by these agencies that are so crucial to social cohesion in Quebec.

These are not the only initiatives on the matter that have been taken in Quebec. In the coming days we are waiting to hear the results of two consecutive years of consultation by Quebec, which will launch its own plan to fight elder abuse. Quebec will acknowledge this international day on June 15 in its own right, as it has done in the past.

The Bloc Québécois joins Quebec in underscoring the desire of Canadians to do their part to raise awareness about and prevent elder abuse and would like its colleagues in the House to show the same openness to what is already being done in Quebec.

This is a day on which we must join forces and stand up for what we believe in so that our seniors may lead their lives to the full and in dignity. Dignity must be our common goal, and dignity is inevitably dependent on the income available to seniors. It is undeniable that the living conditions of each and every one of us are dictated by income. It is no different for seniors. Be it food, housing, health, travel or social life, financial independence is key to living a full life.

I see that my time is up, but I just want to say that—

**The Speaker:** I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but her time has run out. The hon. member for Hamilton East—Stoney Creek.

*Routine Proceedings**[English]*

**Mr. Wayne Marston (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, on June 15, New Democrats will join Canadians and countries around the world in marking the fifth annual World Elder Abuse Awareness Day.

In my view, the Conservative government has only begun to scratch the surface of this serious problem as Canadians begin to face the enormous challenge of adapting to our aging population.

Young families often face the situation where their parents do not have the income to sustain a reasonable set of living conditions and so, must live with their children. This group of younger caregivers have gained the moniker of the “sandwich generation” and they do feel trapped or sandwiched between the normal pressures of raising a family of their own and the care so often required by their parents.

The minister noted the June 15 World Elder Abuse Awareness Conference in Toronto but I would remind the House that the New Democrats started addressing the problem facing our aging our population when we introduced our seniors charter during the previous Parliament.

Our motion laid out a thoughtful plan as to how we should respond to this serious need. We proposed guaranteeing income security for seniors through a retirement income system under which OAS and GIS payments would be adequate to ensure seniors do not slide into poverty.

The seniors charter also included recommendations for safe, comfortable accommodations geared to a cost of 30% of income.

Under the provisions of our charter, seniors' health and well-being would be addressed further with a commitment to ensure the availability of secure public health care system.

I would remind the House that the New Democrats' seniors charter passed unanimously.

Just last June, once again New Democrats led the way with our opposition day motion that laid out a road map to retirement income security for pensioners. We called for an immediate increase to the guaranteed income supplement to raise seniors out of poverty. Our motion said that we must also prepare for the future by doubling CPP.

As a backstop to the type of crisis many seniors have faced in this recession, following the collapse of so many companies, we proposed a national pension insurance plan. This motion, like the seniors charter, was passed with the unanimous support of all parties in the House.

The New Democrats have committed ourselves to ensuring the well-being of the current and future generations of seniors. Elder abuse is as much a symbol of a historic failure of governments to prepare for the boomer generation's retirement as it is a direct problem of its own.

We, the Parliament of Canada, are charged with the care and protection of all Canadians. We must do so much more than we have to date. We must ensure our seniors are not seen as a burden on younger Canadians but, rather, are empowered to live out their senior years to their fullest, to offer the abundance of their knowledge and

experience to younger generations, and to receive the respect from Canadians that they so richly deserve.

\* \* \*

● (1520)

**COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE**

## PUBLIC SAFETY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

**Mr. Mark Holland (Ajax—Pickering, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 97.1(1), I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the second report of the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security in relation to Bill C-391, An Act to amend the Criminal Code and the Firearms Act.

*[Translation]*

## INDUSTRY, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

**Hon. Michael Chong (Wellington—Halton Hills, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the fourth report of the Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Technology concerning the study of the statutory review of the Canada Business Corporations Act.

*[English]*

## ACCESS TO INFORMATION, PRIVACY AND ETHICS

**Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the eighth report of the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics in relation to the certificate of nomination of Suzanne Legault, the nominee for the position of Information Commissioner of Canada.

Your committee has considered the proposed amendment of Ms. Legault as Information Commissioner of Canada and reports its unanimous support for her appointment.

Further, we recommend that the government proceed with the appointment as provided by Standing Order 111.1(2) and that the House do ratify this appointment.

*[Translation]*

## TRANSPORT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND COMMUNITIES

**Mr. Merv Tweed (Brandon—Souris, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the third report of the Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities concerning Bill C-442, An Act to establish a National Holocaust Monument.

● (1525)

*[English]*

The committee has studied the bill and has decided to report the bill back to the House, with amendments.

Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet, I move:

That the House do now proceed to orders of the day.

**The Speaker:** 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 nays have it.

*And five or more members having risen:*

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

• (1605)

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

*(Division No. 64)*

**YEAS**

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Aglukkaq	Albrecht
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Allison
Ambrose	Anders
Anderson	Armstrong
Arthur	Ashfield
Baird	Benoit
Bernier	Bezan
Blackburn	Blaney
Block	Boucher
Boughen	Braid
Breitkreuz	Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)	Brown (Barrie)
Bruinooge	Cadman
Calandra	Calkins
Cannan (Kelowna—Lake Country)	Cannon (Pontiac)
Carrie	Casson
Chong	Clarke
Clement	Cummins
Davidson	Day
Dechert	Del Mastro
Devolin	Dreeshen
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)	Dykstra
Fast	Finley
Flaherty	Fletcher
Galipeau	Gallant
Généreux	Glover
Goldring	Gourde
Grewal	Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Hawn	Hiebert
Hill	Hoback
Hoepfner	Holder
Jean	Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kent	Kerr
Komarnicki	Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Lake	Lauzon
Lebel	Lemieux
Lobb	Lukiwski
Lunn	Lunny
MacKenzie	Mark
McColeman	McLeod
Menzies	Merrifield
Miller	Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
Moore (Fundy Royal)	Nicholson
Norlock	O'Connor
O'Neill-Gordon	Obhrai
Paradis	Payne
Petit	Poilievre
Preston	Raith
Rajotte	Rathgeber
Reid	Richards
Richardson	Rickford

Ritz	Saxton
Scheer	Schellenberger
Shea	Shipley
Shory	Sorenson
Stanton	Storseth
Sweet	Thompson
Tilson	Toews
Trost	Tweed
Uppal	Van Kesteren
Van Loan	Vellacott
Wallace	Warawa
Warkentin	Watson
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)	
Wong	
Woodworth	Yelich
Young — 135	

*Routine Proceedings*

**NAYS**

Members

Allen (Welland)	Angus
Asselin	Atamanenko
Bachand	Bagnell
Bains	Beaudin
Bélanger	Bellavance
Bevington	Bigras
Blais	Bonsant
Bouchard	Brunelle
Byrne	Cardin
Carrier	Charlton
Chow	Christopherson
Coderre	Comartin
Crombie	Cullen
Cuzner	D'Amours
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	Davies (Vancouver East)
Demers	Deschamps
Desnoyers	Dhaliwal
Dhalla	Dion
Donnelly	Dorion
Dryden	Duceppe
Dufour	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)	Easter
Eyking	Faille
Foote	Gagnon
Gaudet	Godin
Gravelle	Guimond (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les
Basques)	
Guimond (Montmorency—Charlevoix—Haute-Côte-Nord)	
Harris (St. John's East)	
Holland	Hughes
Jennings	Julian
Kania	Laforest
Laframboise	Lalonde
Layton	LeBlanc
Lemay	Leslie
Lessard	Lévesque
Malhi	Malo
Malway	Marston
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Martin (Sault Ste. Marie)
Mathysen	McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
McTeague	Ménard
Minna	Mourani
Mulcair	Murphy (Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe)
Murphy (Charlottetown)	Murray
Nadeau	Neville
Oliphant	Ouellet
Pacetti	Paillé (Louis-Hébert)
Patry	Pearson
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Proulx	Rae
Rafferty	Regan
Rodriguez	Rota
Russell	Savage
Savoie	Scarpaleggia
Sgro	Siksay
Silva	Simms
Simson	St-Cyr
Stoffer	Thibeault
Valeriotte	Vincent
Wrzesnewskyj	Zarac — 116

**PAIRED**

Nil

*Government Orders*

**The Speaker:** I declare the motion carried.

I wish to inform the House that because of the ministerial statement, government orders will be extended by 13 minutes.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### CANADA-COLOMBIA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

BILL C-2—TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

**Hon. Jay Hill (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I move:

That in relation to Bill C-2, An Act to implement the Free Trade Agreement between Canada and the Republic of Colombia, the Agreement on the Environment between Canada and the Republic of Colombia and the Agreement on Labour Cooperation between Canada and the Republic of Colombia, not more than one further sitting day shall be allotted to the consideration of the report stage of the bill and one sitting day shall be allotted to the third reading stage of the said bill and, at the expiry of the time provided for government business on the day allotted to the consideration of the report stage and on the day allotted to 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 stage of the bill then under consideration shall be put forthwith and successively without further debate or amendment.

**The Speaker:** Pursuant to Standing Order 67.1, there will now be a 30 minute question period. I invite hon. members who wish to ask questions to rise in their places so that the chair has some idea of the number of members who wish to participate in this question period.

I therefore call upon the hon. member for Burnaby—New Westminster.

• (1610)

**Mr. Peter Julian (Burnaby—New Westminster, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no doubt this is a day of shame and infamy for this Parliament of Canada.

At this time, given the human rights violations in Colombia, there is no doubt that after simply having two hours of debate at report stage, it is shocking that the government brings in the bulldozer of closure. It is a day of infamy for all those Canadians, those thousands of Canadians, who have been writing in to say that the government is wrong, and the Liberals are wrong for propping up a government that has such a shameful human rights record.

Now we know, but I am going to ask this question. Why are the Conservatives bringing in closure now? We know that just the other day we had the release of report from the government that confirms that the number of trade unionists killed in Colombia is rising, and that the targeted killings of African-Colombians, aboriginal people in Colombia, and lesbian and gay community leaders are increasing in Colombia.

We have seen the involvement of president Uribe's brother in the brutal killings by paramilitaries. We have seen the Colombian army attacking striking British Petroleum workers in Colombia. We have seen the paramilitaries attacking unionists in Segovia.

We have seen 30 trade unionists lose their lives so far this year and we have seen the ignominious title of worst country in the world

for trade unionists bestowed on Colombia. Fifty percent of all killings of trade unionists occur in Colombia. It tops the list worldwide.

Is that not the real reason why closure is being invoked today, that with all of these incredible revelations coming forward in the last few days the Liberals and Conservatives are simply embarrassed to have a real debate on this floor, a real democratic debate that allows members of Parliament more than two hours to debate this agreement, and talk about the issues facing Colombians and the appalling human rights violations? Is that not the real reason why they are bringing in the bulldozer today?

**Hon. Peter Van Loan (Minister of International Trade, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, this issue has been debated abundantly in this House, notwithstanding the fervent efforts of the hon. member and his party to filibuster, delay and obstruct in every way possible.

In fact, the hon. member who just spoke, objecting to the lack of opportunities to speak to this bill in the House, has actually risen in this House to speak 71 times on this matter. Hold it, he spoke again. That is now 72 times he has risen in this House to speak to the subject of the Canada-Colombia free trade agreement.

I know he may think that having a chance to speak in this House, personally, 72 times is not enough, but I can say that from this side of the House we have heard quite enough from him to understand the issues and recognize they are not a reason to keep Canada from having the opportunity for the jobs and prosperity that this trade agreement will allow. There is an economic growth potential, and indeed there has been ample time to discuss and debate, including the 72 times he has risen to address it.

[Translation]

**Mr. Jean-Yves Laforest (Saint-Maurice—Champlain, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all Bloc Québécois members, I would like to point out to the minister and to the Conservative government that they have once again hamstrung us, just as they did in committee. They hamstrung us to prevent us from carrying out an in-depth study of this bill, which would implement a trade agreement with one of the world's worst human rights offenders. Colombia's record on this issue is so bad that even the United States, which had already opened free trade negotiations with it, has not pursued the matter because it knows that the human rights issues have not been resolved.

At least the United States is using its proposed agreement to exert pressure on Colombia, but Canada, which is one of the world's most highly industrialized countries, is about to sign an agreement with an outlaw nation. That will not benefit Canada or Quebec at all. We will be doing business with one of the world's biggest pariahs.

*Government Orders*

•(1615)

**Hon. Peter Van Loan:** Madam Speaker, there has been a lot of debate about this free trade agreement between Colombia and Canada. For example, the Bloc Québécois has spoken about this issue throughout numerous speeches from 41 members. That represents a lot of debate on this subject and plenty of opportunities for the Bloc Québécois to express its objections to this free trade agreement, which offers a lot of potential to Canada's workers and a lot of potential for economic growth in both Canada and Colombia. We are satisfied that all of the issues that could have possibly been discussed here have been.

[*English*]

**Mr. Gerald Keddy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I have two quick questions for the minister.

My first question is with regard to the allegations about labour abuses and human rights abuses. This is the first time in over 30 years that Colombia has been taken off the labour watch list. That is significant. There has been no recognition from that at all from the other parties.

My second question to the minister is about the accusations made by the member for Burnaby—New Westminster at committee. He brought forth the terrible accusation that the government of Colombia had murdered 12 members of two different Awa indigenous people's families in the jungle. He insisted that was correct. He insisted that was actually performed by the government. We found out that was not true at all. It was actually his socialist brethren in the FARC who murdered these families. The member totally misled the committee and has still never apologized for that.

I wonder if the minister would care to comment on both of these questions.

**Hon. Peter Van Loan:** Madam Speaker, our government is of the view that Colombia, particularly in recent years, has made considerable progress under the current administration to address issues of human rights, to take on the challenge of dealing with the narco-terrorists, the criminal gangs, who have caused so much disruption and been the source of the human rights violations that we have seen going on in Colombia for some time.

Considerable progress has been made. This free trade agreement is another example of that progress, which helps move along Colombia and improve the living conditions of all Colombians.

My friend raised the issue of the International Labour Organization's watch list in which it lists countries that have problems respecting workers' rights. After 21 years of being on that list, during president Uribe's administration, Colombia moved off that list because of exactly the improvements and living conditions that we have seen.

The International Labour Organization, the United Nations-based organization, is a respected organization. I did believe that the NDP respected its views but apparently that is not a view shared by the hon. NDP member. We certainly think it is consistent with what we have seen.

We have parallel agreements to deal with the environment and labour in this free trade agreement. The parallel agreement dealing with labour secures the fundamental rights of workers, the freedom of association and the like. These are all things that are protected within the agreement.

They have been debated at length in this House. We are simply asking that this House have an opportunity now, after over 100 full speeches addressing the issue of the Canada-Colombia free trade agreement, to be given an opportunity to vote and decide on this bill.

**Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP):** Madam Speaker, it has been four years since the Bush administration signed an agreement with Colombia and yet the U.S. Congress has not ratified it. That should tell us something. For four solid years the United States of America has not seen fit to ratify its agreement with Colombia.

When the Conservatives were in opposition, they decried the whole idea of the Liberal government bringing in closure. The Liberal government brought in closure, I believe, 150 times. When the Conservatives were in opposition, they said that if they formed government they would not bring in closure. They have gone back on their word. They have broken the trust of the people of Canada. I ask them to come clean and admit that.

•(1620)

**Hon. Peter Van Loan:** Mr. Speaker, I am not sure I would use the U.S. Congress as my test of how one would approach trade policy. It may not have ratified its agreement with Colombia but nor has it ratified its agreement with Panama. I do not hear the NDP citing human rights abuses there, nor its agreement with Korea. I think the same applies there.

In fact, that is the same Congress that brought in buy American provisions that cost the jobs of Canadian workers until this government was able to obtain a waiver through the Obama administration from those protectionist measures.

Therefore, I am not sure we want to use that as the test of how we should be making our decisions. In fact, Canada is a country that believes in free trade, that has succeeded through free trade. Two-thirds of our economy is trade based with 4.1 million jobs having been created in this country since we entered into the North American Free Trade Agreement. We now have a doubling of our trade with the United States and increased fivefold with Mexico since we entered into that free trade agreement, and prosperity and jobs have followed.

I understand that the New Democratic Party is ideologically opposed to any kind of free trade. I understand that its members will delay and obstruct. I know that they do not vote in favour of any trade agreements. That is fair, that is its policy.

However, that should not put the NDP members in a position where they deny to the rest of the members of the House of Commons the opportunity to actually vote. That is what they are doing by delaying and obstructing the House through extensive parliamentary tactics. They have had 41 full speeches and they only have 36 members in their caucus. They can hardly complain of a lack of opportunity to address this matter. They have addressed it fully.

*Government Orders*

What they should allow is an opportunity for the members of the House to vote on the bill and decide whether or not they wish to adopt it.

**Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I have said this in the House before and I will say it again.

I was a trade unionist for 16 years. I went to work every day and I defended workers when they had issues at work. I defended workers when they wanted to discuss, and sit down with their employers and talk about their working conditions.

Colombia is the number one country in the world for murdering trade unionists.

I stood in the House and read out the names of the number of trade unionists who were killed.

The Conservatives can make fun of us over there, they can make light of it all they want. I wonder how they would feel if people they worked with were murdered because they went to work every day.

This is the country that the government wants to sign a preferential trade deal with. I would hasten to add that there are other countries in the world right now that have better records of human rights that Canada could and should be trading with.

For the government to stand up and pursue a trade agreement with Colombia says a lot. It speaks volumes about the lack of values that the government has and the lack of respect it has for the rights of workers in this world.

This has nothing to do with trade. Our party has always stood up for trade with other countries. Canada is a trading nation. It is ludicrous to suggest that any party in the House does not support trade.

The question is this. Do we support trade with butchers? I would ask the government to stand up and tell Canadians why it wants to sign a trade deal with one of the worst butchering governments on this planet.

**Hon. Peter Van Loan:** Madam Speaker, when the New Democratic Party members voted against free trade with the United States, I do not know what their test was. Perhaps they say the test is whether or not they are butchers. We do not consider the U.S. government to match that description. I do not recall the NDP members actually ever supporting that or the North American Free Trade Agreement. In fact, I have trouble recalling any free trade agreement they have supported.

However, there is no one that can credibly argue that this trade agreement will in any way hurt the living conditions of the Colombians. In fact, those who are objecting to it are simply saying, "We don't like Colombia", not that this trade agreement will be bad for the people of Colombia.

It will improve the living conditions of the people of Colombia not only because of the economic prosperity and job opportunities that will result but because we have in our parallel agreements protections for people through the environmental accord and labour accord.

The labour agreement covers and gives people guaranteed rights: the right of freedom of association, the right to collective bargaining,

guarantees the abolition of child labour, the elimination of discrimination, and providing protections for occupational safety and health.

These are all protections that are being provided and guaranteed through this agreement with the Colombian government, something that I think we should all recognize as positive progress consistent with the overall positive progress that we have been seeing.

● (1625)

**Mr. David Anderson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources and for the Canadian Wheat Board, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I am very disappointed in the extreme reaction of the NDP members. They do not seem to want to allow the minister to speak. They are screaming at him, they are using extreme language and maybe that is more an indication of their position here rather than dealing accurately with the bill.

These free trade agreements are great things because they do a number of things. The NDP opposes even a general sentence like that. I do not know how those members can stand and say that they want to support free trade. As the minister pointed out, they have opposed it at every possible place and every position they can.

Free trade agreements open up trade around the world and allows nations to step into their place in the global economy. They give opportunities, particularly for nations which need to improve their economies, to improve the conditions in their country. It requires responsibility from these countries as well, and that is one of the reasons why we do this. The NDP does not seem, as usual, to understand that either.

I also point out that I am from an agricultural area and there is significant agricultural trade with those South American nations and with Colombia. We never hear the NDP members talk about that. They refuse to because they do not have any connection any longer with the agricultural areas in this country or anywhere else around the world.

Once again, those members are shouting across trying to keep other people from speaking, but that seems to be the way they want to conduct this debate. Therefore, we have come to the point today where it is time to vote. They have had their say, but they do not want anyone else to have their say.

I would like the minister talk a little about the benefits to agriculture as well as the overall benefits of this agreement for Canadians, for Canadian farmers and for Colombians as well. It is time to move on from these old-fashioned ideas of the world, which we hear from across the way here. Those members believe in protectionism and fear over facts. They believe in using misleading statements. They will even try to present information at committee that is inaccurate. They do not seem to be willing to apologize or to accept the fact that they have been misleading Canadians and parliamentarians with their information.

Why would NDP members be locked in a time warp like this? They seem unable to get out of it. Could the minister explain to us the benefits of moving ahead, the benefits of free trade, the benefits that Canadians and Colombians might experience from this agreement?

*Government Orders*

**Hon. Peter Van Loan:** Madam Speaker, the reason why Canada enters into trade agreements is because it offers benefits to Canadians, benefits in terms of increased economic prosperity and job opportunities. In the case of our trade with Colombia, it already totals \$1.3 billion. It has been growing significantly. A large portion of that is agricultural products. In fact, wheat, pulses and barley, largely grown in the western provinces, significantly are gaining access to the Colombian market and are very attractive exports.

Similarly paper products are important for our lumber and forestry sector, which has been troubled with recent economic challenges. It stands to benefit greatly as do the workers in the pulp and paper industries. I know the NDP is not concerned about their prospects, but they are offered great potential from this agreement, as are the manufacturers of heavy equipment much of which is exported from Canada to Colombia. We have an opportunity to increase that trade, increase the opportunities for the workers in those areas.

The question in front of us on this motion is a very simple one. Has this been debated sufficiently in this House and is it time to stop the delay and obstruction and allow the members of Parliament to finally have a vote on the bill and decide whether they wish to endorse free trade with Colombia, yes or no?

The NDP members will have an opportunity, should that vote proceed, to object to free trade and oppose it as I know they do at every turn. We simply think members of Parliament should have an opportunity. Since the 36 members of the NDP caucus have already made 41 full speeches on this, we are confident they have had their say. We are confident they have had an opportunity to air all the issues they think are important for a decision to be made. We now look forward to the opportunity to let the rest of the members of the House express their view through a vote on the bill.

• (1630)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jean-Yves Laforest:** Madam Speaker, I have a few questions I would like to ask the minister. What is the ranking of Canada-Colombia trade compared to all trade between Canada and other countries?

Is it ranked 30 or 40? If so, why insist so much on entering into a free trade agreement with this country?

Is this agreement not really more about protecting the investments of Canadian mining and oil companies that exploit natural resources outside Canada? Is that not the real objective?

**Hon. Peter Van Loan:** Madam Speaker, Colombia has a dynamic economy, which has recently experienced a great deal of growth. There is a great potential for exports of our products, which would have many benefits for Canadian workers. For example, in the forestry sector, our exports to Colombia are already substantial and we expect to see a little more growth in this sector in future if we have a free trade agreement with Colombia.

We are only asking that members of this Parliament have the opportunity to vote on this bill and indicate whether or not they wish to have a Canada-Colombia free trade agreement.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Denise Savoie):** For the questions and comments that follow, I would ask members to keep their questions very brief, because I see several members rising to speak.

The hon. member for Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor.

[*English*]

**Mr. Scott Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I want to ask a quick question about the social concerns involved in this free trade debate. One issue I hold dear for my riding and for the entire country is social concerns for workers, such as workers' compensation. The workers' compensation program, despite some of its flaws, is still very good and it is a standard for our nation.

Would the minister please comment on what this will do for the rights of workers, especially in regard to workers' compensation, for the people of Colombia?

**Hon. Peter Van Loan:** Madam Speaker, as I have indicated, in this free trade agreement there is a parallel accord on labour. The protection of labour rights, with significant penalties involved, if Colombia does not respect its labour obligations, is a state of the art labour agreement. It is about the highest level of protection one could see in an agreement of this type.

Also a treaty has been entered into by the government, at the request of the Liberals. They asked that there be a reciprocal deposit of reports in the House on an annual basis, reporting on the human rights situation of the respective countries as part of the passage of this agreement. The bill was amended at committee to reflect that. It has been agreed to by the government. We are confident that this goes one step further than has ever been the case to address the concerns in this matter. We do not believe that is necessary. However, we were happy to do it in order to see the bill have an opportunity to be voted on and gain the acceptance of the House.

**Mr. Dean Del Mastro (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I have listened to a number of the comments from NDP colleagues across the way. I find them really quite stunning, especially when we consider we hear no such comments about people like Hugo Chávez from Venezuela, Muammar al-Gaddafi from Libya or even Mahmoud Ahmadinejad from Iran. I have never heard them speak this way of Hezbollah in Lebanon. I have never heard them speak of Hamas or Fidel Castro. I have never heard them speak this way of any of them.

It is quite profound that we are hearing it. Is this not really just about an anti-trade, put-up-the-wall ideology, say whatever the NDP can to make it stick. It has nothing to do with anything factual and simply has to do with what the NDP's ideology, which is to put up walls, to block Canadian trade and to prevent economic growth in our country. When it comes to economics, the NDP members are backward.

Could the minister comment on that?

*Government Orders*

•(1635)

**Hon. Peter Van Loan:** Madam Speaker, as I indicated, we know the New Democratic Party is opposed to free trade as a matter of policy, and that is fair. It is fair to have that policy, to run on that policy and seek the support of Canadians on that policy. That is what NDP has done and that is why it has 36 members of the House of Commons, which has 308 members.

However, the majority of the House of Commons has members who support the concept of freer trade with other countries around the world. That is why we have been able in this Parliament to successfully adopt a free trade agreement with Peru, which we are implementing, and one with the European Free Trade Association, which we are implementing as well. We have other bills awaiting, one with Jordan and we will be introducing one to deal with our free trade agreement with Panama. We believe in freer trade. We believe jobs and opportunity lie there.

The question is this. Should a single party be allowed to hold the House hostage through extensive filibusters, delays and obstruction and prevent the members of the House from having an opportunity to vote and decide on this bill? After having 36 members make 41 full speeches, after one single member has risen and spoken to this 72 times in the House for the NDP, we think they have had their say. It is time to give the other members of the House a chance to have their say in a vote.

**Mr. Peter Julian (Burnaby—New Westminster, NDP):** Madam Speaker, the minister is not even aware of the export figures from his ministry. We asked him for the constant dollar value of exports into the countries with which we had signed bilateral trade agreements and his ministry could not furnish constant dollar figures. What they show is that exports have gone down every time Canada has signed a bilateral trade agreement. Obviously, there is something wrong with the Conservative approach. I will let the minister chew on that.

There are two elements he needs to understand since there has only been two hours of debate at report stage and the government has brought in the bulldozers.

First, every human rights organization on the planet disagrees with him and says that there are serious human rights concerns. He and his Conservative and Liberal colleagues say that everything is fine in Colombia, but the experts disagree. Human rights organizations have said that there is constant targeting of human rights activists, trade unionists and aboriginal and Afro-Colombian peoples as well as the lesbian and gay community.

Second, his pretension that the kill a trade unionist, pay a fine component of his deal is somehow—

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Denise Savoie):** Order, please. I would like to give the hon. minister time to respond. I see other people standing.

**Hon. Peter Van Loan:** Madam Speaker, it is interesting when a member from the New Democratic Party decides to talk about numbers because it always has a problem with numbers. To make the suggestion that, for example, over a 500% increase in trade with Mexico in unadjusted dollars to constant dollars would not be an increase is a pretty wild calculation. I do not care whether one uses constant dollars or real dollars, one will find that 500%, since we

entered into NAFTA, is a huge increase in trade from which our country has benefited.

It is not surprising. That is the same member who has now risen 73 times in the House and thinks this is not enough of a full debate.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Meili Faille (Vaudreuil-Soulanges, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I would like the minister to answer the question my colleague asked. The Bloc Québécois does not oppose international trade. However, it has always subscribed to the principle that international trade must allow for the mutual enrichment and development of both parties.

What provisions will force Colombia to respect and honour social commitments, and what sanctions does the minister plan to impose on mining companies that violate these rules?

[*English*]

**Hon. Peter Van Loan:** Madam Speaker, as I indicated, we have a state-of-the-art parallel labour agreement with this free trade agreement, covering issues such as the right to freedom of association, collective bargaining, the abolition of child labour, the elimination of discrimination and providing protections for occupational safety and health.

In terms of Canadian extractive companies, we encourage them to abide by and take advantage of the policy on corporate social responsibility that we have enacted, including the establishment of a corporate social responsibility counsellor, a state-of-the-art best practices centre to advise companies on adhering to those and the expectation that they will adhere to the widely-accepted principles of corporate social responsibility.

We believe that creating jobs and opportunity in Colombia for Colombians is also a good thing and a good side effect of the agreement. We think it will provide a higher-quality of life. Higher prosperity and secure jobs are all good things for Colombians too, not just Canadians.

•(1640)

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Denise Savoie):** The 30 minute time limit has expired.

Before I put the question, it is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38 to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe, Public Safety; the hon. member for London—Fanshawe, International Co-operation.

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 (Ms. Denise Savoie):** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Denise Savoie):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Denise Savoie):** In my opinion the yeas have it.

*And five or more members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Denise Savoie):** Call in the members.

• (1720)

[Translation]

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

(Division No. 65)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Aglukkaq	Albrecht
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Allison
Ambrose	Anders
Anderson	Armstrong
Arthur	Ashfield
Baird	Benoit
Bernier	Bezan
Blackburn	Blaney
Block	Boucher
Boughen	Braid
Breitkreuz	Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)	Brown (Barrie)
Bruinoooge	Cadman
Calandra	Calkins
Cannan (Kelowna—Lake Country)	Carrie
Casson	Chong
Clarke	Clement
Cummins	Davidson
Day	Dechert
Del Mastro	Devolin
Dreeshen	Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Dykstra	Fast
Finley	Flaherty
Fletcher	Galipeau
Gallant	Généreux
Glover	Goldring
Goodyear	Gourde
Grewal	Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Hawn	Hiebert
Hill	Hoback
Hoeppner	Holder
Jean	Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kent	Kerr
Komarnicki	Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Lake	Lauzon
Lebel	Lemieux
Lobb	Lukiwski
Lunn	Lunney
MacKay (Central Nova)	MacKenzie
Mark	Mayes
McColeman	McLeod
Menzies	Merrifield
Miller	Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
Moore (Fundy Royal)	Nicholson
Norlock	O'Connor
O'Neill-Gordon	Obhrai
Paradis	Payne
Petit	Poilievre
Preston	Raii
Rajotte	Rathgeber
Reid	Richards
Richardson	Rickford
Ritz	Saxton
Scheer	Schellenberger
Shea	Shipley

Shory  
Stanton  
Sweet  
Tilson  
Trost  
Uppal  
Van Loan  
Verner  
Warawa  
Watson  
Sky Country)  
Wong  
Yelich

Government Orders

Sorenson  
Storseth  
Thompson  
Toews  
Tweed  
Van Kesteren  
Vellacott  
Wallace  
Warkentin  
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to  
Woodworth  
Young— 138

NAYS

Members

Allen (Welland)	Andrews
Angus	Asselin
Atamanenko	Bachand
Bagnell	Bains
Beaudin	Bélanger
Bellavance	Bevilacqua
Bevington	Bigras
Blais	Bonsant
Bouchard	Brunelle
Byrne	Cardin
Carrier	Charlton
Chow	Christopherson
Comartin	Cuzner
D'Amours	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Davies (Vancouver East)	Demers
Deschamps	Desnoyers
Dewar	Dhaliwal
Dhalla	Dion
Donnelly	Dorion
Dosanji	Duceppe
Dufour	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)	Easter
Eyking	Faille
Folco	Foote
Freeman	Gagnon
Gaudet	Godin
Gravelle	Guarnieri
Guimond (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques)	Guimond (Montmorency—Charlevoix—Haute-Côte-Nord)
Harris (St. John's East)	Holland
Hughes	Hyer
Jennings	Julian
Kennedy	Laforest
Laframboise	Lalonde
Layton	LeBlanc
Lemay	Leslie
Lessard	Lévesque
Malhi	Malo
Maloway	Marston
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Martin (Sault Ste. Marie)
Mathysen	McCallum
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)	Ménard
Minna	Mourani
Mulcair	Murphy (Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe)
Murphy (Charlottetown)	Murray
Nadeau	Neville
Ouellet	Pacetti
Paillé (Louis-Hébert)	Paquette
Patry	Pearson
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Proulx	Rae
Rafferty	Regan
Rodriguez	Rota
Russell	Savage
Savoie	Scarpaleggia
Sgro	Siksay
Silva	Simms
Simson	St-Cyr
Stoffer	Thibeault
Tonks	Valeriote
Vincent	Wrzesnewskyj
Zarac — 121	

PAIRED

Nil

*Government Orders*

**The Speaker:** I declare the motion carried.

[English]

I wish to inform the House that because of the proceedings on the time allocation motion, government orders will be extended by 30 minutes.

## REPORT STAGE

The House resumed from June 7 consideration of Bill C-2, An Act to implement the Free Trade Agreement between Canada and the Republic of Colombia, the Agreement on the Environment between Canada and the Republic of Colombia and the Agreement on Labour Cooperation between Canada and the Republic of Colombia, as reported (with amendments) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

**Mr. Gerald Keddy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the House today to talk about the Canada-Colombia free trade agreement. This agreement has been a long time getting back to the floor of the House. Quite frankly, we were worried that perhaps it would just be held up forever, in particular by the NDP. However, that is not going to be the case. Parliamentarians will finally get a chance to debate and vote on this important issue.

The implementation of the free trade agreement is a priority, as all free trade agreements are a priority for the Government of Canada. It demonstrates our commitment to helping Canadian businesses compete in markets abroad. Pursuing bilateral and regional trade agreements is essential to bringing continued prosperity to Canadians.

In light of the recent difficult economic times, expanding trade and investment relations through improved market access is more important than ever. Opening our market and pursuing preferential access abroad sends a clear signal that protectionism is not the right way to achieve increased global stability and prosperity. We cannot ignore this global economic downturn that our country has been caught up in, along with the rest of the world. The only way to find our way out of this global economic downturn is through increased trade, increased jobs for Canadians, and increased opportunities for Canadian businesses.

In particular, this free trade agreement demonstrates a commitment by our government to expand opportunities for Canadian businesses. In this age of fierce competition, emerging economies continue to climb the value chain and establish themselves in a wide range of sectors. This is why we continue to seek out more trade and investment opportunities for Canadian businesses and to level the playing field for our companies in an ever more complex and competitive commercial environment.

This government recognizes those challenges, and I am proud to say that we continue to take concrete steps to support the development of these new opportunities. The Canada-Colombia free trade agreement, along with the parallel agreements on the environment and labour co-operation, is essential to our larger commitment to free trade, and more broadly, to Canada's foreign policy goals.

Canada has already established free trade agreements with the United States and Mexico under NAFTA, and agreements with

Israel, Chile, and Costa Rica. Our government took the initiative to implement new free trade agreements with the European Free Trade Association, Peru, and Jordan in 2009. In continuing with our successful trade efforts, this government also signed a free trade agreement with Panama, on May 14, 2010.

We continue to look ahead to other key global partners, including the European Union. We are also committed to advancing economic co-operation through our ongoing free trade negotiations with other partners, including South Korea, the Ukraine, the Central American countries of El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua, the Caribbean community, and the Dominican Republic. This further illustrates this government's ambitious and active trade agenda.

Our government is dedicated to pursuing trade relationships that work for Canadians. Moving forward with building economic relationships, we are working to launch negotiations with new partners, such as Morocco. We are also continuing to enhance our great relationships with India and Japan.

Why is an ambitious trade agreement important to Canada? By eliminating barriers to trade and investment, our government is building new opportunities for Canadian businesses in global markets by helping them compete in an increasingly competitive and interdependent world. As a result, these actions stimulate the Canadian economy. By passing the free trade agreement with Colombia, we are helping Canadian businesses compete on the international stage.

Upon its implementation, Colombia will eliminate tariffs on nearly all current Canadian exports, including wheat, pulses, a variety of paper products, certain machinery, plastics, vehicles, and furniture. In addition, the Canada-Colombia free trade agreement will expand opportunities for Canadian investors and service providers.

● (1725)

Canada already values Colombia as a significant trading partner. In 2009, two-way trade with Colombia was more than \$1.3 billion. We recognize that Colombia is an established and expanding market for Canadian products. Since 2005, Canadian merchandise exports have increased by over 55%, reaching over \$600 million in 2009.

Colombia is also a strategic destination for Canadian investment. The overall stock of Canadian investment in Colombia has reached \$1.1 billion.

In promoting this active trade agenda, our government recognizes that Colombia is a strategic destination for Canadian direct investment in mining and oil exploration, among other sectors.



*Government Orders*

Canadian companies are seeing a lot of potential in the Americas, and this free trade agreement will assist them in maximizing their opportunities. Furthermore, Canadians can offer much expertise. Services such as engineering, mining, energy, and financial services are areas in which Canadian businesses can thrive. Our government recognizes that these sectors are the mainstay of our economy in all communities across this country.

With rapid growth in the Colombian economy in recent years, Canadian companies have made important investments, and Canadian exporters of industrial goods have found ample export opportunities.

This agreement is an important achievement for Canadian exporters, as Colombia has signed a similar free trade agreement with the United States, Canada's main competitor in the Colombian market. Once in place, that agreement would place Canadian exporters at a significant tariff disadvantage compared with their U. S. competitors if Canada's own free trade agreement with Colombia were not implemented in a timely manner.

As well, Colombia recently concluded negotiations with the European Union, and that agreement could enter into force as early as 2011. Colombia is determined to pursue ambitious free trade opportunities with others. Our government will not stand by and put Canadian companies at a disadvantage. We will fight to ensure that businesses have what they need to compete abroad.

There are benefits in this agreement for all regions across Canada, with significant exports to Colombia coming from all regions. For example, the elimination of Colombian tariffs on most machinery and industrial goods, especially mining equipment, which generally range from 12% to 25%, will help Ontario and Quebec exporters maintain and expand their competitiveness compared to suppliers from other countries. I will give the House a personal example that applies to machinery.

I have a fabricating company in my riding in Nova Scotia that makes deepwater equipment for the oil and gas industry. It works in partnership with another company in Calgary. The company is looking at producing the equipment they presently ship to Colombia in Mexico, because Mexico has no tariff on equipment shipped to Colombia. This Canadian company is paying 15%, so we are penalizing it by 15% for trade that it is already carrying on with Colombia. This free trade agreement would allow it to compete on a level footing, and that will certainly help its business opportunities and its potential in Colombia.

The immediate removal of tariffs on wheat and pulses, Canada's main agricultural exports to Colombia, will greatly benefit the prairie provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba by making these products more competitive in Colombian markets. On that point, let me comment.

On red beans, we currently pay a 50% tariff. Red beans are a significant source of protein. The ability to bring those beans into Colombia in three or four years' time, tariff-free, because there will be a gradual elimination of that tariff, would allow Colombians to access cheaper and more available food. It is not just food, it is good food. It is food that is easy to store, and food that is high in protein. All Colombians will be able to access more nutritious food. With

more nutritious food, men and women who are working can do a better job, and the youth of the country can prosper, attend school, get educated, and find jobs in an economy that is growing. They will be able to move forward with the rest of the world. Colombia has sorely been waiting to take its place among the nations of the world.

● (1730)

**Mr. Peter Julian (Burnaby—New Westminster, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, it is nice to hear the fiction from the parliamentary secretary. Obviously, the fact that he and his Liberal colleagues cut off debate at committee and refused to hear from so many representatives from labour unions, civil society groups, the Colombian labour movement, and of course, aboriginal people and African Colombian groups has not helped his lack of information about Colombia.

He was mentioning earlier that the Colombian government and the paramilitary and military forces have not been involved in any massacres of aboriginal people. Therefore, I would like him to answer, on the record, does he deny that the Colombian military or paramilitary forces have been involved in the massacres of aboriginal peoples? It is a very straight-up question.

The second point I would like to raise is the issue of the government's wrong-headed trade strategy. We saw the softwood lumber sellout, which was one of the worst trade agreements ever signed. All of the other agreements the Conservatives have signed have led to a decrease in exports to those markets. Therefore, the economic arguments do not hold water either.

Is the parliamentary secretary aware that constant dollars are different from current dollars, so we have actually seen a reduction in trade?

● (1735)

**Mr. Gerald Keddy:** On the second question, Mr. Speaker, which is the idea that free trade agreements have seen a reduction in trade, everyone in the House, even the hon. member, knows that this is just patent nonsense. It really does not deserve or require an answer.

On the member's question about the Awa first nation, he is wrong about that also.

I am not talking about the Colombian government. I am talking about what that hon. member said at committee. I have it here in front of me. He said:

Obviously, there are fundamental concerns about...human rights. We had another massacre a few weeks ago. Twelve representatives of the Awa first nation were brutally killed. Human rights groups and eyewitnesses say that the Colombian military killed them. There has been no investigation. It is virtual impunity for this kind of crime. I understand that you're here to testify on human rights—

This was his statement to the witnesses.

—but if you would care to comment on how the Canadian government should act when an arm of the Colombian government brutally massacres 12 of its citizens...

We found out later that this was patently false. He gave false information to committee. It is a good time now for that hon. member to rise and apologize to committee members and the rest of the House.

*Government Orders*

**Mr. Ed Fast (Abbotsford, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I was also very pleased to hear my colleague's intervention on this very important free trade agreement for Canada.

One of the things my colleague knows is that the NDP members have not voted in favour of one free trade agreement. Not one. They always come up with a reason for voting against. One day it is the big corporations. The next day it is human rights. The third day it will be labour or the environment. I would ask the parliamentary secretary to comment on how ideological the NDP members are in their approach to free trade agreements that are so critical to our Canadian economy.

**Mr. Gerald Keddy:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member not just for that question but for his interest in this case. If he does not mind, I am going to diverge from his question a little bit and go on to democracy in the House. It is time that the NDP and the Bloc Québécois allow members in this place to vote on this important issue.

We have debated it ad nauseam with over 100 witnesses at committee, with over 50 hours of debate in this place. We debated it as well in the last Parliament.

We have one party that continues to filibuster, continues to obfuscate, and continues to delay the democratic process. If members believe in democracy, it is time to vote.

**Mr. Ed Fast (Abbotsford, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I am thankful for the opportunity to speak to this free trade agreement. As we know, Canada is one of the great free trading nations of this world. We have immeasurable natural resources and human capital. We are a well-educated country, among the best educated in the world.

We have so much to offer to the world. In fact, perhaps the greatest export are the four defining Canadian values of freedom, democracy, human rights and the rule of law. That is what we can export to other countries that may have been lacking that for decades, perhaps centuries.

Our government has an ambitious free trade agenda to help Canadian businesses compete in international markets. This free trade agreement with Colombia is one of many efforts by our government to expand opportunities for Canadian business.

As we know, in this era of global competition, we must develop more investment and trade opportunities for our businesses. In fact, the world has faced perhaps the greatest economic crisis since the Great Depression. It is exactly during times like this when the economic challenges are so great that Canada must seek out new trading opportunities, new opportunities to connect with other countries to build our respective economies. Our government recognizes that these economic challenges are critical if Canada is going to compete in the world.

In fact, the Standing Committee on International Trade has recognized that. In 2007 the committee asked the government to identify countries where Canadian companies were operating at a disadvantage and to pursue defensive free trade agreements with them. Our government has done exactly that. We have responded by launching negotiations with Colombia and Peru in 2007 to ensure that Canadian businesses were not displaced out of these markets by their American competitors. We have this huge giant to the south of

us that would love to pick up the business that is available out there in the world.

It is now three years later and while the Peru agreement has been implemented for almost a year, the business community continues to wait for the implementation of the Colombia free trade agreement. Of course, the reason for the delay is the obfuscation, delaying and filibustering on the part of the New Democratic Party that does not understand what free trade agreements are all about. New Democrats are isolationists. They love to build barriers. They would love to a build big wall along our border to ensure that nobody can trade with us.

By passing this free trade agreement, we are listening and responding to the needs of Canadian businesses to stay competitive. As the Canadian Council of Chief Executives indicated in its presentation to the standing committee, the passage of the free trade agreement will help Canadian workers, farmers and businesses stay ahead of their global competitors. A closer economic partnership with Colombia would reduce tariffs for Canadian exporters and also expand opportunities for Canadian investors and service providers.

Colombia is already a significant trading partner for Canada. In 2009 our two-way merchandise trade totalled \$1.3 billion. Colombia is also a strategic destination for Canadian investment. The Colombian market is an exciting one with 48 million people, much greater than the population of Canada. Considering the sound macroeconomic policy and security improvements achieved by its current leadership, which have generated favourable economic conditions, a country like ours with so much expertise has a lot to offer to Colombia.

The potential for Canada goes beyond traditional areas such as oil and gas to also include infrastructure, agriculture and industrial goods, and services like engineering, mining, energy and financial services. We are a leader in the world in these areas and we have a chance to share this expertise with other countries around the world.

These are all areas where Canada has significant experience and where we shine. Our business community recognizes the opportunities in Colombia.

• (1740)

In fact, the Grain Growers of Canada noted:

The future in countries like Colombia is that there is a large young population. That's a market for the future. If we are in there and working with the Colombians, there's huge potential growth.

Clearly, this agreement is about strengthening our partnership with Colombia.

Beyond the commercial partnerships, the free trade, labour and environment agreements are also meant to complement our ongoing political relationship with Colombia.

*Government Orders*

I mentioned to start off with that Canada is known around the world. It is a lighthouse for the prevailing values of freedom, democracy, human rights and the rule of law. It is incumbent upon us to export those values to countries that have not had those kinds of traditions.

To help solidify ongoing efforts by the government of Colombia to create a more prosperous, equitable and secure democracy, we are taking the steps of engaging the areas of labour and the environment.

In 2010 the government of Colombia took the first step toward joining the voluntary principles on security and human rights by becoming an engaged government. That is good news. It is progress. It is the kind of progress that Canada wants to see. These voluntary principles provide guidance to mining companies on maintaining security in their operations in a manner that respects human rights and fundamental freedoms that we as Canadians take for granted.

Colombia has also demonstrated its continued effort to curb violence against trade unions and to promote prosperity and peace. Our government recognizes that challenges remain in Colombia and is committed to working with Colombia to address these issues.

Canada is not the only country recognizing the improvements in Colombia and working to increase economic relations with that country. In fact, that country is moving forward on an ambitious agenda that includes free trade agreements with many other countries. That is why we should not be left behind.

The European Union and the European Free Trade Association are advancing with their own trade agreements with Colombia. We have to compete with those economic unions. It is very important for us to stay up to speed and ensure we secure those trading relationships.

Our firms and workers expect that their government will work for them and put in place trade agreements to allow them to compete in the international markets on a level playing field. We cannot put our exporters at a relative disadvantage.

That being said, there are clear expectations of our companies.

The Government of Canada takes matters of corporate social responsibility very seriously. That is why this free trade agreement, as well as parallel agreements on labour co-operation and the environment, includes provisions on corporate social responsibility.

Responsible business conduct reinforces the positive effects that trade and investment can have on the communities in which they operate.

At its very core, corporate social responsibility incorporates social, economic and environmental concerns into the daily operations of businesses for the benefit of the communities in which they are operating. Corporate social responsibility can improve human rights, labour standards and the environment, while increasing the competitiveness of businesses.

Given that Canada and Colombia have a significant investment relationship, it was critical to recognize corporate social responsibility in our free trade agreement and we have done that. Not only does this free trade agreement advance our policy to promote corporate responsibility in Canada, it encourages our treaty partners

to increase corporate social responsibility promotion within their own countries.

Provisions in the free trade agreement encourage both governments to promote voluntary principles of responsible business conduct within their business communities. The Canadian Manufacturers & Exporters highlighted the importance of this responsibility:

Canadian companies are nevertheless committed, especially in Latin America, to being socially responsible. Canadian companies are recognized around the world for adopting sound practices. A number of Canadian businesses are genuine role models in this area.

I will end my time by simply saying this agreement is critical to economic prosperity in Canada. We are, as I said earlier, one of the great free trading nations. We need to continue to seek out new trading relationships around the world.

• (1745)

**Mr. Scott Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to just ask a question of my colleague and I want him to flesh out some of the history behind this and dig deeper into what he was saying. When he talked about the agreement, he talked about growth and economic growth and how this is going to be of great benefit to this country, as far as the economy is concerned, and I am assuming in sectors such as agriculture being one of them. I would like the member to focus just for a moment on the responsibility aspect, and perhaps he can flesh out in his mind or give the basis of why we are creating what we call parallel agreements for the environment, for example.

I particularly paid great interest to the social aspect of it because of things like workers' compensation, which I brought up earlier. I think that is going to be of great benefit to all countries. But in this particular case, what makes this side agreement so special and why is it going to be beneficial to Colombia? Why was it so necessary?

• (1750)

**Mr. Ed Fast:** Mr. Speaker, as the member knows, as does the House, Colombia has had a very difficult labour situation. It had a very problematic human rights environment. There are many indications in Colombia now that it is making progress in trying to address some of the issues of violence, violence against unions, and making progress in the area of social responsibility.

That is why these parallel agreements on labour and the environment, and the incorporation of requirements for social and corporate responsibility within the free trade agreement, allow us to export our values that I already articulated in my speech to a country that has not had that legacy that we take for granted in Canada.

*Government Orders*

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jean-Yves Laforest (Saint-Maurice—Champlain, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, earlier, in his speech defending and promoting this agreement, the member opposite said that the Government of Colombia had demonstrated that it wants peace and that it is able to respect human rights.

Has it demonstrated that by the fact that 39 trade unionists were murdered in Colombia in 2007, and 46 were murdered in 2008? Is that the kind of absurd proof he is talking about?

I would like to know what the member was talking about when he said that the government had demonstrated that it was committed to finding peace.

[*English*]

**Mr. Ed Fast:** Mr. Speaker, I suppose there are two perspectives on the issue of engaging with countries that have had problematic human rights regimes and problematic labour regimes. One is to isolate them. One is to keep them out of the international trade community, set them apart, perhaps even impose sanctions.

The other perspective is to say these are countries that desperately need our knowhow, our knowledge, our technology, and above all they need to understand the values that make strong democratic countries and societies. We have chosen to follow the route of engaging with these countries.

What is really interesting is that one would expect that if the country of Colombia were so opposed to expanding its human rights framework that it would resist efforts to impose conditions on issues such as labour, corporate responsibility and the environment, but Colombians have welcomed that engagement. They have said they want to become more like the Canadas of this world. They embrace those values of freedom and democracy, and especially human rights. They want to partner with us to help build those democratic institutions.

In response to my colleague across the way, I would say the proof is in the pudding. I would say look 10 or 20 years down the road. I am confident that 20 years from now Colombia will look quite different. It will have a much more robust human rights framework. It will have a much more robust labour framework, one that all of us can be proud of, and can say that we were a part of.

**Ms. Chris Charlton (Hamilton Mountain, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I have spoken in opposition to the Canada-Colombia free trade agreement on numerous occasions in the House. I am delighted that, through the incredible leadership of my NDP colleague, the member for Burnaby—New Westminster, we so far have been able to stop this bill from becoming law. Now the government is shutting down debate through a draconian time allocation motion because it knows it cannot win its bill on its merits.

While I still can, let me explain again why we feel so strongly about this ill-conceived trade deal. In fact, in the roughly 10 minutes that I have to participate in today's debate, I will give 10 reasons why the Canada-Colombia trade deal should be scrapped.

First, Colombia is still the most dangerous country in the world for unionized workers. More labour leaders are killed in Colombia every year than in the rest of the world combined. Trade unionists

are terrorized to put a chill on union organizing. This keeps unions weak and wages miserably low. It benefits businesses' bottom line and keeps Colombia attractive for foreign investment.

Who is being targeted? The prime targets are activists who are trying to organize or join a union and bargain collectively or who are engaged in industrial disputes or in fighting privatization. They are teachers, prison guards, agricultural, food and health care workers and others from almost every sector. Who is killing these union organizers? Most of the murders are committed by paramilitary death squads. Paramilitaries are illegal armies that fund their operations through Colombia's illegal drug trade and illegal contributions from some companies like Chiquita Brands International. The paras have been classified as a terrorist organization by the Canadian government, along with other armed groups, such as the FARC leftist guerrillas.

The second reason is that Colombian labour law is simply not up to ILO snuff. A union-busting culture dominates Colombian society. Colombia's labour laws stifle unions and workers' rights. Recently, in order to show it is doing something positive, the Colombian government passed two labour code reforms, one on the right to strike and one on "associative labour cooperatives", but even with recent changes, they still do not come close to International Labour Organization minimum standards.

Colombian workers face huge legal and bureaucratic obstacles to register a union and to bargain collectively. Some say it is easier to form an armed group than a trade union in Colombia. These anti-union laws, plus the violence and terror directed at unionized workers, have helped keep Colombia's rate of unionization at less than 5%. With its huge informal sector and high unemployment rate, which is officially over 11%, it means that only one in every 100 workers can negotiate a collective agreement, the lowest of any country in the western hemisphere.

Third, there seems to be impunity for the killers in Colombia. Not enough is being done to bring them to justice. Very few of the crimes against unionized workers and other civilians have been investigated. Even fewer of those responsible have been convicted. This is called impunity. The victims are often accused of being guerrilla sympathizers. Their murders are then not questioned. Ninety-seven per cent of the murders of union activists remain unsolved.

*Government Orders*

That brings me to the fourth reason. Simply put, no justice, no peace. The government insists that it has demobilized the paramilitaries so that they are no longer a threat. Under a program called the justice and peace law, paramilitary combatants were supposed to hand in their arms and admit to their crimes in exchange for reduced sentences, but thousands of the demobilized have simply walked away from the program and formed new, deadly groups, like the Black Eagles, who terrorize the poor and anyone who dares to dissent from Uribe's security plan. The Black Eagles even sent a nasty threat to the Canadian embassy in Bogota. This is a far cry from Colombia's demands for a process that exposes the truth of paramilitary crimes, delivers justice and ensures reparations to the victims.

Reason number five is the shocking government ties to paramilitaries. Today, 62 mafia-like ex-paramilitary drug trafficking criminal networks control economic activities and political institutions in 23 of Colombia's 31 provinces.

Violence and insecurity prevail in the countryside. Colombia's independent supreme court, one of the country's few bright spots these days, has launched a series of groundbreaking investigations into paramilitary presence in the Colombian congress. More than 60 congress members from Uribe's coalition, 20% of the congress, are being investigated for crimes like collaboration with paramilitaries, getting rich from drug trafficking and collusion in election fraud. Thirty of them have been indicted.

• (1755)

That leads to reason number six. The army and the government are implicated in crimes against humanity. In a suspicious move in August 2008, Uribe extradited 14 jailed paramilitary bosses to the United States on drug trafficking charges, a much lesser crime than their crimes against humanity. These criminals are now conveniently out of the way of supreme court investigations into their links with Uribe's and his officials' involvement in atrocities. The International Criminal Court of the Hague is looking into these events.

In November 2008, the world was outraged to learn that 27 high-ranking army officers were accused of a horrifying crime known as false positives. This involves the soldiers kidnapping and executing innocent civilians, dressing them as FARC guerrillas and claiming they were killed in combat. This practice developed in response to President Uribe's demands for results in fighting the FARC insurgents and offers of bonuses based on a body count. These revelations are just the tip of the iceberg in a series of charges of army involvement with executions, extortion, ties to drug traffickers and other crimes against humanity.

It is no wonder then, and this is the seventh reason, that diverse Colombian peoples are vehemently opposed to this trade deal. Colombia's unions have said no to the NAFTA model because it will cause more unemployment, poverty and hunger. Signing a free trade deal with Uribe will signal that state terrorism and killing trade unionists is okay.

Colombia's paramilitary opposition, the Alternative Democratic Pole, or PDA, opposes free trade because it will annex the economy to multinational corporations. For example, it will provide new land grabs for Canadian mining companies that get powerful new rights but not responsibilities. The Association of Indigenous Councils of

Northern Cauca carried out a popular referendum in 2005 in which 98% said no to free trade. In October 2008, tens of thousands of people protested the free trade model, linking it to the death of mother earth.

This brings me to reason number eight. More trade and investment will hurt, not help, human rights. Independent human rights organizations, such as Human Rights Watch and others, warn that this deal could actually undermine the struggle for democracy in Colombia. Without international pressure, the Colombian government will have no incentive to make improvements in human rights.

The ninth reason for opposing this deal is that Canada's own parliamentary trade committee said that human rights must come first. In 2008, Parliament's Standing Committee on International Trade undertook an in-depth study called "Human Rights, the Environment and Free Trade with Colombia". Committee members even went on an official mission to Bogota to hear first-hand what people thought. The international trade committee report said:

The Committee recommends that an independent, impartial, and comprehensive human rights impact assessment should be carried out by a competent body, which is subject to levels of independent scrutiny and validation; the recommendations of this assessment should be addressed before Canada considers signing, ratifying and implementing an agreement with Colombia.

Last, we come to reason number 10, specifically for my colleagues across the way, who first introduced this bill solely to support the international efforts of George Bush. Well, there is a new president south of the border and Barack Obama says yes to workers' rights. There is no way that this trade deal will pass south of the border anytime soon.

Let us do the right thing here in Canada, too. Let us put human rights before free trade and carry out an independent assessment of human rights violations in Colombia before ratifying and implementing this deal.

• (1800)

**Mr. Leon Benoit (Vegreville—Wainwright, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I understand that the New Democratic Party does not represent much of rural Canada. Maybe there is a reason for that. I listened to the presentations by the NDP members and not a bit of concern did they show for farmers across this country. This free trade agreement would mean that my neighbours and other farmers right across Canada would have a better market for their peas, lentils, wheat, barley and other agriculture products.

Do the NDP members even consider that in opposing this free trade agreement? Not at all. They oppose all free trade agreements. Every one of the free trade agreements that our government has negotiated will help provide a market for more agriculture products. That helps farmers. That helps my friends and my neighbours. The members of the NDP do not seem to care what it does to farmers in their constituencies and in neighbouring constituencies.

Why does the member not show a bit of concern for farmers and new markets that would be available for them, particularly at this time of low farm prices?

*Government Orders*

**Ms. Chris Charlton:** Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to take that question seriously when he says that New Democrats do not represent rural Canada.

Has the member actually looked at a map of this country? I would encourage him to have this conversation with the member for Western Arctic. He should have a look at the map and see how much of Canada we actually represent. He should have a look at northern Ontario. All of those seats are NDP seats. Please, have another look at the map.

With respect to the member's question, we know that exports have actually gone down after we have signed free trade agreements so this agreement is not going to help the farmers in the member's riding. Moreover, if the member is so absolutely certain that this free trade deal has nothing but benefits on all of the points that I raised, then why is he so afraid of putting this deal to an independent assessment before it is ratified and implemented?

I would encourage the member to do that. The member should stand up and say that he is willing to do that if he is so certain he is making legitimate points in this House.

• (1805)

**Hon. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to help the hon. member with a little bit of a fact check.

She said that the agreement was a George Bush agreement, that Canada was following the Bush administration. In fact, negotiations between Canada and Colombia on this free trade agreement began in 2002 under former prime minister Jean Chrétien. In fact, they preceded the discussions with the Bush administration.

Second, with respect to the Obama administration, President Obama has commended the Uribe government for its progress on human rights. On the congressional side, we received a copy of a letter this week, which was tabled at the trade committee, from a large number of Democrat and Republican congressmen who support the FTA and urge President Obama to move forward with the legislation.

Third, 91% of Colombians voted for political parties both in the congressional and in the most recent presidential elections that support of all of these FTAs that Colombia has been signing. So, Colombians support it.

Last, the ILO has taken Colombia off its labour black watch this year. That is a significant move forward.

I know the hon. member is a fair, honest and unbiased member of the New Democratic Party, and as such she will agree that these facts are important and that all members have a responsibility to adhere to the facts. I would appreciate the member's input in this very important matter.

**Mr. Tim Uppal:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, due to the motion moved during routine proceedings today, a number of members were unable to table petitions. There are people here in Ottawa to witness the presentation of those petitions. Therefore, I would ask for unanimous consent to revert to routine proceedings for the sole purpose of allowing members to present petitions, provided we return to government orders.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin):** Does the hon. member have unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin):** The hon. member does not have unanimous consent. The hon. member for Hamilton Mountain.

**Ms. Chris Charlton:** Mr. Speaker, I did not quite realize how important it was to the member for Kings—Hants to put on the record that it was actually Chrétien's relationship with President Bush that started the free trade agreement, but I am certainly happy to confirm that. Yes, absolutely, we will set that record straight.

I am also sure that organizations like the steelworkers and the CLC will be delighted to know about the member's support for this free trade agreement.

There are a couple of other things. With respect to the letters he claims to have gotten from the Democrats and Republicans in support of this free trade agreement, I know there were also letters in opposition to the free trade agreement. While it may be right that the ILO is investigating the situation in Colombia right now, I am not sure that that investigation has come to a close.

I hope that clarifies things.

**Mr. Ted Menzies (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I note that there are a lot of enthusiastic individuals in this House who would love to speak to this. We have heard many debates and certainly one of the most comprehensive debates, so no one in this House can justifiably say that this has not been debated and that the witnesses have not been to committee and argued all sides of this.

The only thing I would argue is that we probably did not have enough farmers at committee to hear how important it is to them.

However, Canada has negotiated a comprehensive and high quality free trade agreement with Colombia. Canadians can be proud of the market access provisions and the comprehensive rules that we have secured for business people to make them more competitive in this market.

Canadian companies are already active in Colombia. In 2009, two-way merchandise trade between Canada and Colombia totaled over \$1.3 billion. Canadian merchandise exports to Colombia have grown by over 55% since 2004. Colombia is also clearly a strategic destination for Canadian investments which totaled over \$773 million at the end of 2009. However, I am pleased to report that this free trade agreement will increase opportunities for our exporters, investors and service providers in the Colombian market.

In terms of market access, Colombia will eliminate the majority of its tariffs on all industrial products, including paper, machinery and equipment, and certain chemical products, as well as textiles and apparel.

*Government Orders*

In the agriculture sector that I referred to earlier, Colombia will also immediately eliminate tariffs on a majority of agricultural exports from Canada, including wheat, barley, peas and lentils. That is very critical, as the hon. member for Vegreville—Wainwright just told us, not only for western farmers but for farmers all across this country.

The NDP members actually suggest that they represent farmers. If they represented farmers, they would actually listen to what farmers are telling them. Farmers are dependent upon exports and dependent upon imports. We all realize that is what makes this country operate. I will retract that. Most of us in this House realize how important that is for our economy.

We continue as a government to promote free and fair trade all around the world. I have no idea why the NDP stands in this House, as our former trade minister said, in its ideological straitjacket and tries to stop good deals that promote trade and promote a strong economy.

•(1810)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin):** It being 6:13 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 report stage of the bill now before the House.

The question is on Motion No. 1. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin):** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Acting speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin):** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And five or more members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin):** The division on Motion No. 1 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 2. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin):** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin):** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And five or more members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin):** The recorded division on Motion No. 2 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 3. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin):** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin):** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And five or more members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin):** The division on Motion No. 3 stands deferred.

[*Translation*]

The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded divisions at the report stage of the bill.

Call in the members.

•(1830)

[*English*]

*And the bells having rung:*

**The Speaker:** The question is on Motion No. 1.

•(1835)

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

(*Division No. 66*)

## YEAS

## Members

Allen (Welland)	André
Angus	Asselin
Atamanenko	Bachand
Beaudin	Bellavance
Bevington	Bigras
Blais	Bonsant
Bouchard	Brunelle
Cardin	Carrier
Charlton	Chow
Christopherson	Comartin
Crowder	Cullen
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	Davies (Vancouver East)
Demers	Deschamps
Desnoyers	Dewar
Donnelly	Dorion
Duceppe	Dufour
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)	Faille
Freeman	Gagnon
Gaudet	Godin

*Government Orders*

Gravelle	Guimond (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les
Basques)	
Guimond (Montmorency—Charlevoix—Haute-Côte-Nord)	
Harris (St. John's East)	
Hughes	Hyer
Julian	Laforest
Laframboise	Lalonde
Lavallée	Layton
Lemay	Leslie
Lessard	Lévesque
Malo	Maloway
Marston	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Martin (Sault Ste. Marie)	Mathysen
Ménard	Mourani
Nadeau	Ouellet
Paillé (Louis-Hébert)	Paquette
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Rafferty	Savoie
Siksay	St-Cyr
Stoffer	Thibeault
Vincent— 75	

**NAYS**

## Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Aglukkaq	Albrecht
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Allison
Ambrose	Anders
Anderson	Andrews
Armstrong	Arthur
Ashfield	Bagnell
Bains	Baird
Bélangier	Bennett
Benoit	Bernier
Bevilacqua	Bezan
Blackburn	Blaney
Block	Boucher
Boughen	Braid
Breitkreuz	Brison
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)	Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)
Brown (Barrie)	Bruinoogee
Byrne	Cadman
Calandra	Calkins
Cannan (Kelowna—Lake Country)	Cannis
Carrie	Casson
Chong	Clarke
Clement	Coady
Cotler	Crombie
Cummins	Cuzner
D'Amours	Davidson
Day	Dechert
Dei Mastro	Devolin
Dhaliwal	Dhalla
Dion	Dreeschen
Dryden	Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dykstra
Easter	Eyking
Fast	Finley
Flaherty	Fletcher
Foote	Fry
Galipeau	Gallant
Généreux	Glover
Goldring	Goodyear
Gourde	Grewal
Guarnieri	Hall Findlay
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)	Hawn
Hiebert	Hill
Hoback	Hoeppner
Holder	Holland
Ignatieff	Jean
Jennings	Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
Kania	Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kennedy (Calgary Southeast)	Kent
Kerr	Komarnicki
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)	Lake
Lauzon	Lebel
LeBlanc	Lee
Lemieux	Lobb
Lukiwski	Lunn
Lunney	MacAulay
MacKenzie	Malhi
Mayes	McCallum

McColeman	McGuinty
McLeod	McTeague
Mendes	Menzies
Merrifield	Miller
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	
Murphy (Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe)	
Murphy (Charlottetown)	Murray
Nicholson	Norlock
O'Connor	O'Neill-Gordon
Obhrai	Oliphant
Pacetti	Paradis
Payne	Petit
Poilievre	Preston
Rae	Raït
Rajotte	Ratans
Rathgeber	Regan
Reid	Richards
Richardson	Rickford
Ritz	Rodriguez
Rota	Russell
Savage	Saxton
Scarpaleggia	Scheer
Schellenberger	Sgro
Shea	Shipley
Shory	Simms
Simson	Sorenson
Stanton	Storseth
Sweet	Szabo
Thompson	Tilson
Toews	Tonks
Trost	Trudeau
Tweed	Uppal
Van Kesteren	Van Loan
Vellacott	Verner
Volpe	Wallace
Warawa	Warkentin
Watson	Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to
Sky Country)	
Wilfert	Wong
Woodworth	Wrzesniewskij
Yelich	Young
Zarac— 195	

**PAIRED**

## Members

Bourgeois	Cannon (Pontiac)
DeBellefeuille	Guay
MacKay (Central Nova)	Moore (Fundy Royal)
Oda	Paillé (Hochelaga)
Roy	Smith
Strahl	Thi Lac— 12

**The Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 1 lost. The next question is on Motion No. 2.

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

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Rodger Cuzner:** Mr. Speaker, on the same vote, the Liberals will be voting no.

● (1840)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Michel Guimond:** Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois will support this motion.

**Mr. Yvon Godin:** Mr. Speaker, the members of the NDP vote in favour of this motion.

**Mr. André Arthur:** Mr. Speaker, I vote against this motion.



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

(Division No. 67)

### YEAS

#### Members

Allen (Welland)	André
Angus	Asselin
Atamanenko	Bachand
Beaudin	Bellavance
Bevington	Bigras
Blais	Bonsant
Bouchard	Brunelle
Cardin	Carrier
Charlton	Chow
Christopherson	Comartin
Crowder	Cullen
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	Davies (Vancouver East)
Demers	Deschamps
Desnoyers	Dewar
Donnelly	Dorion
Duceppe	Dufour
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)	Faille
Freeman	Gagnon
Gaudet	Godin
Gravelle	Guimond (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques)
Guimond (Montmorency—Charlevoix—Haute-Côte-Nord)	
Harris (St. John's East)	
Hughes	Hyer
Julian	Laforest
Laframboise	Lalonde
Lavallée	Layton
Lemay	Leslie
Lessard	Lévesque
Malo	Maloway
Marston	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Martin (Sault Ste. Marie)	Mathysen
Ménard	Mourani
Nadeau	Ouellet
Paillé (Louis-Hébert)	Paquette
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Rafferty	Savoie
Siksay	St-Cyr
Stoffer	Thibeault
Vincent— 75	

### NAYS

#### Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Aglukkaq	Albrecht
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Allison
Ambrose	Anders
Anderson	Andrews
Armstrong	Arthur
Ashfield	Bagnell
Bains	Baird
Bélangier	Bennett
Benoit	Bernier
Bevilacqua	Bezan
Blackburn	Blaney
Block	Boucher
Boughen	Braid
Breitkreuz	Brisson
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)	Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)
Brown (Barrie)	Bruinooge
Byrne	Cadman
Calandra	Calkins
Cannan (Kelowna—Lake Country)	Cannis
Carrie	Casson
Chong	Clarke
Clement	Coady
Cotler	Crombie
Cummins	Cuzner
D'Amours	Davidson
Day	Dechert
Del Mastro	Devolin
Dhaliwal	Dhalla
Dion	Dreeshen

### Government Orders

Dryden	Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dykstra
Easter	Eyking
Fast	Finley
Flaherty	Fletcher
Foote	Fry
Galipeau	Gallant
Généreux	Glover
Goldring	Goodyear
Gourde	Grewal
Guarnieri	Hall Findlay
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)	Hawn
Hiebert	Hill
Hoback	Hoepfner
Holder	Holland
Ignatieff	Jean
Jennings	Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
Kania	Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Kent
Kerr	Komarnicki
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)	Lake
Lauzon	Lebel
LeBlanc	Lee
Lemieux	Lobb
Lukiwski	Lunn
Lunney	MacAulay
MacKenzie	Malhi
Mayes	McCallum
McColeman	McGuinity
McLeod	McTeague
Mendes	Menzies
Merrifield	Miller
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	
Murphy (Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe)	
Murphy (Charlottetown)	Murray
Nicholson	Norlock
O'Connor	O'Neill-Gordon
Obhrai	Oliphant
Pacetti	Paradis
Payne	Petit
Poillievre	Preston
Rae	Raitt
Rajotte	Ratansi
Rathgeber	Regan
Reid	Richards
Richardson	Rickford
Ritz	Rodriguez
Rota	Russell
Savage	Saxton
Scarpaleggia	Scheer
Schellenberger	Sgro
Shea	Shipley
Shory	Simms
Simson	Sorenson
Stanton	Storseth
Sweet	Szabo
Thompson	Tilson
Toews	Tonks
Trost	Trudeau
Tweed	Uppal
Van Kesteren	Van Loan
Vellacott	Verner
Volpe	Wallace
Warawa	Warkentin
Watson	Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)
Sky Country)	
Wilfert	Wong
Woodworth	Wrzesnewskyj
Yelich	Young
Zarac— 195	

### PAIRED

#### Members

Bourgeois	Cannon (Pontiac)
DeBellefeuille	Guay
MacKay (Central Nova)	Moore (Fundy Royal)
Oda	Paillé (Hochelaga)
Roy	Smith
Strahl	Thi Lac— 12

**The Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 2 lost.

*Government Orders*

The question is on Motion No. 3.

[*English*]

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

**The Speaker:** Is there agreement to proceed in this fashion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Rodger Cuzner:** Mr. Speaker, the Liberals will be voting against the motion.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Michel Guimond:** Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois will vote in favour of this motion.

[*English*]

**Mr. Yvon Godin:** Mr. Speaker, members of the NDP will be voting yes.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Arthur:** Mr. Speaker, I vote against this motion.

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 3, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 68)*

## YEAS

## Members

Allen (Welland)	André
Angus	Asselin
Atamanenko	Bachand
Beaudin	Bellavance
Bevington	Bigras
Blais	Bonsant
Bouchard	Brunelle
Cardin	Carrier
Charlton	Chow
Christopherson	Comartin
Crowder	Cullen
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	Davies (Vancouver East)
Demers	Deschamps
Desnoyers	Dewar
Donnelly	Dorion
Duceppe	Dufour
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)	Faille
Freeman	Gagnon
Gaudet	Godin
Gravelle	Guimond (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les
Basques)	
Guimond (Montmorency—Charlevoix—Haute-Côte-Nord)	
Harris (St. John's East)	Hyer
Hughes	Laforest
Julian	Lalonde
Laframboise	Layton
Lavallée	Leslie
Lemay	Lévesque
Lessard	Maloway
Malo	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Marston	Mathysen
Martin (Sault Ste. Marie)	Mourani
Ménard	Ouellet
Nadeau	Paquette
Paillé (Louis-Hébert)	Pomerleau
Plamondon	Savoie
Rafferty	St-Cyr
Siksay	Thibeault
Stoffer	
Vincent — 75	

## NAYS

## Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Aglukkaq	Albrecht
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Allison
Ambrose	Anders
Anderson	Andrews
Armstrong	Arthur
Ashfield	Bagnell
Bains	Baird
Bélanger	Bennett
Benoit	Bernier
Bevilacqua	Bezan
Blackburn	Blaney
Block	Boucher
Boughen	Braid
Breitreuz	Brisson
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)	Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)
Brown (Barrie)	Bruinooge
Byrne	Cadman
Calandra	Calkins
Cannan (Kelowna—Lake Country)	Cannis
Carrie	Casson
Chong	Clarke
Clement	Coady
Cotler	Crombie
Cummins	Cuzner
D'Amours	Davidson
Day	Dechert
Del Mastro	Devolin
Dhaliwal	Dhalla
Dion	Dreeschen
Dryden	Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dykstra
Easter	Eyking
Fast	Finley
Flaherty	Fletcher
Foote	Fry
Galipeau	Gallant
Généreux	Glover
Goldring	Goodyear
Gourde	Grewal
Guarnieri	Hall Findlay
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)	Hawn
Hiebert	Hill
Hoback	Hoepfner
Holder	Holland
Ignatieff	Jean
Jennings	Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
Kania	Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Kent
Kerr	Komarnicki
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)	Lake
Lauzon	Lebel
LeBlanc	Lee
Lemieux	Lobb
Lukiwski	Lunn
Lunney	MacAulay
MacKenzie	Malhi
Mayes	McCallum
McColeman	McGuinty
McLeod	McTeague
Mendes	Menzies
Merrifield	Miller
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	
Murphy (Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe)	
Murphy (Charlottetown)	Murray
Nicholson	Norlock
O'Connor	O'Neill-Gordon
Obhrai	Oliphant
Pacetti	Paradis
Payne	Petit
Poilievre	Preston
Rae	Raitt
Rajotte	Ratansi
Rathgeber	Regan
Reid	Richards
Richardson	Rickford
Ritz	Rodriguez
Rota	Russell
Savage	Saxton
Scarpaleggia	Scheer

*Government Orders*

Schellenberger	Sgro
Shea	Shipley
Shory	Simms
Simson	Sorenson
Stanton	Storseth
Sweet	Szabo
Thompson	Tilson
Toews	Tonks
Trost	Trudeau
Tweed	Uppal
Van Kesteren	Van Loan
Vellacott	Verner
Volpe	Wallace
Warawa	Warkentin
Watson	Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)
Wilfert	Wong
Woodworth	Wrzesnewskyj
Yelich	Young
Zarac— 195	

## PAIRED

## Members

Bourgeois	Cannon (Pontiac)
DeBellefeuille	Guay
MacKay (Central Nova)	Moore (Fundy Royal)
Oda	Pailé (Hochelaga)
Roy	Smith
Strahl	Thi Lac— 12

**The Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 3 lost.

**Hon. Peter Van Loan (Minister of International Trade, CPC)** moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in.

**The Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

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

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Rodger Cuzner:** Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party will vote in favour of the motion.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Michel Guimond:** Mr. Speaker, the Bloc will vote against this motion.

**Mr. Yvon Godin:** Mr. Speaker, the members of the NDP are proud to vote against this motion.

**Mr. André Arthur:** Mr. Speaker, I vote in favour of this motion.

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

*(Division No. 69)*

## YEAS

## Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Aglukkaq	Albrecht
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Allison
Ambrose	Anders
Anderson	Andrews
Armstrong	Arthur
Ashfield	Bagnell
Bains	Baird
Bélangier	Bennett
Benoit	Bernier
Bevilacqua	Bezan
Blackburn	Blaney

Block	Boucher
Boughen	Braid
Breitkreuz	Brown
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)	Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)
Brown (Barrie)	Bruinooge
Byrne	Cadman
Calandra	Calkins
Cannan (Kelowna—Lake Country)	Cannis
Carrie	Casson
Chong	Clarke
Clement	Coady
Cotler	Crombie
Cummins	Cuzner
D'Amours	Davidson
Day	Dechert
Del Mastro	Devolin
Dhaliwal	Dhalla
Dion	Dreesen
Dryden	Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dykstra
Easter	Eyking
Fast	Finley
Flaherty	Fletcher
Foote	Fry
Galipeau	Gallant
Généreux	Glover
Golding	Goodyear
Gourde	Grewal
Guarnieri	Hall Findlay
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)	Hawn
Hiebert	Hill
Hoback	Hoepfner
Holder	Holland
Ignatieff	Jean
Jennings	Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
Kania	Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kenny (Calgary Southeast)	Kent
Kerr	Komamicki
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)	Lake
Lauzon	Lebel
LeBlanc	Lee
Lemieux	Lobb
Lukiwski	Lunn
Lunney	MacAulay
MacKenzie	Malhi
Mayes	McCallum
McColeman	McGuinty
McLeod	McTeague
Mendes	Menzies
Merrifield	Miller
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	Murray
Murphy (Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe)	Norlock
Murphy (Charlottetown)	O'Neill-Gordon
Nicholson	Oliphant
O'Connor	Paradis
Obhrai	Petit
Pacetti	Preston
Payne	Raii
Poillievre	Ratansi
Rae	Regan
Rajotte	Richards
Rathgeber	Rickford
Reid	Rodriguez
Richardson	Russell
Ritz	Saxton
Rota	Scheer
Savage	Sgro
Scarpaleggia	Shipley
Schellenberger	Simms
Shea	Sorenson
Shory	Storseth
Simson	Szabo
Stanton	Tilson
Sweet	Tonks
Thompson	Trudeau
Toews	Uppal
Trost	Van Loan
Tweed	Verner
Van Kesteren	Wallace
Vellacott	Warkentin
Volpe	Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)
Warawa	
Watson	
Sky Country)	

*Routine Proceedings*

Wilfert  
Woodworth  
Yelich  
Zarac— 195

Wong  
Wrzesnewskyj  
Young

## NAYS

## Members

Allen (Welland)  
Angus  
Atamanenko  
Beaudin  
Bevington  
Blais  
Bouchard  
Cardin  
Charlton  
Christopherson  
Crowder  
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)  
Demers  
Desnoyers  
Donnelly  
Duceppe  
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)  
Freeman  
Gaudet  
Gravelle  
Basques)  
Guimond (Montmorency—Charlevoix—Haute-Côte-Nord)  
Harris (St. John's East)  
Hughes  
Julian  
Laframboise  
Lavallée  
Lemay  
Lessard  
Malo  
Marston  
Martin (Sault Ste. Marie)  
Ménard  
Nadeau  
Paillé (Louis-Hébert)  
Plamondon  
Rafferty  
Siksay  
Stoffer  
Vincent— 75

André  
Asselin  
Bachand  
Bellavance  
Bigras  
Bonsant  
Brunelle  
Carrier  
Chow  
Comartin  
Cullen  
Davies (Vancouver East)  
Deschamps  
Dewar  
Dorion  
Dufour  
Faille  
Gagnon  
Godin  
Guimond (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les

Hyer  
Laforest  
Lalonde  
Layton  
Leslie  
Lévesque  
Maloway  
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)  
Mathysen  
Mourani  
Ouellet  
Paquette  
Pomerleau  
Savoie  
St-Cyr  
Thibeault

## PAIRED

## Members

Bourgeois  
DeBellefeuille  
MacKay (Central Nova)  
Oda  
Roy  
Strahl

Cannon (Pontiac)  
Guay  
Moore (Fundy Royal)  
Paillé (Hochelaga)  
Smith  
Thi Lac— 12

**The Speaker:** I declare the motion carried.

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

[*English*]

**COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE**

## INDUSTRY, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY.

The House resumed from June 2 consideration of the motion

**The Speaker:** The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion to concur in the second report of the Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Technology concerning the extension of time to consider Bill C-309.

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

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Rodger Cuzner:** Mr. Speaker, the Liberals will vote in favour of the motion.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Michel Guimond:** Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois will also be voting in favour of this motion.

**Mr. Yvon Godin:** Mr. Speaker, the NDP is also voting in favour of this motion.

**Mr. André Arthur:** Mr. Speaker, I am voting in favour of this motion.

**Mr. Bernard Patry:** Mr. Speaker, I was not present for the previous vote, and I would like to be included in this vote. I am in favour of this motion.

**Hon. Denis Coderre:** Mr. Speaker, I was not present for the previous vote, and I am voting in favour of this motion.

● (1845)

[*English*]

**Mr. Gerard Kennedy:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to have my vote applied in favour.

**Mr. Francis Valeriot:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to have my vote in favour.

**Hon. Anita Neville:** Mr. Speaker: I would also like to have vote registered in favour.

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

(*Division No. 70*)

## YEAS

## Members

Abbott  
Aglukkaq  
Allen (Welland)  
Allison  
Anders  
André  
Angus  
Arthur  
Asselin  
Bachand  
Bains  
Beaudin  
Bellavance  
Benoit  
Bevilacqua  
Bezan  
Blackburn  
Blaney  
Bonsant  
Boucher  
Braid  
Brison  
Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)  
Bruinooge  
Byrne  
Calandra  
Cannan (Kelowna—Lake Country)

Ablonczy  
Albrecht  
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)  
Ambrose  
Anderson  
Andrews  
Armstrong  
Ashfield  
Atamanenko  
Bagnell  
Baird  
Bélangier  
Bennett  
Bernier  
Bevington  
Bigras  
Blais  
Block  
Bouchard  
Boughen  
Breitkreuz  
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)  
Brown (Barrie)  
Brunelle  
Cadman  
Calkins  
Cannis

*Private Members' Business*

Cardin	Carrie	Regan	Reid
Carrier	Casson	Richards	Richardson
Charlton	Chong	Rickford	Ritz
Chow	Christopherson	Rodriguez	Rota
Clarke	Clement	Russell	Savage
Coady	Coderre	Savoie	Saxton
Comartin	Cotler	Scarpaleggia	Scheer
Crombie	Crowder	Schellenberger	Sgro
Cullen	Cummins	Shea	Shipley
Cuzner	D'Amours	Shory	Siksay
Davidson	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	Simms	Simson
Davies (Vancouver East)	Day	Sorenson	St-Cyr
Dechert	Del Mastro	Stanton	Stoffer
Demers	Deschamps	Storseth	Sweet
Desnoyers	Devolin	Szabo	Thibeault
Dewar	Dhaliwal	Thompson	Tilson
Dhalla	Dion	Toews	Tonks
Donnelly	Dorion	Trost	Trudeau
Dreeshen	Dryden	Tweed	Uppal
Duceppe	Dufour	Valeriot	Van Kesteren
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)	Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Van Loan	Vellacott
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)	Dykstra	Verner	Vincent
Easter	Eyking	Volpe	Wallace
Faillie	Fast	Warawa	Warkentin
Finley	Flaherty	Watson	Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to
Fletcher	Foote	Sky Country)	Wong
Freeman	Fry	Wilfert	Wrzesnewskyj
Gagnon	Galipeau	Woodworth	Young
Gallant	Gaudet	Yelich	
Généreux	Glover	Zarac — 275	
Godin	Goldring		
Goodyear	Gourde		
Gravelle	Grewal		
Guarnieri	Guimond (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les		
Basques)			
Guimond (Montmorency—Charlevoix—Haute-Côte-Nord)			
Hall Findlay			
Harris (St. John's East)	Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)		
Hawn	Hiebert		
Hill	Hoback		
Hoepfner	Holder		
Holland	Hughes		
Hyer	Ignatieff		
Jean	Jennings		
Julian	Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)		
Kania	Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)		
Kennedy	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)		
Kent	Kerr		
Komarnicki	Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)		
Laforest	Laframboise		
Lake	Lalonde		
Lauzon	Lavallée		
Layton	Lebel		
LeBlanc	Lee		
Lemay	Lemieux		
Leslie	Lessard		
Lévesque	Lobb		
Lukiwski	Lunn		
Lunney	MacAulay		
MacKenzie	Malhi		
Malo	Maloway		
Marston	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)		
Martin (Sault Ste. Marie)	Mathysen		
Mayes	McCallum		
McColeman	McGuinly		
McLeod	McTeague		
Ménard	Mendes		
Menzies	Merrifield		
Miller	Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)		
Mourani	Murphy (Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe)		
Murphy (Charlottetown)	Murray		
Nadeau	Neville		
Nicholson	Norlock		
O'Connor	O'Neill-Gordon		
Obhrai	Oliphant		
Ouellet	Pacetti		
Paillé (Louis-Hébert)	Paquette		
Paradis	Patry		
Payne	Petit		
Plamondon	Poilievre		
Pomerleau	Preston		
Rae	Rafferty		
Raitt	Rajotte		
Ratansi	Rathgeber		

## NAYS

Nil

## PAIRED

## Members

Bourgeois	Cannon (Pontiac)
DeBellefeuille	Guay
MacKay (Central Nova)	Moore (Fundy Royal)
Oda	Paillé (Hochelaga)
Roy	Smith
Strahl	Thi Lac — 12

**The Speaker:** I declare the motion carried.

The House resumed from June 2 consideration of the motion.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin):** The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion to concur in the third report of the Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Technology concerning the extension of time to consider Bill C-393.

**Hon. Gordon O'Connor:** Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you would find unanimous support for this motion.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin):** Does the Chief Government Whip have unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

---

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS**

[English]

**EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT**

The House resumed from June 4 consideration of the motion that Bill C-395, An Act to amend the Employment Insurance Act (labour dispute), as reported (with amendment) from committee, be concurred in.

*Private Members' Business*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin):** The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion for concurrence at report stage of Bill C-395 under private members' business.

• (1855)

[Translation]

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

*(Division No. 71)***YEAS**

## Members

Allen (Welland)	André
Andrews	Angus
Asselin	Atamanenko
Bachand	Bagnell
Bains	Beaudin
Bélanger	Bellavance
Bennett	Bevilacqua
Bevington	Bigras
Blais	Bonsant
Bouchard	Brisson
Brunelle	Byrne
Cannis	Cardin
Carrier	Charlton
Chow	Christopherson
Coady	Coderre
Comartin	Cotler
Crombie	Crowder
Cullen	Cuzner
D'Amours	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Davies (Vancouver East)	Demers
Deschamps	Desnoyers
Dewar	Dhaliwal
Dhalla	Dion
Donnelly	Dorion
Dryden	Duceppe
Dufour	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)	Easter
Eyking	Faille
Footé	Freeman
Fry	Gagnon
Gaudet	Godin
Gravelle	Guarnieri
Guimond (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques)	
Guimond (Montmorency—Charlevoix—Haute-Côte-Nord)	
Hall Findlay	Harris (St. John's East)
Holland	Hughes
Hyer	Jennings
Julian	Kania
Kennedy	Laforest
Laframboise	Lalonde
Lavallée	Layton
LeBlanc	Lee
Lemay	Leslie
Lessard	Lévesque
MacAulay	Malhi
Malo	Maloway
Marston	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Martin (Sault Ste. Marie)	Mathysen
McCallum	McGuinty
McTeague	Ménard
Mendes	Mourani
Murphy (Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe)	Murphy (Charlottetown)
Murray	Nadeau
Neville	Oliphant
Ouellet	Pacetti
Paillé (Louis-Hébert)	Paquette
Patry	Plamondon
Pomerleau	Rae
Rafferty	Ratansi
Regan	Rodriguez
Rota	Russell
Savage	Savoie
Scarpaleggia	Sgro
Siksay	Simms

Simson  
Stoffer  
Thibeault  
Trudeau  
Vincent  
Wilfert  
Zarac — 139

St-Cyr  
Szabo  
Tonks  
Valeriote  
Volpe  
Wrzesnewskyj

**NAYS**

## Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Aglukkaq	Albrecht
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Allison
Ambrose	Anders
Anderson	Armstrong
Arthur	Ashfield
Baird	Benoit
Bernier	Bezan
Blackburn	Blaney
Block	Boucher
Boughen	Braid
Breitkreuz	Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)	Brown (Barrie)
Bruinooge	Cadman
Calandra	Calkins
Cannan (Kelowna—Lake Country)	Carrie
Casson	Chong
Clarke	Clement
Cummins	Davidson
Day	Dechert
Del Mastro	Dreeshen
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)	Dykstra
Fast	Finley
Flaherty	Fletcher
Galipeau	Gallant
Généreux	Glover
Goldring	Goodyear
Gourde	Grewal
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)	Hawn
Hiebert	Hill
Hoback	Hoepfner
Holder	Jean
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)	Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Kent
Kerr	Komarnicki
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)	Lake
Lauzon	Lebel
Lemieux	Lobb
Lukivski	Lunn
Lunny	MacKenzie
Mayes	McColeman
McLeod	Menzies
Merrifield	Miller
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	
Nicholson	O'Connor
Norlock	Obhrai
O'Neill-Gordon	Payne
Paradis	Poilievre
Petit	Raitt
Preston	Rathgeber
Rajotte	Richards
Reid	Rickford
Richardson	Saxton
Ritz	Schellenberger
Scheer	Shipley
Shea	Sorenson
Shory	Storseth
Stanton	Thompson
Sweet	Toews
Tilson	Tweed
Trost	Van Kesteren
Uppal	Vellacott
Van Loan	Wallace
Verner	Warkentin
Warawa	Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to
Watson	
Sky Country)	Woodworth
Wong	Young — 134
Yelich	

## PAIRED

## Members

Bourgeois	Cannon (Pontiac)
DeBellefeuille	Guay
MacKay (Central Nova)	Moore (Fundy Royal)
Oda	Paillé (Hochelaga)
Roy	Smith
Strahl	Thi Lac— 12

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin):** I declare the motion carried.

\* \* \*

[English]

## CONTROLLED DRUGS AND SUBSTANCES ACT

The House resumed from June 7 consideration of the motion that Bill C-475, An Act to amend the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act (methamphetamine and ecstasy), be read the third time and passed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin):** The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at third reading stage of Bill C-475 under private members' business. The question is on the motion.

● (1900)

[Translation]

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

(Division No. 72)

## YEAS

## Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Aglukkaq	Albrecht
Allen (Welland)	Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Allison	Ambrose
Anders	Anderson
André	Andrews
Angus	Armstrong
Arthur	Ashfield
Asselin	Atamanenko
Bachand	Bagnell
Bains	Baird
Beaudin	Bélangier
Bellavance	Bennett
Benoit	Bernier
Bevilacqua	Bevington
Bezan	Bigras
Blackburn	Blais
Blaney	Block
Bonsant	Bouchard
Boucher	Boughen
Braid	Breitreuz
Brisson	Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)	Brown (Barrie)
Bruinoogee	Brunelle
Byrne	Cadman
Calandra	Calkins
Cannan (Kelowna—Lake Country)	Cannis
Cardin	Carrie
Carrier	Casson
Charlton	Chong
Chow	Christopherson
Clarke	Clement
Coady	Coderre
Comartin	Cotler
Crombie	Crowder
Cullen	Cummins
Cuzner	D'Amours

## Private Members' Business

Davidson	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Davies (Vancouver East)	Day
Dechert	Del Mastro
Demers	Deschamps
Desnoyers	Dewar
Dhaliwal	Dhalla
Dion	Donnelly
Dorion	Dreeshen
Dryden	Duceppe
Dufour	Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Dykstra	Easter
Eyking	Faille
Fast	Finley
Flaherty	Fletcher
Foote	Freeman
Fry	Gagnon
Galipeau	Gallant
Gaudet	Généreux
Glover	Godin
Goldring	Goodyear
Gourde	Gravelle
Grewal	Guamieri
Guimond (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques)	Guimond (Montmorency—Charlevoix—Haute-Côte-Nord)
Hall Findlay	Harris (St. John's East)
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)	Hawn
Hiebert	Hill
Hoback	Hoepfner
Holder	Holland
Hughes	Hyer
Jean	Jennings
Julian	Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
Kania	Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kennedy	Kenny (Calgary Southeast)
Kent	Kerr
Komarnicki	Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Laforest	Laframboise
Lake	Lalonde
Lauzon	Lavallée
Layton	Lebel
LeBlanc	Lee
Lemay	Lemieux
Leslie	Lessard
Lévesque	Lobb
Lukiwski	Lunn
Lunney	MacAulay
MacKenzie	Malhi
Malo	Maloway
Marston	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Martin (Sault Ste. Marie)	Mathysen
Mayes	McCallum
McColeman	McGuinty
McLeod	McTeague
Ménard	Mendes
Menzies	Merrifield
Miller	Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
Mourani	Murphy (Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe)
Murphy (Charlottetown)	Murray
Nadeau	Neville
Nicholson	Norlock
O'Connor	O'Neill-Gordon
Obhrai	Oliphant
Ouellet	Pacetti
Paillé (Louis-Hébert)	Paquette
Paradis	Patry
Payne	Petit
Plamondon	Poillievre
Pomerleau	Preston
Rae	Rafferty
Raitt	Rajotte
Ratansi	Rathgeber
Regan	Reid
Richards	Richardson
Rickford	Ritz
Rodriguez	Rota
Russell	Savage
Savoie	Saxton
Scarpaleggia	Scheer
Schellenberger	Sgro
Shea	Shibley
Shory	Siksay
Simms	Simson
Sorenson	St-Cyr

*Adjournment Proceedings*

Stanton	Stoffer
Storseth	Sweet
Szabo	Thibeault
Thompson	Tilson
Toews	Tonks
Trost	Trudeau
Tweed	Uppal
Valeriote	Van Kesteren
Van Loan	Vellacott
Verner	Vincent
Volpe	Wallace
Warawa	Warkentin
Watson	Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)
Wilfert	Wong
Woodworth	Wrzesnewskyj
Yelich	Young
Zarac— 273	

## NAYS

Nil

## PAIRED

## Members

Bourgeois	Cannon (Pontiac)
DeBellefeuille	Guay
MacKay (Central Nova)	Moore (Fundy Royal)
Oda	Paillé (Hochelaga)
Roy	Smith
Strahl	Thi Lac— 12

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin):** I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed)

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin):** I wish to inform the House that because of the delay there will be no private members' business today. Accordingly, the order will be rescheduled for another sitting.

\* \* \*

● (1905)

## POINTS OF ORDER

## USE OF CAMERA IN CHAMBER

**Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the rule in the House is that we are not supposed to use cameras to take pictures. The member for Oakville just used a camera to take pictures in the House while the House was sitting.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin):** It would appear that the member for Oakville has left the chamber. The point of order is noted and we will wait to hear from the member for Oakville.

**Mr. Stephen Woodworth:** Mr. Speaker, it may be too late in light of your earlier comments, but I was hoping to ask the House to see the clock as 6:59 p.m. so that we might proceed to private members' business.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin):** Is it agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

## ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

[*English*]

## PUBLIC SAFETY

**Mr. Brian Murphy (Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on April 16, I rose to ask the Minister of Public Safety why he continued to pay no attention to the safety and security needs of Canadians in southeastern New Brunswick.

Since 1997, Moncton, Riverview and Dieppe have employed RCMP police services, with great success I might add. The Codiac RCMP has ensured honourable and effective service for many New Brunswickers but costs in recent years have soared.

Public safety is a fundamental right and it is the responsibility of government to guarantee this right. That is why the federal government has a cost sharing agreement with Canadian municipalities for their policing needs.

Of almost 270 communities in Canada, all but 2 out of 270 enjoy the 10% rebate provided by the federal government. Both of those communities are in southeastern New Brunswick. This is shameful. It is a dereliction of duty on the part of the government and it is not in the national interests. I speak now of the local concerns of the municipal governments in Moncton, Riverview and Dieppe that are suffering, as are the taxpayers, by this discrimination and dereliction of duty.

Over the last three years, municipal, provincial and federal leaders in New Brunswick have requested the cost sharing agreement every other community has been afforded. Repeated and sustained efforts have been met without the slightest response or acknowledgement from the government. This is totally unacceptable.

Every year the people of Moncton, Riverview and Dieppe must foot an extra \$2 million in police costs that are covered by the federal government in every other community, and this is at a time when the government thinks it is appropriate to spend about the same amount of money, \$1.9 million, on a fake lake. So, \$2 million for policing services or \$2 million for a fake lake with a fake lighthouse. What do the people of Canada think about this?

How have photo ops come to supercede the public safety needs of Canadians? All parties involved, from the municipalities to the Codiac Regional Policing Authority, have proven their shared commitment to finding a resolution to this matter but the federal government has not.

This is beyond the time for deliberations and consultations, as the minister continues to assert. These discussions have gone on for years now and the safety and security of New Brunswickers continues to suffer. The City of Moncton alone has made it clear that the current situation is unsustainable. Requests for a decision from the government have been completely ignored and the city stands to not renew its contract with the Codiac RCMP when it expires in 2012.



*Adjournment Proceedings*

Only with a far more equitable cost sharing agreement can the Codiac RCMP continue to operate in the region. Moncton must make its final decision on the future of its police services by June 30 of this year. After years of being ignored by the government, it has now come to a head.

The question has been asked in this House numerous times. Soft assurances have been given and lunches paid for in the parliamentary restaurant by the government for mayors and successive mayors. Successive municipal administrations have not had an answer from the government.

When will equity and fairness be done so that southeastern New Brunswickers can join the other 268 communities that enjoy this advantage?

• (1910)

**Mr. Dave MacKenzie (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to respond to the question put by my good friend, the member for Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe, regarding the police services agreement for Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe.

In 1992 the Government of Canada entered into police service agreements with all of the provinces, except Ontario and Quebec which have their own provincial police forces, the territories and about 180 municipalities. Contract policing carried out by the RCMP is a method by which contract jurisdictions enter into an arrangement with the federal government known as a police service agreement for the use of the RCMP as a provincial, territorial or local police force. Contract policing has been seen as a way to advance federal government goals for public safety, as well as to provide a recognized professional police service to contract jurisdictions.

As I indicated, the RCMP does provide police service across the country pursuant to police service agreements with contract jurisdictions. All municipal police service agreements signed before 1992 contain a term or clause to share certain costs with Canada. The greater Moncton area, which includes Moncton, Riverview and Dieppe, has been policed by the RCMP under a police service agreement entered into in January 1998 by the former government. Within this agreement there is a clear provision agreed to by the signing parties that the policing service provided by the RCMP would be charged at 100% cost recovery.

The contract was signed in 1998, as I indicated, by the previous government and will expire in 2012, along with all other police service agreements. Currently the federal government is discussing the renewal of all police service agreements with the contract jurisdictions. There are many issues under discussion as all parties prepare for the expiry of the agreements in 2012 and for new arrangements starting then.

I am well aware of the issue concerning the costing arrangements for the police service agreement with Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe. The member may rest assured that this issue has been and will be discussed within the broader context of the renewal of the police service agreement. I believe it would be wise to allow our officials to continue to advance this issue.

**Mr. Brian Murphy:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the response. I know the parliamentary secretary is very hard working and has a background in policing. I do appreciate his sincerity.

However, here is the deal. The deadline is approaching. The citizens of Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe have to make a decision, and by the non-response, because the response to Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe has to be couched in an overall reassessment of the agreement for the other 268 communities, this means that the governments in Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe will have to make a decision and that decision will not be with the benefit of a future reduction in the RCMP costs of 10% that other communities enjoy.

The answer tonight says to governments and mayors that we will not have the RCMP in the greater Moncton area. The government has done nothing to further the cause of the RCMP in greater Moncton because it does not give a response to this June 30 deadline.

It is a fait accompli. I am sorry for this dereliction, but that is the way it is.

• (1915)

**Mr. Dave MacKenzie:** Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleague across the floor listens closely. Contract policing is recognized by other nations as a model for integrating the fight against crime at the local, provincial, national and international levels, which does advance federal government goals for public safety and provides a professional police service to many rural and remote areas of Canada.

The cost issue has been and will continue to be discussed within the broader context of the renewal of the police service agreements.

## INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION

**Ms. Irene Mathyssen (London—Fanshawe, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, Canada's G8 and G20 maternal and child health strategy is of profound concern.

On April 28, 2010, I asked the Minister of International Cooperation to explain to the House why the government has decided to renege on its international commitments by refusing to include a complete range of maternal health services in its maternal and child health strategy.

All G8 partners, including the Americans and the British, have been very clear that access to safe abortions must be part of the maternal health initiative.

In his response, the parliamentary secretary followed the example of the minister and decided to use quotations from various organizations, creating the illusion that these organizations actually support this G8 initiative. The cherry-picking of quotations misled the House and the Canadian public.

*Adjournment Proceedings*

On May 3, the Standing Committee on the Status of Women began its study on the G8 maternal and child health initiative. Over the course of our meetings, we heard from a number of reputable aid and maternal health organizations. These organizations that specialize in maternal health stated that access to legal, safe abortion must be included in a maternal health strategy.

I will give members an idea of the information that was presented at committee. We learned that with the adoption of the Maputo plan of action on sexual and reproductive health and rights in 2006, all African states now permit abortion under some circumstances.

However, despite this, the WHO shows that only 5 in every 100 abortions in Africa are carried out under safe conditions. So, despite political will among these nations, they have not been able to put the infrastructure in place to provide safe abortions.

Katherine McDonald, executive director of Action Canada for Population and Development, cautioned the committee, saying that if we are to restrict abortion from Canadian aid policies, we have to remember that in most of those countries where women get sexual and reproductive health care there is only a one-stop shop.

If abortion is legal, contraception fails and they go back to find out what their options are with respect to the possible termination of a pregnancy, the practical issue arises of what to do if that clinic is receiving Canadian aid. Do providers say no, that it must turn them away because they have Canadian aid pooled in their funding, or is it a situation where Canadian aid will not be available to that clinic at all?

We were also provided with some troubling statistics. Ainsley Jenicek, project manager of Fédération du Québec pour le planning des naissances, told the committee:

In reality, more than 220,000 children lose their mothers each year due to unsafe abortions. So it is a lot more likely that, without their mothers, those children will die.

Approximately 70,000 women die each year due to unsafe abortions.

Five million women are hospitalized because of complications resulting from unsafe abortion....

On May 11, the Minister of International Cooperation reported to the House that the Canadian Association of Midwives supported Canada's maternal and child health strategy. She led the House to believe that the exclusion of abortion was acceptable.

A letter from Gisela Becker, the president of CAM, stated:

...I would like to clarify our organization's position and respond to [the] comments [of the minister] in the House of Commons on May 11th, 2010 that CAM supports the Canadian Government's position on its MNCH strategy. CAM certainly [does] support [that position]... However, CAM believes that reproductive health care is an integral part of maternal health; this includes contraception, family planning and access to legal, safe abortion care as a fundamental right of women regardless of where they live.

This testimony shows that the government is risking women by refusing to provide safe, legal abortion. Does it think it can play political games with the lives of women?

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Sylvie Boucher (Parliamentary Secretary for Status of Women, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for giving me an opportunity to speak in this House on such an important matter.

Our government's foreign affairs record is impeccable. We have doubled our aid to Africa. We have doubled our total aid to an unprecedented \$5 billion and our aid has become more effective, targeted and responsible. The purpose of foreign aid is obvious: to reduce poverty in developing countries. Improving the lives of mothers and children lays the groundwork for reducing poverty permanently.

What the opposition does not say about this issue is the simple fact that the NGOs that support this initiative are experts. We have worked with World Vision, UNICEF, Results Canada, Care Canada, Plan Canada and Save the Children. These NGOs support our initiative because they know, based on their expertise, that it is an excellent initiative. These NGOs are not intimidated by the opposition's tactics.

I would like to reiterate some points made in previous speeches. Our government has no interest in reopening the debate the opposition is pushing. That is their agenda, not ours. The opposition is playing political games, and we will not stoop to their level. Our G8 initiative is about saving lives. We want to promote results-driven solutions that will help mothers and children in an effective, focused and accountable manner.

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

**Mrs. Sylvie Boucher:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to be able to talk.

For months, committees have heard a great deal of testimony, including plenty of testimony supporting and applauding our government's initiative.

I want to make sure that the NDP member and Canadians are well aware of that fact. Canadians want to see us operating on the world stage in a manner that brings people together instead of dividing them. Canadians want their government to be a world leader. This Prime Minister has taken it upon himself to ensure that we get the job done.

According to the World Health Organization, every year more than 500,000 women, most of them in sub-Saharan Africa and Asia, die in pregnancy and childbirth from largely preventable causes. These women are giving birth in completely unsanitary conditions.

Every year, three million babies die in their first week of life. Nearly 9 million children in the developing world die before their fifth birthday from largely preventable diseases.

There are simple solutions to address all of these problems. The G8 initiative is the very essence of these solutions. The last thing we need are pointless debates.

I want to make sure that opposition members are aware of what Melinda Gates said yesterday. The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation announced its program on maternal health yesterday. It mirrors the Government of Canada's position on this issue. She even told the media that they took that particular position because they do not want to be part of the controversy or contribute to the controversy.

*Adjournment Proceedings*

● (1920)

*[English]*

**Ms. Irene Mathyssen:** Mr. Speaker, the government has chosen to cherry-pick quotations and statistics in a desperate attempt to justify an initiative that has been criticized by both Canadian and international aid experts. What is clear from the conduct of the government is that it is choosing votes from its base as opposed to the health and lives of women.

We saw the same thing from the Bush administration in the U.S. What we learned from the Bush gag rule was that refusing to fund abortion does not reduce the number of abortions that occur. It simply increases the number of unsafe abortions, thus increasing the maternal mortality rate. The only way to reduce mortality is to provide women with access to contraception and family planning, which includes abortion when necessary.

Today on Parliament Hill a demonstration was held in memory of the thousands of women who have died from botched abortions. The people present, and so many other Canadians and citizens around the world, realize that because of the government's idealized and ridiculous decision women will die.

● (1925)

*[Translation]*

**Mrs. Sylvie Boucher:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the opposition that numbers can be made to say whatever one wants. I would like to tell the House that there are simple solutions for saving the lives of women and children. We do not want and we will not stoop to enter into a debate that is not ours to have and that is not in our agenda. The Government of Canada's position on this issue is clear.

UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon said that we know how to save the lives of mothers and that some simple blood tests, consultation with a doctor and qualified help at the birth can make a huge difference. He also said that with basic antibiotics, blood transfusions and a safe operating room, the risk of death can almost be eliminated.

Those are simple solutions, and that is what Canada is aiming for.

*[English]*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin):** The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 7:26 p.m.)

---



# CONTENTS

Wednesday, June 9, 2010

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

### Nuclear Non-Proliferation

Mr. Obhrai ..... 3591

### Religious Freedom

Mrs. Crombie ..... 3591

### Annette Savoie

Mr. Desnoyers ..... 3591

### Harmonized Sales Tax

Mr. Siksay ..... 3591

### Citizens of the Year

Mr. Payne ..... 3592

### India

Mr. Bains ..... 3592

### Controlled Drugs and Substances Act

Mr. Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country) ..... 3592

### Quebec Archaeological Museum

Mrs. DeBellefeuille ..... 3592

### Leader of the Liberal Party of Canada

Mr. Gourde ..... 3593

### Human Rights

Ms. Duncan (Etobicoke North) ..... 3593

### Firearms Registry

Mrs. Glover ..... 3593

### Status of Women

Ms. Charlton ..... 3593

### Ministerial Responsibility

Mr. Brown (Barrie) ..... 3593

### The Conservatives

Ms. Bonsant ..... 3594

### Religious Freedom

Mr. Malhi ..... 3594

### Liberal Party of Canada

Mr. McColeman ..... 3594

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### G8 and G20 Summits

Mr. Ignatieff ..... 3594

Mr. Harper ..... 3594

Mr. Ignatieff ..... 3594

Mr. Harper ..... 3594

Mr. Ignatieff ..... 3595

Mr. Harper ..... 3595

Mr. Holland ..... 3595

Mr. Flaherty ..... 3595

Mr. Holland ..... 3595

Mr. Toews ..... 3595

Mr. Duceppe ..... 3595

Mr. Harper ..... 3595

Mr. Duceppe ..... 3595

Mr. Harper ..... 3595

Mr. Paquette ..... 3596

Mr. Baird ..... 3596

Mr. Paquette ..... 3596

Mr. Cannon ..... 3596

### Jobs and Economic Growth Act

Mr. Layton ..... 3596

Mr. Harper ..... 3596

Mr. Layton ..... 3596

Mr. Harper ..... 3596

Mr. Layton ..... 3596

Mr. Harper ..... 3596

### G8 and G20 Summits

Mrs. Jennings ..... 3596

Mr. Cannon ..... 3597

Mrs. Jennings ..... 3597

Mr. Cannon ..... 3597

Mr. Savage ..... 3597

Mr. Cannon ..... 3597

Mr. Savage ..... 3597

Mrs. Shea ..... 3597

### Committees of the House

Mrs. Freeman ..... 3597

Mr. Poilievre ..... 3597

Mr. Guimond (Montmorency—Charlevoix—Haute-Côte-Nord) ..... 3597

Mr. Poilievre ..... 3597

### Foreign Affairs

Ms. Lalonde ..... 3597

Mr. Cannon ..... 3598

Ms. Lalonde ..... 3598

Mr. Cannon ..... 3598

### Banking Sector

Mr. McCallum ..... 3598

Mr. Flaherty ..... 3598

Mr. McCallum ..... 3598

Mr. Flaherty ..... 3598

### Oil and Gas Sector

Mr. Regan ..... 3598

Mr. Paradis ..... 3598

Mr. Regan ..... 3598

Mr. Paradis ..... 3598

### Foreign Affairs

Mr. Bezan ..... 3599

Mr. Harper ..... 3599

### G8 and G20 Summits

Mr. Angus ..... 3599

Mr. Cannon	3599
Mr. Angus	3599
Mr. Poilievre	3599
<b>Afghanistan</b>	
Mr. Bachand	3599
Mr. Nicholson	3599
Mr. Bachand	3599
Mr. Nicholson	3600
Mr. Dosanjh	3600
Mr. Nicholson	3600
Mr. Dosanjh	3600
Mr. Nicholson	3600
<b>Aboriginal Affairs</b>	
Ms. Leslie	3600
Mrs. Aglukkaq	3600
Mrs. Hughes	3600
Mr. Flaherty	3600
<b>Maternal and Child Health</b>	
Ms. Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)	3600
Ms. Ambrose	3601
Ms. Fry	3601
Ms. Ambrose	3601
<b>Aboriginal Affairs</b>	
Mr. Lemay	3601
Mr. Duncan (Vancouver Island North)	3601
<b>Asbestos</b>	
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	3601
Mr. Paradis	3601
<b>Justice</b>	
Mrs. O'Neill-Gordon	3601
Mr. Nicholson	3601
<b>Presence in Gallery</b>	
The Speaker	3602
<b>ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS</b>	
<b>Chief Electoral Officer</b>	
The Speaker	3602
<b>Government Response to Petitions</b>	
Mr. Lukiwski	3602
<b>Canada Consumer Product Safety Act</b>	
Mrs. Aglukkaq	3602
Bill C-36. Introduction and first reading	3602
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	3602
<b>Elder Abuse Awareness</b>	
Mrs. Ablonczy	3602
Ms. Sgro	3603
Mrs. Freeman	3603
Mr. Marston	3604
<b>Committees of the House</b>	
<b>Public Safety and National Security</b>	
Mr. Holland	3604

<b>Industry, Science and Technology</b>	
Mr. Chong	3604
<b>Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics</b>	
Mr. Szabo	3604
<b>Transport, Infrastructure and Communities</b>	
Mr. Tweed	3604
Motion	3604
Motion agreed to	3606

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

<b>Canada-Colombia Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act</b>	
<b>Bill C-2—Time Allocation Motion</b>	
Mr. Hill	3606
Motion	3606
Mr. Julian	3606
Mr. Van Loan	3606
Mr. Laforest	3606
Mr. Keddy	3607
Mr. Maloway	3607
Mr. Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	3608
Mr. Anderson	3608
Mr. Simms	3609
Mr. Del Mastro	3609
Mr. Julian	3610
Ms. Faille	3610
Motion agreed to	3612
<b>Report stage</b>	
Bill C-2. Report Stage	3612
Mr. Keddy	3612
Mr. Julian	3613
Mr. Fast	3614
Mr. Fast	3614
Mr. Simms	3615
Mr. Laforest	3616
Ms. Charlton	3616
Mr. Benoit	3617
Mr. Brison	3618
Mr. Menzies	3618
Division on Motion No. 1 deferred	3619
Division on Motion No. 2 deferred	3619
Division on Motion No. 3 deferred	3619
Motion No. 1 negatived	3620
Motion No. 2 negatived	3621
Motion No. 3 negatived	3623
Mr. Van Loan	3623
Motion for concurrence	3623
Motion agreed to	3624

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

<b>Committees of the House</b>	
<b>Industry, Science and Technology.</b>	
Motion agreed to	3625
Motion for concurrence	3625
(Motion agreed to)	3625

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS**

<b>Employment Insurance Act</b>	
Motion for concurrence .....	3625
Motion agreed to .....	3627
<b>Controlled Drugs and Substances Act</b>	
Bill C-475. Third reading .....	3627
Motion agreed to .....	3628
(Bill read the third time and passed) .....	3628

**Points of Order**

**Use of Camera in Chamber**

Mr. Godin .....	3628
-----------------	------

**ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS**

**Public Safety**

Mr. Murphy (Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe) .....	3628
Mr. MacKenzie .....	3629

**International Co-operation**

Ms. Mathysen .....	3629
Mrs. Boucher .....	3630

**MAIL  POSTE**

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

**Lettermail**

**Poste-lettre**

**1782711  
Ottawa**

*If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:*  
Publishing and Depository Services  
Public Works and Government Services Canada  
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5

*En cas de non-livraison,  
retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à :*  
Les Éditions et Services de dépôt  
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada  
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5

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.

Additional copies may be obtained from: Publishing and Depository Services  
Public Works and Government Services Canada  
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5  
Telephone: 613-941-5995 or 1-800-635-7943  
Fax: 613-954-5779 or 1-800-565-7757  
publications@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca  
http://publications.gc.ca

Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the following address: <http://www.parl.gc.ca>

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.

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les Éditions et Services de dépôt  
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada  
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5  
Téléphone : 613-941-5995 ou 1-800-635-7943  
Télécopieur : 613-954-5779 ou 1-800-565-7757  
publications@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca  
http://publications.gc.ca

Aussi disponible sur le site Web du Parlement du Canada à l'adresse suivante : <http://www.parl.gc.ca>