

PARLIAMENTARY WRAP-UP FOR THE WEEK OF MARCH 30 – APRIL 2, 2015

Updates on Key Legislation pertaining to First Nations

Please note: LEGISinfo, a website maintained by the Library of Parliament, provides comprehensive information on all legislation:

<http://www.parl.gc.ca/LegisInfo/Home.aspx?Language=E&Mode=1&ParliamentSession=41-2>

Bill C-32: Canadian Victims Bill of Rights Act

- **Currently at 3rd reading in the Senate - completed review by the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs and reported to the Senate with no changes.**
- The Bill would create a Victims Bill of Rights that outlines specific rights for victims of crime, including accessing information about the criminal justice system and programs and services, information about the status of investigations and criminal proceedings, protection from intimidation and retaliation, right to have views considered, the right to present a victim impact statement and to make a restitution order.
- The Bill would amend sentencing principles in the Criminal Code, including s. 718.2(e) that directs consideration to the unique circumstances of Aboriginal offenders. There is concern that this proposed amendment would be confusing and would interfere with the intention of flexibility in sentencing for Aboriginal offenders particularly coupled with recent introduction of mandatory minimums.

Bill C-33: First Nations Control of First Nations Education Act

- **Passed 2nd reading on May 5, 2014. The Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development announced that the bill will be held pending clarification of the position of First Nations. The pre-study initiated by the Senate Committee on Aboriginal Peoples has also been put on hold.**

Bill C-46: Pipelines Safety Act

- **Introduced December 8, 2014 and has been referred to the House of Commons Standing Committee on Natural Resources. The Committee set out very limited timelines for review of the Bill, designating one meeting on Tuesday March 31, 2015 to hear from witnesses in advance of the 2 week break, and moving to clause-by-clause review on April 21, 2015.**
- **The AFN provided a written submission outlining impacts on First Nations' rights (attached).**
- The Bill introduces absolute liability for all NEB-regulated pipelines, meaning that companies will be liable for costs and damages irrespective of fault — up to \$1 billion for major oil pipelines; companies continue to have unlimited liability when at fault or negligent; provides the NEB authority to order reimbursement of any cleanup costs incurred by governments, communities or individuals; and provides the NEB authority and resources to assume control of incident response if a company is

Bill C-51: Anti-Terrorism Act, 2015

- **Completed review by the House of Commons Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security and is at Report Stage with four amendments, including removing the word “lawful” from the greater certainty clause under the Definitions in Part 1, which now reads: *For greater certainty, it does not include advocacy, protest, dissent and artistic expression.***
- **Currently under pre-study by the Standing Senate Committee on National Security and Defence.**
- **National Chief Bellegarde presented to the committee on March 12, 2015 and a written submission has been provided to the committee (attached).**
- Under Part 1 of the ATA 2015, an “activity that undermines the security of Canada” includes: (a) interference with the capability of the Government of Canada in relation to intelligence, defence, border operations, public safety, the administration of justice, diplomatic or consular relations, or the economic or financial stability of Canada; (b) changing or unduly influencing a government in Canada by force or unlawful means; (d) terrorism; (f) interference with critical infrastructure. This definition could be problematic for First Nations who have marched across or set up blockades at the border of

the United States and Canada, First Nations who have called for action on a specific file by setting up a blockade along a major highway, or who block access to a road or railway.

- There is also a concern that that Bill C-51 would criminalize speech and intent, not just action; lower the requirement to detain people without due process; and allow security agencies unrestricted access to Canadians' tax records, online communication, and travel plans.

Bill S-6: *Yukon and Nunavut Regulatory Improvement Act.*

- **Currently under study by the House of Commons Standing Committee on Aboriginal Peoples and Northern Development. Transcripts from hearings held in Whitehorse on March 30, 2015 are attached.**
- Amends the *Yukon Environmental and Socio-economic Assessment Act* to provide that the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* does not apply in Yukon, to allow for the coordination of reviews of transboundary projects, to establish time limits for environmental assessments and to establish a cost recovery regime.
- Yukon First Nations have assessed that the Bill infringes their Treaty rights and has been imposed without Crown consultation and accommodation.

Private Member Bills

Bill C-469: *Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act*

- **Introduced on January 28, 2013 by Romeo Saganash, Abitibi – Baie-James – Nunavik – Eeyou.**
- Requires the Government of Canada to take all measures necessary to ensure that the laws of Canada are consistent with the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, and that the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs must prepare an annual report to Parliament for the next four years reviewing progress in implementing this law.

Bill C-628: *An Act to amend the Canada Shipping Act, 2001 and the National Energy Board Act (oil transportation and pipeline certificate)*

- **Defeated at 2nd reading in the House of Commons on April 1, 2015.**
- Would amend the National Energy Board Act to ensure that consultations must take place between the Government of Canada and First Nations whose lands or waters will be affected by a pipeline.

Bill C-639: *An Act to amend the Criminal Code (protection of critical infrastructures)*

- **Introduced December 3, 2014 by [Wai Young \(Vancouver South\)](#)**
- Act would create an offence of damaging any part of critical infrastructure, with a minimum fine of \$3,000 and maximum imprisonment of 10 years. If such damage is deemed to cause a danger to life, it could result in life imprisonment.
- Critical infrastructure is very broadly defined as: "privately owned facility, network, service or asset that provides or distributes services for the benefit of the public, including services relating to energy, telecommunications, finance, health care, food, water, transportation, public safety, government and manufacturing, the disruption of which could produce serious adverse economic effects or endanger the health or safety of Canadians."
- This Act could be used to target First Nations engaging in civil disobedience, lawful protest or blockades.

Bill C-641: *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act*

- **Introduced December 4, 2014 by Romeo Saganash, Abitibi – Baie-James – Nunavik – Eeyou. First hour of debates at 2nd reading took place on March 12, 2015.**
- Would require the Government of Canada to take all measures necessary to ensure that the laws of Canada are in harmony with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and for the Government to table a report on its progress between 2016 – 2036.
- Requires the Government of Canada to take all measures necessary to ensure that the laws of Canada are consistent with the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, and that the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs must prepare an annual report to Parliament for the next four years reviewing progress in implementing this law.

Highlights in the House of Commons

Monday March 30, 2015

Penticton Indian Band

  [\[Table of Contents\]](#)

Mr. Dan Albas (Okanagan—Coquihalla, CPC):

Mr. Speaker, we often talk on the importance of building bridges with first nation communities. I am happy to announce that in Okanagan—Coquihalla this is happening literally, as the Penticton Indian Band is building the new Satik^w Crossing over a portion of the Okanagan River system. This new bridge is vital to opening up lands for economic development that will in turn create jobs.

It is developments like this bridge that have earned the Penticton Indian Band the award of Aboriginal Economic Development Corporation of the year from the Canadian Council for Aboriginal Business. More recently, the band received a coveted Tommie Award for environmental construction for its Skaha Hills development.

This is very exciting news for our region, and the Satik^w Crossing is just one of the many major projects underway or recently completed.

However, these projects do not happen by accident. I would like to ask the House to join me in recognizing the leadership of Chief Jonathan Kruger and council in making these important projects a reality.

Public Safety

  [\[Table of Contents\]](#)

Ms. Rosane Doré Lefebvre (Alfred-Pellan, NDP):

Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives' Bill C-51 reveals their obsession with spying, particularly on activists who do not subscribe to their ideology.

Veterans' groups, first nations associations and doctors campaigning for care for refugees have been spied on by this government on the pretext that they are threats to national security. Bill C-51 will make that even easier for the Conservatives.

Why would the minister want to spy on Canadians involved in legal activities?

  [\[Table of Contents\]](#)

Hon. Steven Blaney (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC):

Mr. Speaker, I have confidence that the committee will improve the bill with reasonable amendments that will make it better and provide greater protection for Canadians.

I would like to quote a former Supreme Court justice, John Major, who said that better information sharing could have prevented the Air India tragedy.

We have to take concrete measures. Sharing information is part of that. Protests are not subject to that information sharing.

  [\[Table of Contents\]](#)

Ms. Rosane Doré Lefebvre (Alfred-Pellan, NDP):

Mr. Speaker, 45 of the 48 witnesses who appeared before the committee proposed amending the bill or scrapping it altogether and going back to the drawing board. I truly hope that the Conservatives have decided to do the right thing and support the NDP's amendments.

Intelligence agencies are producing more and more investigation reports. The Government Operations Centre received reports on more than 160 lawful events and demonstrations between May 2014 and February 2015. Virtually none of those activities presented a potential risk to national security. Bill [C-51](#) will not help matters.

Why is the minister wasting taxpayers' money to monitor the activities of groups that pose no risk to national security?



[\[Table of Contents\]](#)

Hon. Steven Blaney (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC):

Mr. Speaker, the Government Operations Centre plays a vital, critical role for our country because it monitors events that could have catastrophic consequences, such as floods, earthquakes and fires. It was created in 2004 and is responsible for coordinating all government operations. Clearly, Bill [C-51](#) does not cover those activities

Still, I would like to invite my colleague to avoid looking for excuses for not putting effective mechanisms in place to protect Canadians.



[\[Table of Contents\]](#)

Mr. Randall Garrison (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, NDP):

Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives may want to appear like they have been listening when it comes to Bill [C-51](#), but the three weak amendments they have had to bring forward to their own bill do not even come close to dealing with its fundamental flaws.

Bill [C-51](#) is still dangerously vague and overreaching, and it still ignores proven measures that work to combat terrorism.

When Canadians hear that security services are monitoring protesting veterans and disability advocates, they are right to wonder whether it makes any sense to give these agencies wider powers with no new oversight.

Why does the minister continue to insist that more oversight is not needed when it clearly is?



[\[Table of Contents\]](#)

Hon. Steven Blaney (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC):

It is amazing to hear, Mr. Speaker, the NDP using excuses not to support a bill that has common sense measures to protect Canadians against the terrorist threat we face, a terrorist threat we have seen in Ottawa, we have seen in Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu, in Copenhagen, in Paris, in Sydney.

This is a serious matter. I count on the committee to come up with good proposals and amendments that would strengthen the bill, strengthen our protection, our right, but, more important, keep us safe from the terrorist threat we now face.



[\[Table of Contents\]](#)

Mr. Randall Garrison (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, NDP):

Mr. Speaker, we are waiting for official reports on both those incidents in October.

It is not just Bill [C-51](#) where the Conservatives are falling short on protecting public safety. Global News investigators have raised questions about whether RCMP officers lacked the tools and training needed to respond to the attack on RCMP members in New Brunswick, which cost three lives.

The RCMP has been forced to reallocate resources and to move 600 officers from organized and financial crimes to respond to national security threats, a situation the RCMP commissioner called unsustainable.

Now the Conservatives are asking the RCMP to do even more, while they cut its budget for a third year in a row. Does the minister think the situation is acceptable?



[\[Table of Contents\]](#)

Hon. Steven Blaney (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC):

Mr. Speaker, while we have increased the budget RCMP by one-third, we did not get the support of the opposition.

Keeping our streets and communities safe is our priority. While training and procurement are matters that fall under the direct review of the RCMP, our government supports Canada's law enforcement agencies with legislative tools such as Bill [C-51](#), which the NDP are not willing to give to our RCMP officers, and resources.

Will the New Democrats stand up for the RCMP? Where is the NDP when talking of public safety and security?

Aboriginal Affairs



[\[Table of Contents\]](#)

Ms. Mylène Freeman (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, NDP):

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development deeply offended first nations leaders when he tried to cite an unsourced fact contradicted by the RCMP. Instead of attacking indigenous people, the minister should bring people together to end the violence, and finally call a national public inquiry into missing and murdered indigenous women.

Will the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development stand up and apologize for his hurtful and thoughtless comments?



[\[Table of Contents\]](#)

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development, CPC):

Mr. Speaker, as I said last week, the week before I did a tour of the Prairies and met with several first nations and stakeholders to discuss a wide range of issues.

While I do not disclose the specifics of closed-door meetings, I can assure all members that we had a productive discussion. What I got from many people outside of those meetings, and I am talking about chiefs and tribal councils, is that they will indeed use the action plan to address the issues of missing aboriginal women.



[\[Table of Contents\]](#)

Ms. Mylène Freeman (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, NDP):

Mr. Speaker, the minister insists on blaming everyone other than himself and his own inaction.

There have been more and more calls for his resignation. Yesterday on *Tout le monde en parle* we heard a moving plea from Laurie Odjick, the mother of Maisy, who disappeared more than six years ago in the aboriginal community of Kitigan Zibi.

Will the minister listen to her call for justice and for a national public inquiry?

  [\[Table of Contents\]](#)

Mrs. Susan Truppe (Parliamentary Secretary for Status of Women, CPC):

Mr. Speaker, that member knows full well that we do not need a national inquiry. What we have is an action plan which the minister tabled in September of last year.

We will continue to work with communities to develop safety plans, to raise awareness and take measures to empower aboriginal women and girls. We are developing more community safety plans on and off reserves, including in regions identified specifically by the RCMP. This action plan will engage men and boys. It will raise awareness to break intergenerational cycles of violence. It will address underlying causes of violence through structured training initiatives.

We on this side of the House stand up for aboriginal women and girls.

Canada Shipping Act 

The House resumed from December 2, 2014 consideration of the motion that Bill C-628, An Act to amend the Canada Shipping Act, 2001 and the National Energy Board Act (oil transportation and pipeline certificate), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

 [\[Table of Contents\]](#)

The Speaker:

The hon. member for New Westminster—Coquitlam has seven minutes left to conclude his remarks.

  [\[Table of Contents\]](#)

Mr. Fin Donnelly (New Westminster—Coquitlam, NDP):

Mr. Speaker, ten thousand individuals and organizations, including the provincial government of British Columbia and several first nations, wrote to or appeared before the joint review panel assessing the northern gateway project. Their opposition to the project was nearly unanimous.

I would like to mention my work as an MP to protect coastal communities, encourage sustainability, and protect the marine inland ecosystems. Early in my term, I introduced a bill to ban oil tankers off B.C.'s north coast. I also introduced a bill to protect wild salmon by transitioning west coast fish farms to closed containment. I also helped form an all-party oceans caucus to inform parliamentarians about issues threatening the health of Canada's oceans and of the opportunities to become a global leader in areas like ocean research. I also introduced a bill to ban the importation of shark fins to Canada, which was based on a UN report on the state of the world's oceans. It concluded that our oceans are under threat, with major stress from climate change in the form of ocean acidification, and that large predators like sharks are in serious decline.

I mention these initiatives because they relate directly to the work of my good friend, the member for Skeena—Bulkley Valley, and specifically to the intent of the bill to protect our way of life on the west coast, not just for current generations, but for future generations as well.

The member for Skeena—Bulkley Valley came to my riding late last year. He spoke to a large gathering of my constituents about the impact that the Enbridge northern gateway project would have on the north coast if it were to go ahead. He was captivating from the start. He was informative and his stories were engaging. He presented alternatives to what the Conservatives are proposing. He spoke of the bill we are debating today and what could be expected with a New Democratic government. The people really appreciated his presentation, his thoughtful analysis, and his well-researched proposal. They liked it.

Energy pipelines and the environment are very much a concern to the people of British Columbia. Not only is there massive opposition to the Enbridge northern gateway pipeline, but there is also opposition to Kinder Morgan's Trans Mountain pipeline proposal. My colleague from Burnaby—Douglas and the mayor of Burnaby, Derek Corrigan, and his council, have worked hard to expose the shortcomings of the project and the flawed NEB process. We know that over 100 people were arrested on Burnaby Mountain, clearly demonstrating their opposition to the pipeline proposal. I attended a rally in September at the Colony Farm Regional Park, in my riding, where people were very concerned about Kinder Morgan's proposal to use Colony Farm as a staging area for assembling of the pipes for the section of the proposed new pipeline. People were very opposed to this use of a public park.

I have provided background information to Bill [C-628](#). I spoke of my own work relating to protecting B.C.'s west coast way of life. I should add that even before I was an MP, I was concerned about these issues. In 1995, and again in 2000, I swam the 1,400 km length of the Fraser River, one of the world's greatest salmon rivers, to raise awareness about the threats facing this great river system and to our way of life in British Columbia. Over 1.4 million people live within the Fraser River basin. A huge amount of the economy is generated within the basin. The health of the river, like the ocean on B.C.'s north coast, is critical to the health of our way of life on the west coast of Canada.

I am saying that the intent of Bill [C-628](#) is to protect a way of life and to promote a sustainable way of life. It is certainly what motivates me to do the work that I do as a parliamentarian. It is why I became an MP, and it is why I am happy to support Bill C-628. I would like to thank my colleague for bringing it forward.

Before I conclude, I would like to provide a quote from Art Sterritt, the executive director of Coastal First Nations, who said, "for too long the concerns of our people and the majority of British Columbians have been ignored. The bill addresses some of our major concerns with Enbridge's Northern Gateway Pipeline".

What the member for [Skeena—Bulkley Valley](#) is doing with this bill is not only listening to his constituents, but proposing solutions that make sense for west coast communities and a west coast way of life.

In conclusion, the Conservatives have brazenly tried to force the northern gateway pipeline and supertanker projects on to British Columbians and first nations. The New Democrats will continue to stand with B.C. and first nations to fight for a fairer process for all Canadians. This bill is a common sense initiative to put respect for communities, first nations, and the environment back into Canada's energy conversation, and to make sure that Canadians are getting the full benefit of our energy development.

Canada's Parliament has been mulling over protection for British Columbia's north against oil tanker traffic for over a generation. It is time for MPs, especially those from British Columbia, to rise to the occasion and extend permanent protection for B.C.'s north coast.



[Table of Contents](#)

Mr. Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River, CPC):

Mr. Speaker, I have been following this debate very closely, just as our government has been listening very carefully to what British Columbians, and indeed all Canadians, have been saying about economic development and environmental responsibility in this country.

I appreciate the opportunity to respond to the bill before us and to reiterate some of the points made so persuasively by some of my colleagues. I will also add that I find it ironic that this member is proposing such a bill after he and his party voted against our increased measures for pipeline safety. New Democrats voted against doubling the number of audits and increasing the number of inspections on pipelines. They voted against fining companies that break environmental regulations.

Our government is listening to Canadians, and the message we are hearing is very clear: Canadians want balance. They understand the importance of resource development, but not at any price. They understand that economic development and environmental protection go hand in hand, and so does our government.

Environmental protection is and always will be a priority for us. We have been clear that projects will only proceed if they are safe for Canadians and safe for the environment. That is precisely what our plan is, and that is what responsible resource development is all about. Grounded in sound science and world-class standards, that plan ensures that we can develop the energy of the structure we need in a way that protects the environment we all share.

As part of this effort, our government is strengthening marine, pipeline, and rail safety, resulting in stronger prevention, enhanced preparedness and response, as well as improved liability and compensation in the highly unlikely event of an incident.

The members opposite may not be aware, but oil has been safely transported along Canada's west coast since the 1930s, thanks to responsible players in the industry and effective preventive measures. In addition, 99.999% of oil transported on federally regulated pipelines between 2008 and 2013 was moved safely.

This outstanding track record should reassure Canadians, and especially British Columbians, that our energy resources can safely be exported overseas to create jobs and economic growth here at home. That said, even one incident is one too many. Our goal must always be zero major spills or accidents, and to achieve this our government has introduced stringent new safety standards for tankers, together with new navigational supports to better protect our coastal waters.

Put simply, Canada's approach to marine regulations seeks to balance the safety of shipping and the protection of the marine environment with the need to encourage maritime commerce. In fact, we have nine acts of Parliament governing marine safety. These laws complement international regulations established by the International Maritime Organization, and that is before we factor in the tough new regulatory oversight and enforcement capabilities provided under Bill C-3, Safeguarding Canada's Seas and Skies Act.

There is compulsory pilotage in British Columbia's coastal waters. This means that a vessel must have an on-board pilot who is a navigator, certified to a specialized knowledge of local waters. In addition, Transport Canada has more than 300 inspectors who work every day to verify that ships meet Canada's regulations and the international standards that Canada has adopted.

Within the international maritime community, Canada is highly respected as a country that provides a clear and consistent set of rules that promote safety and protect the environment. I would like to quote the British Columbia environment minister who spoke about our government's plan and said the following:

I have a high degree of confidence that [the government is] serious about achieving the goals that we have in front of us and serious about the safety of our coast and the transportation of tankers up and down our coastline.

Canadians want a balanced approach to economic development. They support growth and want good jobs and long-term prosperity for themselves, their families, and their country. What Canadians might be surprised to learn is how important natural resource development is to our quality of life. Over the last five years, the oil and gas sector has contributed an average of \$25.1 billion in taxes, royalties, and fees to government. This money helps to support public pensions, provide health care, and build schools, hospitals, housing, and highways.

If we want to maintain our high standard of living and ensure governments have the funds to pay for a wide array of social programs, we need to seize the potential of new markets for our energy. That is something our government understands. It is something business understands, and it is something Canadians understand from coast to coast to coast.

Our focus then is on preventing incidents from happening, cleaning them up quickly in the unlikely event of their occurring, and protecting taxpayers from any cleanup or remediation costs. Under this government, it is polluters who will pay, not taxpayers.

We recently introduced the [pipeline safety act](#), which would enshrine in law the principle of polluter pays. To ensure that pipeline companies can respond in the unlikely event of a major incident, they would be required to maintain the highest minimum financial resources in the world. For companies operating major oil pipelines, that amounts to \$1 billion, as well as holding sufficient cash on hand to respond quickly to incidents.

The [pipeline safety act](#) would also give the National Energy Board even greater authority so that it could strengthen incident prevention, preparedness, and response as well as liability and compensation.

With all of these efforts, we are seeking to foster greater public confidence in our country's ability to develop its resources and to do so responsibly. We know that building public confidence in major resource projects requires a whole-of-government approach. Our approach to promoting responsible resource development is a balanced approach, and it is the right way to go.

Bill [C-628](#) is not a balanced approach. A ban on oil tankers would have a lasting negative impact on Canada. The NDP's anti-trade, anti-development agenda is clear. This bill would limit further diversifying our energy exports to countries other than the United States, which would severely impact our economy, jobs, and everything. Moreover, such a ban would be looked upon negatively by other countries, which view these waters as open for navigation, and banning a legitimate class of vessel would be contrary to the system that has served Canadians so well for decades.

Canadians want a balanced approach, and that is the path that this government is going to follow.



[Table of Contents](#)

Hon. Geoff Regan (Halifax West, Lib.):

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise and participate in this debate on Bill [C-628](#) and to bring a perspective from the east coast, one of Canada's other two coasts, as the member for Halifax West in Nova Scotia.

The bill calls for a ban on oil tanker traffic from the inland waters of Canada's Pacific north coast, which is a magnificent area that includes the Great Bear Rainforest, many species of wildlife, and runs of salmon. It is a magnificent area that is important to preserve and protect.

Coming from Halifax West as I do, I appreciate the strong desire that people have in British Columbia to protect coasts and coastal communities. I understand the concerns that many have with respect to the potential of supertankers, which are the very large crude carriers, or what are now called "VLCCs". They carry far more oil than the *Exxon Valdez* carried when it went aground and leaked so much oil back in 1989. I think it is about eight times as much. People have very great concerns about tankers that huge travelling through such sensitive areas.

As I have said, I come from a coastal community, and we see the snow starting to melt in Nova Scotia. We have had an awful lot of snow this year. As my colleague says, I can dare to dream, but I am looking forward to the summer and kayaking along the coast of Newfoundland if I can get a little time away from the long campaign that we expect to start once the House rises.

I guess there is no surprise when we look at the situation and the position of the current government. First of all, it is difficult to understand why the Conservatives would not support the bill before us, but on the other hand, it should not be a surprise to anyone who has seen how the Conservative government has systematically dismantled so many critical environmental protections during what can only be described as a decade of devastation.

The proposed legislation closely resembles previous bills that have been brought forward to the House a number of times, the contents of which will be familiar to members. Of course, amendments to the

Canada Shipping Act are the main focus of the bill before us. While much of this was in earlier legislation, there is one notable difference in Bill C-628, which is the addition of provisions to amend the National Energy Board Act to require the NEB to take into account certain factors before making a recommendation to the minister with regard to the issuance of a pipeline certificate. For example, one element of the bill asks the NEB to ensure that consultations on pipeline projects occur and to report on those consultations in its consideration of a project.

These consultations are more important than ever these days. I think we see today that even when the National Energy Board approves a project, it does not necessarily mean it is going ahead, because there is that question of social licence. One has to have a considerable amount of community support before moving forward with a natural resource project of any size. I think that is why it is so important that we develop greater confidence in the public in terms of the regulatory processes we have in this country as they relate to the approval of those projects and to environmental assessment.

Therefore, when the government has gutted the programs and the assessments in the way it has, it is a great concern. I look forward to discussing this aspect of Bill C-628. Hopefully when it goes to committee, as I hope it will, this aspect will get great discussion there as well.

However, the fact is that the government has undermined public trust around pipeline projects. In fact, I hope we hear more today from Conservative British Columbians, who will really share their views on this topic. I wonder if they will reflect on the fact that eight out of ten British Columbians are in favour of the kind of measures that are being proposed here and are opposed to ships carrying crude oil travelling through the waters we are talking about. That will be interesting.

Maybe they will explain why the government felt the need to change the National Energy Board process to further limit consultation about pipelines or to shorten the National Energy Board regulatory reviews to a maximum time limit of 15 months. The question is how this makes sense—that is, to limit the consultation of Canadians—when they are more engaged than ever before on these issues. Is it not a time to give them more opportunity to have a say?

We are not talking about foreign radicals, as was said by the Minister of Finance, who was or the Minister of Natural Resources at the time. That it is what members opposite want people to believe. In fact, National Energy Board officials testified recently before the natural resources committee, of which I am member, and said that the Canadian energy industry is in the midst of a “perfect storm”.

The NEB noted, in fact, that in March 2010, when the board released its Keystone XL decision, it was to relatively little fanfare, and there were only 29 intervenors in the process. We can contrast that with the Trans Mountain pipeline expansion project, which has 400 intervenors and more than 1,300 commentators. Then there is the energy east application and the hearings related to that, where there are close to 2,300 application participants. We can see a great deal of public engagement these days, yet the government wants to cut that short.

When more and more Canadians are engaging in the debate about pipelines and pipeline safety, the Conservatives think they should have fewer and fewer opportunities to express their opinions. They are out of sync with Canadians on this, and certainly with British Columbians, as we can see from all the surveys that tell us about concerns British Columbians have on these topics. I think they are out of line.

In my province right now, the roads are in rough shape after the winter we have had. There are lots of potholes, and I am sure that more than one person over the course of this spring is going to have to pay for a wheel alignment to keep his or her vehicle going straight. Canadians are going to want a realignment of the Government of Canada as well, so that it is aligned with their priorities, views, and values, which the government clearly is not.

It makes no sense to cut this process short. That is a big part of the reason that there is so much mistrust of the government these days, and why there is so much mistrust of the processes that I have been talking about. Of course, the Conservatives have fed that mistrust by gutting elements of the Fisheries Act and the Navigable Waters Protection Act in their several omnibus bills, particularly Bill C-38.

As my party's critic for natural resources, I am keenly aware of how important, and at times how highly controversial, the issue of pipelines has become for Canadians. Given the sustained interest on the subject of Bill [C-628](#), the fact that we have had this issue come to us in various forms over the years, including in bills introduced by my colleague from [Vancouver Quadra](#), and coupled with the Conservative government's rollbacks on environment protection in recent years, it is clear that additional study of the concepts raised in Bill C-628 is very much needed and warranted.

Many of my B.C. colleagues, including the sponsor of this legislation, have already spoken about how the bill would impact the west coast and how important it is to residents of northwestern British Columbia. Coming from Atlantic Canada, representing Halifax West, I can assure my friends on all sides that the folks on the east coast share the pride in maritime traditions and have a connection with the ocean similar to that of people in British Columbia.

Nova Scotia, for example, has 20 companies involved in our ocean research in areas like fisheries, aquaculture, offshore oil and gas, maritime security, and shipbuilding. There are many areas in which Atlantic Canadians are connected to our oceans, as British Columbians are. It is important to support this bill and send it to committee for further study.



[Table of Contents](#)

Ms. Jinny Jogindera Sims (Newton—North Delta, NDP):

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to speak in support of a very important bill, important not only for British British Columbians but for all Canadians from coast to coast to coast. At this stage, I want to acknowledge the work done by my colleague, the member of Parliament for [Skeena—Bulkley Valley](#), not only for the B.C. coastline but for the communities that reside in the north. He is an example to us of how to do effective advocacy outreach, and then to try to push for those improvements in the House.

This should not be a partisan issue because this is all about protecting our coastline. Today, I am making a heart-felt appeal to my B.C. colleagues across the way to search deep in their hearts, do the right thing and support the bill. British Columbians, whether they live in Kelowna, in the Kootenays, in Kitimat or Surrey, all care very deeply about our beautiful coastline. However, we also care about the future of our industries in British Columbia. We care about the kind of country and environment we want to leave for our children.

If my colleagues across the way feel they cannot support this, I hope they will rise to their feet and use all their persuasive powers to have some of us change our mind because they feel they are right. Let them defend the position they have taken in not supporting the bill. I will wait for that.

This is a common sense bill. It is a bill that came from the people and has been brought here by the member of Parliament. It shows respect for communities, first nations and environment. It talks about having a truly different type of conversation. Instead of us and them, instead of saying that they can get the heck out of our country, instead of saying "it's our way or the highway", the bill proposes a pathway to meaningful dialogue that is respectful of all points of view, one that actually listens to the experts and the communities. It is a way to ensure that when we look at our energy development, we do it right, we do it in a way that will benefit our children for generations to come.

It is no surprise to many members who have been in the House for a long time that the issue of protection for the coastline has been around for over a decade. The bill would do bring closure to this. The law would provide permanent protection to B.C.'s north coast, permanent protection against oil tankers.

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, if you have ever had the privilege of visiting the beautiful coastline of British Columbia. In my previous job, I had the privilege to visit every community, even the ones where they had a one-room school. Travelling through British Columbia, visiting our coastline and our northern communities, we begin to see the close ties between are our land and the environment. However, we

also see something else. I am not what I call a “gorilla kayaker”; I am a gentle kayaker but I am married to a gorilla kayaker. The Douglas Channel is narrow and inviting. Those waters are not suitable for supertankers.

When we look at our beautiful coastline in British Columbia, and I am sure people on the east coast feel exactly the same, we want to ensure our it is protected. We are carrying on the proud tradition the NDP has had for the past number of years, dating back to 1972 when a previous member of Parliament for Skeena, Frank Howard, brought forward such a motion to ban tanker traffic. It is time to turn it in to law. We have talked long enough.

Some people will say that we oppose the Northern gateway pipeline because we do not want to see damage done to our rivers, lakes and coastline. People say that the NDP does not believe in resource development or growing jobs, but we are 100% committed to growing decent-paying jobs in Canada.

This is a novelty for some, but we support responsible management of our non-renewable resources, a transition to renewable resources of energy and increasing energy efficiency, and a process that respects communities and the environment. That is the kind of resource development the New Democratic members can support, do support and will continue to fight for.

We are not the only ones who have said that. The bill has also been endorsed by the Council of the Haida Nation, the Wet'suwet'en First Nation, and the city of Terrace.

I want to take us back to Kitimat. We are going to see so many tankers filled with diluted bitumen going through the Douglas Channel along B.C.'s northern coastline to Asia or California, through some of our most biologically diverse environment, 120 species of sea birds and 27 species of marine mammals, such as orca, grey and humpback whales, as well as commercially important wild salmon, halibut and other fisheries.

The economic costs of a spill would be absolutely ginormous. The seafood sector in B.C. generates close to \$1.7 billion each year, while the wilderness tourism in B.C. generates more than \$1.55 billion in annual revenues. We are not talking over a lifetime; we are talking about one year.

We are talking over \$3.2 billion of revenue from the fishing and tourism industries. These sectors do not work in isolation. They provide decent-paying jobs, permanent sources of income for around 45,000 Canadians. If there is a spill, we put guaranteed revenue into jeopardy. Not only that, but we know the cost of an oil spill and of a cleanup. We also see the long-term impact on other industries.

We often hear people saying that spills are not really going to happen. Enbridge is doing its own research, and this is from its own data. Dr. Gerald Graham determined that the likelihood of a major oil spill was 14%. That is not negligible; that is a huge probability. That is 1.5 out of 100 tankers. Do we want to take that kind of a chance? Think about the number of tankers that will go through the channel each and every year.

The Alberta Federation of Labour has estimated 26,000 decent-paying jobs would be created and would help to boost the middle class if the amount Enbridge intended to export raw was upgraded and refined in Canada.

Over the next 50-year span, we are looking at 11,000 tankers going down the Douglas Channel. I appeal to my B.C. colleagues to please persuade their other colleagues to vote for the bill.



[\[Table of Contents\]](#)

Hon. Ron Cannan (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC):

Mr. Speaker, as the member of Parliament for Kelowna—Lake Country in beautiful British Columbia, I am pleased to speak to Bill [C-628](#) and share how and why our government is committed to protecting the safety of Canadians and the safety of the environment. It is not either/or, but a balanced approach. We have taken significant action to strengthen the safety and security of Canada's energy transportation system, whether it be rail, pipeline or tanker safety.

Bill [C-628](#) proposes to ban oil tankers off the coast of British Columbia. It is founded on perceived shortcomings of Canada's energy system that are simply not accurate.

Over the next few minutes, I would like to share with Canadians the broad range of concrete measures already in place and the new actions we are taking to build on Canada's strong world-class safety system. That is because members on this side of the House understand they are essential to achieving our goal of energy market diversification, which is itself crucial to ensuring ongoing job creation, economic growth and prosperity for Canadians.

I would like to explain why I believe it is so important that we diversify our energy markets.

In 2012, Canada produced over 3.38 million barrels of crude oil and almost 3.9 billion cubic feet of natural gas per day. All of that activity supported roughly 190,000 direct jobs and an additional 70,000 indirect jobs. Then there are revenues to federal, provincial and territorial governments from the oil and gas industry, which averaged approximately \$25 billion annually over the past five years. That money paid for everything from roads and bridges to schools, hospitals in communities from coast to coast to coast. These multi-billion numbers are not surprising given the oil and gas sector accounted for 7.5% of GDP in 2013, and \$83 billion of capital expenditures. Industry also represented \$117 billion in exports in 2013.

To say the energy sector plays a major role in our high standard of living is an understatement. I believe it fuels the high quality of life of Canadians.

However, it is not something we can take for granted. The reality is that the global energy landscape is undergoing a seismic shift, creating both new opportunities and new challenges for Canada. On the plus side, there is an enormous and growing appetite for our energy supply. Demand for Canadian oil is strongest in the rapidly growing markets of the Asia-Pacific region.

The International Energy Agency predicts that, by 2035, the world will need a third more energy than is being consumed today. Most of this increase is due to the need for energy in emerging economies. Canada can capably meet that need as Canadian oil and gas production through innovation and new technology is expected to grow dramatically over the same period.

If we want to maintain our high standard of living and ensure governments have the resource sector royalties to fund a wide array of social programs, we must diversify our energy markets to have the funds to proceed in this manner.

While it appears the NDP by bringing forward this bill does not appreciate how crucial this issue is to the lives and livelihoods of Canadians, I can assure members that other government leaders across Canada do.

At the 2014 Energy and Mines Ministers' Conference, federal, provincial and territorial ministers recognized that the continued advancement of energy infrastructure was fundamental to gaining access to new markets and generating economic growth. Ministers also reaffirmed the need to coordinate our efforts to reinforce the diversification of Canada's natural resources by ensuring the safe transport of resources by pipeline, marine and rail.

We understand and fully agree that public safety and environmental protection are necessary conditions for energy development to proceed.

As I said earlier, it is a balanced approach; it is not either/or. That is precisely what responsible resource development is all about. It sends a clear signal that our government is determined to protect public safety and the health of the environment, based on sound science and world-class standards.

Between 2000 and 2011, federally regulated pipelines boasted a safety record of over 99.999%. We are proud of the action we have taken to ensure Canada has a world-class regulatory framework and a means for the safest form of transportation of our energy products.

Our Government has introduced stringent new safety standards to prevent oil spills from happening and new navigational supports for tanker ships to better protect our coastal waters.

We have nine acts of Parliament governing marine safety, and that is before we factor in the tough new regulatory oversight and enforcement capabilities provided under Bill C-3, the Safeguarding Canada's Seas and Skies Act.

Thanks to tough legislation and technological innovations, there have been no spills from double-hulled tankers in Canadian waters. Nor have there ever been spills from tankers escorted by tugs with a local pilot aboard.

Especially important, we are ensuring that polluters, not taxpayers, will be responsible for costs in the unlikely event of a spill. We have brought in polluter pays legislation for both offshore and onshore, with billion dollar conditions for spill response and cleanup.

These measures underline that when it comes to transporting our natural resources, whether by pipeline, rail, or tanker, our government will never compromise on safety.

Our government has also given the independent National Energy Board the necessary resources to increase annual inspections of pipelines by 50%. The board has doubled the number of annual comprehensive safety audits to identify pipeline issues before incidents occur. Equally important, the National Energy Board now has the authority to impose substantial financial penalties on companies that do not comply with safety and environmental regulations. It can levy fines of up to \$100,000 a day for as long as the infractions are not addressed.

It is disappointing that the member who put forward the bill we are debating today and who purports to be in favour of improving safety voted against each and every one of the measures I just mentioned.

Canada's outstanding safety record should assure Canadians that our energy resources can be developed safely and can in turn create good jobs and economic growth here at home. Our government's approach to promoting responsible resource development is the right one.

I believe that Canadians simply cannot trust the New Democrats to protect our economy or our environment. They oppose every form of resource development. They vote against our legislation to increase pipeline safety measures. Then they propose this bill that would hurt the Canadian economy. Bill C-628 risks undoing all the good being achieved under our plan for responsible resource development and would come at a great cost to Canadians. For that reason, we cannot support this bill.

In closing, having spent the first 27 years of my life in Alberta, I understand the oil and gas economy and how important it is not only to Alberta but to all of Canada. Given my last 25-plus years calling beautiful British Columbia home, I understand the value of the energy industry and also tourism, the environment, safety, and the economy. They are all brought together. It is not either/or, as I have alluded to before.

As a father of three daughters and three grandsons, I want a future for our Canadian economy, for our community of Kelowna Lake Country, for British Columbia, and for all Canadians. I believe that if this bill is passed, it would take us backward and would not help create those jobs we want in the future.

This is Easter week, a week of hurt and a week of hope. My hope is that we will work together to manage our resources responsibly. We are called to be good stewards. We have abundant resources across Canada. However, this type of legislation would not help our industry and would not help to create jobs. We want to have a balanced approach. I believe that by working together, we can create jobs and grow the economy to achieve long-term prosperity and a good quality of life for all North Americans



[Table of Contents](#)

Mr. Ryan Cleary (St. John's South—Mount Pearl, NDP):

Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of Bill C-628, an act to amend the Canada Shipping Act, 2001 and the National Energy Board Act. My party, the New Democratic Party of Canada, has stood with first nations and communities across British Columbia in their opposition to the Enbridge northern gateway since day

one. This bill would enshrine a crude oil tanker ban on British Columbia's north coast in law. It would set it in stone.

I have never been to B.C.'s north coast. In fact, I have only been to British Columbia once, to the city of Vancouver, two or three years ago. As members know, I represent St. John's South—Mount Pearl in Newfoundland and Labrador. As a representative of Canada's most easterly province, I am on my feet here today speaking about a bill impacting Canada's most westerly province, because we have a lot in common.

I hear about how beautiful, unique, and pristine British Columbia is, but I certainly could not conceive of B.C. being any more beautiful, unique, or pristine than Newfoundland and Labrador. There are similarities, but there are differences as well. I know those differences well.

British Columbia has had a moratorium on oil and gas drilling off its coast since 1959. That is 56 years. Oil and gas companies have been drilling off Newfoundland and Labrador for a dog's age. It has been for decades. There is a moratorium off B.C. and just the opposite off Newfoundland and Labrador, where oil companies have been filling their boots for years. While there is no offshore oil and gas industry off B.C., we have had one on the Grand Banks of Newfoundland since the 1990s. In fact, the first offshore oil project, Hibernia, and the construction of the project's gravity-based structure in the 1990s, saved Newfoundland and Labrador's economy.

At the same time as the Hibernia project was getting off the ground, our northern cod stocks were in complete collapse. The northern cod moratorium in 1992 was the biggest layoff in Canadian history to that point. It may well still be the biggest layoff in our history. More than 30,000 people were thrown out of work immediately, and those were direct jobs.

Newfoundland and Labrador has done well through its oil industry. It has done very well. It has been a "have" province since November 2008, contributing more to the country than it gets back. Between 1949, when Canada joined our province, and 2008 it was a "have not" province. That hurt not just our economy but our psyche, too.

There are people who say that the oil industry has hurt Newfoundland and Labrador in certain ways and that there is too much emphasis on the non-renewable oil and gas industry and not enough attention to our greatest renewable industry, the fishery. Economic diversification also has not happened. The Newfoundland and Labrador government is facing a \$916-million deficit this year alone, because oil revenues are down so severely and there is nothing to pick up the slack. The Government of Canada has also turned away from the fishery, with constant cuts to fisheries science and research budgets, in general, and a broken management system. There are some lessons B.C. can learn from Newfoundland and Labrador.

This bill would stop the Enbridge northern gateway pipeline in its tracks. Enbridge proposes that supertankers the length of the Empire State Building thread their way through the needle that is the sensitive and difficult waters of the Douglas Channel and B.C.'s north coast. Over the project's 50-year lifespan, we are talking about 11,000 tanker trips. What are the odds of a devastating accident or catastrophe? Most British Columbians and first nations do not want to take that chance. That message has been heard loud and clear across Canada.

Back to Newfoundland, there is constant oil tanker traffic in and out of Placentia Bay. Placentia Bay is seen as the area in Canada with possibly the highest risk of having an oil spill.

It was only recently that the Atlantic Pilotage Authority wanted to move the pilot station, where pilots board tankers to help guide them through the tricky waters. The pilotage authority wanted to move the boarding station deeper into Placentia Bay, but it backed off when opposition rang out, including opposition right here in the House. It backed off because it made no sense, because it increased the risk.

As it stands, Transport Canada's oil spill response equipment for Placentia Bay is located hundreds of kilometres away in a warehouse in the city of Mount Pearl, next to the city of St. John's. How does that make any sense?

One of the first papers I read in preparing to speak on the bill was a report carried out for B.C.'s first nations. The report was entitled, "Assessing offshore oil and gas development on British Columbia's coast". The report said, "The risk of oil spills is declining with new management practices and technology". That is fair enough. I suppose it is. However, here is the interesting part: "However, oil spills are a relatively common occurrence in oil and gas development. Newfoundland has recorded 138 small oil spills from 1997 to 2002".

In the 13 years since that report, since those numbers were gathered, we can bet that there have been dozens, hundreds even, more spills, mostly small spills, but still spills.

Returning to British Columbia, there are two concerns with the Enbridge northern gateway project: the impact on the environment and the impact on the economy. The project would move 525,000 barrels of diluted bitumen per day from Alberta to B.C. The 1,177 kilometre pipeline would cross the Rocky Mountains, which I hear are almost as beautiful and as rugged as Newfoundland and Labrador's mountain ranges. The pipeline would cross the Rocky Mountains and hundreds of rivers and streams. From Kitimat, the bitumen would be loaded onto supertankers and shipped down the Douglas Channel and along B.C.'s north coast to Asia or California, wherever the markets are.

B.C.'s north coast is known for great biological diversity and extreme weather. It sounds like home. The north coast is home to 120 species of birds and 27 species of marine mammals, including orcas and gray and humpback whales, not to mention salmon, halibut, and other fish species. Again, it sounds like home and almost as nice. An oil spill would be devastating. Supertankers do not stop on a dime. Supertankers have a minimum stopping distance of three kilometres.

The economic cost of a spill would be equally as devastating. B.C.'s seafood sector generates close to \$1.7 billion a year. Wilderness tourism is worth another \$1.55 billion. Combined, that is well over \$3 billion a year. We could imagine the dent an oil spill would put in those numbers.

However, there is another economic impact, not just for British Columbia but for all of Canada. The Alberta Federation of Labour estimates that 26,000 jobs could be created in Alberta if those 525,000 barrels of diluted bitumen were upgraded and refined right here in Canada. Why would we ship out unrefined bitumen? Why would we throw away 26,000 jobs? How does that make sense? How is that smart?

Newfoundland and Labrador has not benefited just from our own oil and gas industry. Alberta's oil sands have pumped hundreds of millions of dollars, dare I say billions, into our economy through hundreds and thousands of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians who migrate west every day, every week, every year. I speak with them on the planes. I see them in the airports. They go to places like Fort McMurray, Newfoundland and Labrador's second biggest city, as the joke goes. Why would Canada support a pipeline that threatens so much of our environment and exports jobs to other countries?

There are three coasts in Canada. Each is equally important, although it does not always feel that way. In B.C., as in Newfoundland and Labrador, we live and die by the sea. If we jeopardize our oceans, our coasts, our culture, and our heritage, our economy will be lost.



[\[Table of Contents\]](#)

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP):

Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to have a right of reply to first express my thanks to my colleagues from across the country and in the House. From the east coast and to the north, I thank my colleagues from British Columbia, New Democrats, Liberals and Green Party alike, as well as the independents who have shown their support.

I represent northwestern British Columbia in the House of Commons. We are a culture and an economy based on our environment. As we say up north, the people do not make the land, the land makes the people, which is increasingly true.

This bill that I have presented in Parliament was in fact borne out of a crisis, out of a threat from an oil company seeking to build an 1,100-kilometre twin pipeline carrying unrefined raw bitumen from northern Alberta to the Port of Kitimat and then on to China through supertankers three football fields long. In my duty as the member of Parliament representing this place, I realized that I had to oppose this project, because the risks so far outweighed the benefits for the people I represent, and I would argue for the people of British Columbia and Canada.

However, from this crisis is an opportunity, and we have taken this opportunity to find common cause, not just in northwestern British Columbia, but across beautiful B.C. and in fact across this country. First nations and non-native people, community to community, have stood shoulder to shoulder in expressing our commonly held values to protect our homes. They have expressed that most Canadian sense of determination, that when a government tries to force something upon us, we stand resolute with one another in opposition to that government.

Also through this bill, I sought to propose solutions to the crisis that is upon us, to make consultation with Canadians meaningful and respectful, so that if the opinion of Canadians in their communities and their homes is asked, then the Government of Canada should listen.

This bill, perhaps for the first time in Canadian law, also seeks to actually have an opinion about natural resources in this country as to whether we export them raw, as is planned by Enbridge's northern gateway and Kinder Morgan, Keystone, or if we add value to the endowment that we have inherited. However, if we ask these questions of proponents, the Conservatives say we are antagonistic, but I say that is not right.

I have held dozens of town halls across British Columbia, from the east to the west, from Vancouver Island to the interior, to the north, to the cities. Tens of thousands of British Columbians have been engaged, signing petitions, writing postcards and coming to town halls.

I was in the interior of B.C. this weekend and took the red eye back this morning. A woman came up to me at one of our town halls and thanked me for providing a little bit of hope, because she felt quite desperate with the current Conservative government and its approach to her province and home and native land. However, I realized that through the course of this, it has been myself that has taken the most inspiration from the British Columbians I have engaged with.

Despite a cynical and oppositional government that seeks to strip our environmental laws, ignore first nations' rights and title, ignore the reality of climate change, ignore the idea that we should be adding value to our natural wealth, despite all that, British Columbians, Canadians, have continued to show up. Even with the increasing threat from a government that says if one dares have an opinion that is contrary to its own, one will be called a foreign-funded radical by one's own government, one will be called an enemy of the state by one's own government, people have chosen hope over that fear time and time again. It does not make one an enemy of Canada to express an opinion; that makes one truly Canadian.

Coastal first nations; B.C. municipalities; the B.C. government; the Fraser community's labour, tourism and businesses have all stood together in opposing this project; two-thirds of British Columbians consistently. Therefore, I say to my Conservative colleagues from British Columbia that they clearly have a choice in a vote in 48 hours to decide who it is that they work for. Do they work for the current Prime Minister and his oil lobby friends, or do they work for the people who sent them to this place from British Columbia?

Those members must decide that within the next two days, because this bill is an opportunity to stand with British Columbia and defend our coast, or stand with the Prime Minister, who has truly lost his way and believes that it is a radical thing to stand up for one's community, that it makes one an enemy of Canada rather than a Canadian citizen.



[Table of Contents](#)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin):

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. 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): Pursuant to Standing Order 93, the division stands deferred until Wednesday, April 1, immediately before the time providing for private members' business.

[NOTE: The Bill was defeated at 2nd reading and will not proceed to committee]

Tuesday March 31, 2015

Health  



[Table of Contents](#)

Hon. Carolyn Bennett (St. Paul's, Lib.):

Mr. Speaker, last week, I was honoured to attend a naming ceremony and feast for the new aboriginal health institute at our University of Toronto. The work of this world-class research facility will be instrumental in closing the health outcome gap between aboriginal and non-aboriginal people in Canada.

Interim Director Dr. Jeff Reading made it clear that this institute's exciting new approach will establish a true partnership between researchers and indigenous communities, and it will be grounded in the guiding principles of scientific excellence and community relevance.

The newly named Waakebiness-Bryce Institute for Indigenous Health will bear the ceremonial indigenous name bestowed on its benefactor, Dr. Michael Dan, by the Lac La Croix First Nation, and Bryce for Dr. Peter Henderson Bryce, who founded the Public Health Service of Ontario and was an outspoken advocate for indigenous health.

I would like to take this opportunity to pay special tribute to the vision and generosity of Dr. Michael Dan, who made this new institute possible with a \$10 million donation.

[Member spoke in aboriginal language as follows:]

Chi-miigwetch, Michael and Amira.

Wednesday, April 1, 2015

Aboriginal Affairs  



[Table of Contents](#)

Mr. Dennis Bevington (Northwest Territories, NDP):

Mr. Speaker, northerners are deeply concerned about the position of the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development that the three territories are the same and that their environmental laws should be uniform.

In committee, the minister went on and on about how the government's plan is to have the same laws governing the land and water of all three territories. Any northerner would tell us that we cannot treat the territories the same.

This paternalistic approach by the Conservatives is completely wrong. Each territory is unique, with different demographics, different geography, different cultures, and different relationships with aboriginal governments. We have fought for years to create our identities. The minister and his Conservative colleagues instead tell northerners that that their uniqueness, issues, concerns, and political relationships are of no importance to them.

Northerners are fighting back. The NWT's Tlicho First Nation has won an injunction against the creation of the environmental super-board, and Yukon first nations are already preparing their court case to stop Bill [S-6](#).

Conservative Members from the north, listen up, the opposition will be heard at the ballot box.

The Environment



[\[Table of Contents\]](#)

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP):

Mr. Speaker, tonight Parliament will have an opportunity to vote on my bill, an act to defend the north coast. This bill was born from a decade-long threat that has faced the northwest of British Columbia in the form of Enbridge northern gateway's pipeline.

Yet within this crisis, we have found hope. In this conflict, we have found an opportunity. First nations and non-first nations people are standing shoulder to shoulder, community to community, against this threat and the threat posed by a Conservative government unwilling and unable to listen to the people of my province.

This bill is not just to oppose dangerous resource development; it is a bill that would finally put truth into community consultations and put an end to the rip and ship policies of the government. For the first time in our history, Parliament will have an opportunity to vote to protect B.C.'s coast from the danger of supertankers plying its waters.

Tonight we will have an opportunity to see my Conservative colleagues from B.C. and who they actually stand and represent. Who is it they work for: the [Prime Minister](#) and his oil lobby or the people of British Columbia who sent them here?

Aboriginal Affairs



[\[Table of Contents\]](#)

Ms. Linda Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona, NDP):

Mr. Speaker, yesterday Grand Chief Steve Courtoreille of Treaty 8 First Nations wrote to the [Prime Minister](#). The letter speaks for itself:

The behaviour and mannerisms displayed by your Minister during the [March 20] meeting in Calgary can only be described as rude, demeaning, blaming, and condescending. ...

We cannot and will not work with someone who exhibits such blatant disregard for First Nation people.

As such, we demand the immediate removal of [the minister]....

Will the [Prime Minister](#) take responsibility for his minister's actions?



[\[Table of Contents\]](#)

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development, CPC):

Mr. Speaker, as I have said on many occasions in this House, the week before last, I did a tour of the prairies and met with several first nations and stakeholders to discuss a wide range of issues.

While I do not disclose specifics of closed-door meetings, the discussions were productive, and our government will continue to work with first nations to address these issues and work on our shared priorities.



[\[Table of Contents\]](#)

Ms. Niki Ashton (Churchill, NDP):

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the meetings were anything but productive when we hear from the first nations leaders who met with this minister.

Let us go back to the words of Grand Grand Chief Steve Courtoreille:

[The Minister of Aboriginal Affairs'] responses and attitude strongly reflects the very same attitude that resulted in Indian residential schools.

These are very strong words, words that must be acknowledged by the Prime Minister.

Let me repeat the question. Will the Prime Minister take responsibility for the shameful actions that we have seen from this minister?



[\[Table of Contents\]](#)

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development, CPC):

Mr. Speaker, it is strange to see this member make this kind of accusation when at every step of the measures we have taken and are taking to improve and reduce the gaps between aboriginal and non-aboriginal Canadians, this party, the NDP, votes against each and every measure.

I am talking about matrimonial property rights. I am talking about water standards on reserves and a host of other measures, all of which they oppose.

Thursday April 2, 2015

Violence Against Women



[\[Table of Contents\]](#)

Ms. Niki Ashton (Churchill, NDP):

Mr. Speaker, today across Canada people are coming together to call for justice for Cindy Gladue. By doing so, they are calling for justice for all missing and murdered indigenous women.

Lauren Crazybull, an activist from Alberta, said it well:

Cindy's case is so visibly unjust. Our community doesn't want to wait for another case to happen or another woman to go missing or be found murdered. This is our breaking point.

People and systems have tried to dehumanize Cindy Gladue, but today's calls for justice honour her memory. Like never before, communities are speaking out and standing up against systems' failures to address the high rates of violence faced by indigenous women in Canada.

Today thousands are gathered to send a direct message: no more missing and murdered indigenous women. Today they and we are calling for justice for Cindy Gladue and for all missing and murdered indigenous women.

Highlights in the Senate

Wednesday, April 1, 2015

SENATORS' STATEMENTS

Tributes

The Late Honourable Aurélien Gill

Hon. James S. Cowan (Leader of the Opposition): Colleagues, I rise today to pay tribute to our late friend and colleague, Senator Aurélien Gill.

Senator Gill retired from this chamber in 2008, following a long and dedicated life of public service. I'm delighted that so many of his family members could be with us today, looking over this place which he served so well. Welcome.

Senator Gill profoundly affected all of us who had the privilege of knowing and working with him. Before being appointed to the Senate in 1998, he served as a teacher, a public servant and a successful businessman in Quebec. In all of these roles he was, as he was throughout his life, a leader.

He was born in Mashteuiatsh or, as it is also known, Pointe-Bleue, Quebec. Following his studies at Laval, he went on to the National Defence College in Kingston, where he studied under some of the country's greatest strategists. It was during this time that he travelled throughout the world and saw firsthand the conditions of other Aboriginal peoples and especially the positive actions that had been taken elsewhere that could be taken here.

Colleagues, sometimes one has an experience that proves to be a turning point, setting the course of one's life. That was such a time for Senator Gill. He resolved to devote his life to our First Nations people — a promise he kept. We are all the beneficiaries of that dedication.

In preparation for today, I reread the tributes paid to Senator Gill when he left this place. Colleagues described his "irreproachable integrity and dedication," his "remarkable generosity", "extraordinary talents, energy and eloquence." He was called a: "leader of intelligence, commitment, confidence, passion and bravery"; a "spontaneous man who showed great generosity in his everyday life"; "sincere, and frank", and a man with a lesser-known "gift for livening up social functions."

But, colleagues, even more than his charming and gregarious nature, it was his devotion to improving the lives of this country's first inhabitants that shone through the most. That is where Senator Gill truly made his mark and where he truly distinguished himself by his vision.

From 1974 to 1985, Aurélien Gill served as Chief of the Montagnais at his home in Lac-Saint-Jean. He went on to found and serve on numerous organizations aimed at creating a world where respect, equality and dignity would prevail — a world where Aboriginals could assume responsibility for their own affairs. He continued this effort throughout his 10 years of service in the Senate, working tirelessly to advance the cause of Aboriginal peoples.

His deep and long-standing connection to his Montagnais roots and to Aboriginal communities at large were evident to everyone who served alongside him in this chamber.

I had the privilege of being his colleague for three and a half years and, in that time, I saw him advocate for First Nations independence with extraordinary passion, eloquence and vigour. He earned the respect

and admiration of his many colleagues, engaged us with his fiery speeches, and educated us all on the very serious challenges facing First Nations.

In his last remarks in this place, Senator Gill said:

Certain topics are very difficult, but the issues facing First Nations people must be resolved. A path and a solution must be found. That day is not far off, for the world is changing, and it will change for the better. One day there will be a representative assembly of First Nations. . . . We, the First Nations people, have not only survived, but we have made a contribution; we have worked towards making the world a better place for all Canadians, without exception, without excluding anyone.

He told us that he had "great faith in the future," that it had always been his most profound desire to "live in a just, beautiful and noble society." He brought that goal much closer for all the rest of us.

To his family and friends, thank you for sharing him with this country and with those of us in this place. He is deeply missed.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Guy Dagenais: Honourable senators, today I rise in honour of a former colleague, Senator Aurélien Gill, who died on January 17, 2015, at the age of 81, after a remarkable and inspiring career.

Senator Gill was an ardent defender of the interests of Aboriginal peoples in Quebec and all of Canada. He was a teacher and became a model of dedication to his community during his term as a senator and in the key roles he played as president and founder of the Conseil Attikamek-Montagnais and chief of the Innu community of Mashteuiatsh from 1975 to 1982 and 1987 to 1989.

[*English*]

Senator Gill also devoted his energy to the establishment of the Montagnais Cultural Educational Institute, the Amerindian Police Council, the Confederation of Indians of Quebec, the Assembly of First Nations and the Provincial and National Aboriginal Advisory Council.

[*Translation*]

Before being appointed to the Senate, Senator Gill was co-founder and president of Les Gestions Gamac P.N., a holding company that owns Air Roberval, Aviation Québec-Labrador and Air BGM. Senator Gill also held several positions in the public sector, including that of Quebec Director General of the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs. In 1991, he was made a knight of the National Order of Quebec.

(1340)

In 1998, the Right Honourable Jean Chrétien appointed Aurélien Gill to the Senate of Canada, where he served for 10 years until he retired in 2008.

Senator Gill made a significant contribution to the Senate through his experience and expertise by serving on various committees, including the Standing Senate Committee on Aboriginal Peoples. Last year, Senator Gill was awarded the Order of Canada for his commitment to promoting and defending the interests of First Nations, particularly the Innu people.

[*English*]

Senator Gill will be remembered for his great accomplishments and unwavering dedication to serving the people of Canada throughout his life.

[*Translation*]

Thank you for your attention.

[*English*]

Hon. Wilfred P. Moore: Honourable senators, I also rise today to pay tribute to a very dear former colleague, the Honourable Aurélien Gill, who passed away on January 17, 2015, at the age of 81 years.

Aurélien was a teacher by trade, but he was also a community builder and activist, as demonstrated by his lifelong dedication to advocacy in the interests of Canada's indigenous peoples. He served as chief of the Innu community of Mashteuiatsh from 1975 to 1982, as vice-president of the Quebec Association of Indians from 1973 to 1975, and as chairman of the Atikamekw and Montagnais First Nations from 1975 to 1976. Senator Gill was also a key participant in the founding of the National Indian Brotherhood, now known as the Assembly of First Nations. He was a generous adviser to indigenous peoples in other countries.

Summoned to the Senate by the Right Honourable Jean Chrétien on September 17, 1998, Senator Gill further promoted the cause of Aboriginal peoples through his work on the Standing Senate Committee on Aboriginal Peoples and the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology. Part of this work was the recognition of the fact that the relationship between the Aboriginal peoples and the Crowns of both England and France has been nothing short of disgraceful. Yet, despite the erosion of Aboriginal society over the years and the dependence upon government policy, Senator Gill foresaw that Aboriginal peoples might one day control their own destiny.

Such was the vision of Aurélien Gill when on April 30, 2008, he tabled Bill S-234, An Act to establish an assembly of the aboriginal peoples of Canada and an executive council, to establish a third chamber of Parliament. Recognizing the need to break free from the bonds of the archaic, paternalistic Indian Act and the Department of Indian Affairs, this bill would encourage Canada's Aboriginal peoples to play a greater role not only in their own affairs, but also in those of the country as well. An Aboriginal assembly would provide the voice of the peoples recognized in the Constitution Act, 1982.

In the world of inventors, when a person is the first person to think of a product or process, it's called a "flash of genius." Aurélien Gill had that flash of genius when he conceived of his brilliant system of self-government for the Aboriginal peoples of Canada. Much thought went into that bill, and I encourage fellow senators to read it. It is much more than just food for thought; it is the template for Aboriginal government in Canada. As Senator Gill put it:

This country will never be complete as long as Aboriginal peoples do not have a place in this political architecture.

He also said:

How can we be anything less than passionate about this, when this concerns the future of our many children, their education, their health, their environment, their pride, their culture and their identity?

After Aurélien's retirement from the Senate in 2008, we remained in contact. I continue to advocate on behalf of his bill, distributing it to numerous chiefs and speaking about it at opportune times. I thank you, honourable Aurélien, for your work and vision. *Meegwetch.*

Senator Gill is survived by his wife, Aline; three daughters, Guylaine, Carole and Marie-Claude; and 12 grandchildren and two great-grandchildren. I wish Aline and all of you present to know that it was an honour to serve with Aurélien, who taught me much about life among our Aboriginal peoples. We were good friends. He enriched all our lives, and I thank you for sharing him with us.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Yonah Martin (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I rise today to remember the Honourable Senator Aurélien Gill, whom we are celebrating for his long, dedicated career, which he spent defending the interests of Aboriginal peoples.

[*English*]

Born on August 26, 1933, Senator Gill grew up on the Pointe-Bleue Reserve of the Lac-Saint-Jean area of Quebec and went on to earn his bachelor's degree in pedagogy from the University of Laval. He held notable positions in the public sector as Director General of the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs and in the private sector as co-founder and president of Les Gestions Gamac P.N.

Senator Gill was also a visionary. At the age of 42, he became the founding president of the Conseil Atikamekw-Montagnais and chief of the Mashteuiatsh Montagnais community in the mid-1970s and again in the late 1980s. Senator Gill was dedicated to his community and in 1991 was made a Knight of the National Order of Quebec in recognition of his achievements.

In 1998, Aurélien Gill was appointed to the Senate on the recommendation of Prime Minister Jean Chrétien. As a senator, he played an integral role as a member of the Standing Senate Committee on Aboriginal Peoples from the beginning of his tenure to his retirement. He also sat on numerous other committees, such as Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration; Legal and Constitutional Affairs; Agriculture and Forestry; Fisheries and Oceans; and many more. Senator Gill served with distinction over the course of his Senate tenure with his insights and contributions to debates, committee work, activities and initiatives. Deservedly, Senator Gill was appointed to the Order of Canada by the Governor General for his life's work and service to the community and to Canada.

[*Translation*]

On behalf of the Conservative caucus, I wish to extend our deepest sympathy to Senator Gill's wife and three daughters, as well as to the entire Mashteuiatsh community. While they have lost a beloved husband, father and leader, we have all lost an exemplary Canadian senator. Thank you.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

Hon. Joan Fraser (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, I had the enormous privilege of joining the Senate the same day as Aurélien Gill. Even at the time, I knew it was a privilege, although it was only with the passage of time that I realized just how much of a privilege it was to be paired, if you will, with such an extraordinary man.

One of the ironies of political life is that Aurélien Gill represented a senatorial division in Quebec called Wellington. Wellington was one of the greatest warriors in the history of England. He was the man who conquered Napoleon, and he was well known, apparently, for his haughty, difficult and even snobby disposition.

Aurélien Gill was anything but those things. Aurélien was a man with an enchanting smile. Just look at any photo of him. He was always smiling. Even as I look at those photos today, I feel like his smile makes me smile.

I think one of the best descriptions of Aurélien that I ever read was in his obituary. Among other things, it said:

Mr. Gill was a unifying force and was always actively involved in his community, region and country. He worked on promoting respect, cooperation and partnership. To his family and friends, he was the epitome of integrity, justice and perseverance.

All these words are true, especially the first descriptor, "unifying force." He was a unifying force. It was hard not to like Aurélien Gill or answer his calls.

The current chief of Mashteuiatsh — like Senator Martin, I have a hard time pronouncing the name of Aurélien's favourite place in the world even though he tried to teach me how for 10 years — Gilbert Dominique, said:

I think he will certainly inspire us because he never gave in or gave up. He believed very strongly that we had rights, that we . . .

—he was talking about Aboriginal peoples—

. . . had rights and we could certainly build our future on that basis.

(1350)

As Senator Moore said earlier in his tribute, Aurélien Gill never stopped fighting for his people and for his country, but particularly for his people. He taught us what we needed to know about Aboriginal peoples, and we thank him for that. I offer our condolences to his entire family.

[*English*]

The Hon. the Speaker *pro tempore*: Honourable senators, I would like to remind you to stay within the three minutes, please.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Céline Hervieux-Payette: Honourable senators, I would first like to offer my condolences to the family. I had the opportunity to meet them a few minutes ago.

If it weren't for Aurélien Gill, I might never have known about Pointe-Bleue. The name alone brings to mind a beautiful countryside, a fantastic region, and above all, a place where people help each other and are extremely welcoming. I encourage any of my colleagues who have never been to Pointe-Bleue to go for a visit and maybe have a coffee with his daughters while they are there.

I always knew that Aurélien was proud of his heritage. Some people forget about where they came from, but he did not. He worked his whole life to advance the cause of Aboriginal peoples in a positive and generous manner. I don't think that we who arrived in this land well after the Aboriginal communities have been that generous, and I believe that the example he set of sharing is worth serious consideration.

I would also like to share a little secret with you. If Aurélien were with us today, I can tell you that he would very likely have been asked to participate in a well-known television show called *Dancing with the Stars* and that his talents as a dancer would have put some participants to shame. After some caucus meetings, I remember going to bed rather late but filled with gladness because his love of life transcended his work in the Senate, where he made a lot of friends.

When I think of everything that he did for his community, I feel I must tell his family that he was a proud man and that they should be proud of him. He was a Canadian who made a great contribution to this country, and I too was always proud to serve with him. He will always be remembered fondly. I will not say goodbye, but rather, until we meet again. I am sure we will see each other again one day and have the chance to get into a bit of trouble and maybe dance a little.

[English]

Hon. Charlie Watt: Honourable senators, today I rise to give tribute to our former colleague, Senator Gill.

Long before I was a senator, I worked very closely with Senator Gill. For many years he touched a part of me in a way that some other people probably would not have. That's how close a relationship I had with Senator Gill.

He was Quebec director-general at the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs. Before that, he was the vice-president of the Quebec Association of Indians. That was between 1973 and 1975. He was also the chairman of the Council of Atikamekw and Montagnais from 1975 to 1976. So we had many years of experience with each other and in dealing with the different matters that were before us. Actually, I have known Senator Gill for over 40 years.

As some of you senators are fully aware, in his final years he introduced a private member's bill, Bill S-234, to establish an assembly of Aboriginal peoples of Canada, along with an executive attached to it. And we shared his vision for a third house of Parliament — an Aboriginal people's chamber — with support right across the country.

Last week, I hosted a round table with the First Nation leaders, and I can assure you that Senator Gill's vision is still alive in the minds and the hearts of our community leaders today.

Aboriginal people are under-represented in this chamber, and those of us who remain miss him very much. We carry a disproportionate load because the community is growing rapidly, yet Aboriginal representation in this place continues to shrink.

I had an opportunity today to meet with his family. Unfortunately his wife didn't have the strength to come here. The rest of his family is here, including his grandchildren and great-grandchildren. I met his three daughters, Guylaine, Carole and Marie-Claude. We are all happy to receive them here in Ottawa.

I would say Senator Gill was most effective and very focused on the matters that he dealt with. I was fortunate to have many years' experience with Senator Gill, a strong advocate for the indigenous people, and I was honoured to call him my good friend.

Thank you, honourable senators.

Hon. Jim Munson: Honourable senators, and to the Gill family, I have another statement to make, but I'm caught up in the moment. I'll say a few words.

I was the new kid on the block in 2003, and Senator Gill was already here. He took me aside and showed me a few things. I'm not allowed to say what they were, but they were all good. Every darn bit of it was good. He was a mentor in my life as well and helped me understand even more about the issue of Aboriginal rights and speaking with one voice.