



House of Commons  
CANADA

# Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade

---

FAAE • NUMBER 050 • 1st SESSION • 38th PARLIAMENT

---

EVIDENCE

**Monday, June 20, 2005**

—  
**Chair**

**Mr. Bernard Patry**

All parliamentary publications are available on the  
"Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire" at the following address:

**<http://www.parl.gc.ca>**

## Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade

Monday, June 20, 2005

• (1535)

[Translation]

**The Chair (Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.):** This is the 50<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade. On the agenda, we have committee business.

[English]

We're going to start with the presentation of the third report of the Subcommittee on International Trade, Trade Disputes and Investment, entitled "Elements of an Emerging Market Strategy for Canada".

Mr. Cannis, please.

**Mr. John Cannis (Scarborough Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Chairman, I have the pleasure of presenting the report of the Subcommittee on International Trade of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade, entitled Elements of an Emerging Market Strategy for Canada".

I would like to acknowledge the tremendous contribution from all members on the subcommittee. I see with us here the vice-chair, Mr. Menzies, and I want to take an opportunity to thank him for his great contribution to this report and his input in stepping in when sometimes I was not able to be there. As a matter of fact, at one of the later stages he guided it very nicely, and I thank him very much.

As well, I thank the researchers who are here with us today, who've done such a tremendous job in helping us put this together.

Without further ado, here is our report. Thank you very much.

**The Chair:** Are there any comments?

Mr. Menzies, please.

**Mr. Ted Menzies (Macleod, CPC):** I would like to commend our chairman, Mr. Cannis, for the fine work he has done on this, in guiding this through and listening to a diverse group of interests that brought forward a lot of issues that we think are very relevant and are portrayed in this report.

I would like to add to this a dissenting opinion that means no disrespect whatsoever to the work done by this committee. In fact, I think it probably improves on it a little bit. So I would like to ask that this be attached to the report.

**The Chair:** This is the Conservative Party's dissenting opinion?

**Mr. Ted Menzies:** Yes, it is.

**The Chair:** Fine, Mr. Menzies. He'll do so.

Are there any other comments concerning this?

Can we adopt the third report of the Subcommittee on International Trade, Trade Disputes and Investment, entitled "Elements of an Emerging Market Strategy for Canada", including the dissenting opinion of the Conservative Party?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Chair:** Shall we request a government response within the next six months, as usual? I think it would be appropriate, but I'm just asking you.

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Chair:** Good. We'll do so.

All agreed to present it in the House?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Chair:** Fine.

Next is the third report of the Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Development, entitled "Mining in Developing Countries - Corporate Social Responsibility".

Do we have a copy for each member?

**Mr. Navdeep Bains (Mississauga—Brampton South, Lib.):** We had submitted a draft. The final report will be submitted to you momentarily. They are just making photocopies.

**The Chair:** Okay, we're going to suspend dealing with that for now, and we'll go to the discussion on the draft motion circulated by Mr. Abbott.

Mr. Abbott, please.

**Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay—Columbia, CPC):** Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank you and all members of the committee for your consideration. It's very generous. This came about as a result of a discussion I had with Mr. McTeague and Mr. Derek Lee over the my Taiwan act, Bill C-357.

There are many members in the House and in my party who are leaning towards voting in favour of my bill, Bill C-357. This, however, does not mean those members do not have some concerns. Some are torn because of the assertions made by the Government of China, through their embassy here, that this would represent a de facto change in the relationship between Canada and China.

That being the case, in light of the tremendous amount of public interest in this matter, recognizing that Bill C-357 has profound international implications, and in order to give all members of Parliament an opportunity for serious consideration of the bill, I have given the committee a draft suggesting that this committee undertake a review of the issues related to the subject matter of Bill C-357.

I'm wide open to any amendments members might want to make to this. I presume they will be friendly amendments. The one I have heard already, which I would be agreeable to, is on number 7: "That the review be completed and reported to the House by October 21, 2005" be amended to read, "...reported to the House 30 days following the...", whatever the correct words are, "the recommencement"....

I would like to think of this as being a responsible reaction, on my part as a mover, to the concerns that have been expressed.

My best guess at this point, having telephoned people in all parties, is that the vote would likely be in favour of the bill, with the amount of information now available. This is not in any way an attempt on my part to avoid what's going to happen in Parliament. Rather, I want to assist the members and all members of Parliament in judging how they choose to vote on this bill. That is the purpose of this motion.

● (1540)

**The Chair:** Comments?

Mr. Boudria.

**Hon. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.):** I want to congratulate our colleague for the approach he's taking. It's very constructive. He and I have had a number of conversations over the last week.

I am aware that some members are perhaps worried about the precedent this creates. If members are worried, there may be a few words to add that would solve the problem, and I offer them to the committee. We could say right at the beginning, "Notwithstanding the usual procedure of private members' business that the standing committee..." This says, in the same kind of language we use in the House—I've used it countless times in my previous incarnation as House leader—that this isn't precedent-setting. The parliamentary catch-all is, "Notwithstanding the usual procedure and practice", or words to that effect. It generally covers this case, so that no one has to worry that this creates a precedent. In fact, those words say this isn't a precedent. It's the parliamentary jargon for describing this situation. It's a suggestion I make for my colleagues.

**The Chair:** It is a good suggestion.

I have Mr. McTeague and Madame Lalonde.

**Hon. Dan McTeague (Pickering—Scarborough East, Lib.):** I concur with Mr. Abbott about the conversations we've had, and I'm pleased to see that it has come to this. There is no need for the House of Commons to proceed to a level that might be interpreted as something it clearly is not.

There are a couple of points I wish to make to facilitate this motion. I would point out to Mr. Abbott that the Government of Canada indeed is concerned about section 4, in particular as it relates to the potential for *de jure*. It's not necessarily the Chinese

government...but indeed the opinion of the Government of Canada is very much along that line. I'd also be concerned if any amendment were proposed on the timing. As opposed to 30 days, I believe the intention was 30 sitting days. Considering the number of motions we get on this committee, we're lucky if we can get through something, as witnessed by Mr. Day's motion on Israel that has been with us for a couple of months now.

I'm not averse to the points that have been made here, and I think there can be some latitude as to witnesses. I invite all members to provide witnesses and be able to provide commentary on the bill. I don't see the bill as being precedent-setting, in terms of unanimous consideration to look at the options, and it may just strike the right note.

Considering that we had individuals here from the department on the subject of transit visas, it appears there is more of an inclination—as we'll see from Ms. McDonough a little later on—to deal more plentifully with Canada's relationship with Taiwan and its overall implications for trade, its overall cultural implications, and its overall policy implications for the one China policy. I think that is the right way to go.

● (1545)

[*Translation*]

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

Ms. Lalonde, please.

**Ms. Francine Lalonde (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ):** I would like to congratulate Mr. Abbott on his initiative. We know that this bill is raising concerns, to say the least, with respect to our relationship with China.

I decided to support the spirit of the bill insofar as it does not change Taiwan's international status or amount to recognition. The way you are going about this will enable us to consider your bill calmly at a later date and have a more informed debate.

I support the motion.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Merci, Madame Lalonde.

I have a question for Mr. Abbott. Where does your Bill C-357 stand right now? When are we supposed to be voting on this at second reading? Can you just give me an update?

**Mr. Jim Abbott:** The second hour of debate was to have occurred tomorrow, but as a result of my discussions with Mr. Derek Lee, Mr. McTeague, and subsequently you, I swapped a bill with Mr. Lee. It will come back for a second hour of debate, which will lead to a vote in September or whenever the House sits. Obviously, I will again defer that until we go through this process.

**The Chair:** That's fine.

Are there any other comments?

Ms. McDonough.

**Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP):** Mr. Chair, I'd like to say that I think I'm in agreement with the spirit of what is being attempted here, which is to ensure that we are as fully informed as possible about the implications of this, as we try to be about every bill we deal with.

I'm a bit confused about the process. I think, Mr. Boudria, perhaps you were referring to my having raised the question of precedent. I'm trying to understand why we're dealing with this at committee before it even goes to second reading. It just seems to me to be questionable. I mean, a lot of private members' bills never do come to committee. Whether you think that's a good thing or a bad thing, that's a reality. By and large, we're all in agreement that the House has a role to play in terms of the referral of private members' bills.

I have two concerns. One is that I think we've got some unfinished business from our last meeting: the concerns that were raised by the Taiwanese about transit visas and the denial of other visas. So I'd like to know that we're going to deal with those. Secondly, rather than rushing into this today, if we're all in agreement that the point of what's being attempted here is to make sure that we are in fact fully informed before we take a position, why would we not wait until it goes to second reading, at which time, when second reading is concluded, if it's referred to committee, that is what we would undertake to do?

Perhaps there's some plausible explanation here that would help me understand why we would delay it and not deal with the further disposition after it has actually gone to second reading.

• (1550)

**The Chair:** I have Mr. Abbott, Mr. Boudria, and Mr. McTeague, but first, Ms. McDonough, you mentioned unfinished business. That's exactly in Mr. Abbott's second point, his second bullet. We want to discuss procedure and protocol, enabling or restricting private or public visits, etc.

Mr. Abbott, please.

**Mr. Jim Abbott:** I'll defer to Mr. McTeague.

**Hon. Dan McTeague:** I accept the concerns Ms. McDonough has raised, but it's precisely because they are raised.... It would appear that in section 2 of Mr. Abbott's proposal we do deal with the public visits and persons appointed. Rather than doing these things as a one-off, Ms. McDonough, I thought it might be helpful to look at the entire relationship with respect to Taiwan.

The bill is inevitable. Whether it wins or passes tomorrow evening, or whenever Mr. Abbott should present it, in my view, it will not satisfy the overall concerns members of Parliament have. I think we do owe it to Parliament to provide expertise on this issue. In my year and a half here, it's come up several times, even before Mr. Abbott's bill. Setting a time aside to give this proper study.... I think Mr. Abbott has gone through the exercise of trying to capture what has been done singularly on several occasions, including the concerns raised by you, and of course by your replacement, your colleague, Peter Julian, who was here that one day to talk about transit visas.

Rather than seeing this issue as for or against and having it interpreted by others—not just by the House of Commons—as a signal one way or another, considering all the issues that seem to be

coming in day by day on this, rather than dealing with lobbyists calling us one-off, perhaps it's best that the committee get the expertise and get ahead of the issue.

I think it would certainly strike the right balance in a minority government to try to find ways in which we can develop a compromise, or at least get an assessment of the bill that's before us, whether or not it's accurate. There are elements within it that we could take up as a committee and make recommendations on that would have greater effect than perhaps a private member's bill, which may or may not make it.

I appreciate the point you're making regarding private members' bills in general. Having passed more than most MPs, I know how difficult that is. I think it's not so much the bill, the private member's business, but rather the subject that is being treated that is of great concern and grave concern to us.

**The Chair:** Mr. Boudria.

**Hon. Don Boudria:** I would like to address the issue of the subject matter of the bill being referred to committee. That's not without precedent. It has been done many times. Sometimes it has been done by withdrawing the order that's before the House and simply asking the committee to do it. It's been done various ways. But having a committee study a subject rather than having it voted on in the House has been done on many occasions. I've had to deal with that on a number of occasions before, so that's not at all without precedent.

In any case, I thought maybe adding a few catch-all words to indicate that this isn't a precedent may provide, shall I call it, greater certainty.

**The Chair:** Thank you for your comments and explanations, Mr. Boudria.

Mr. Abbott.

**Mr. Jim Abbott:** Ms. McDonough, have the interventions satisfied your question?

As I say, I perceive a tremendous amount of goodwill in this committee. I could only wish that most of the committees on the Hill would be able to work with this kind of spirit, and it was with this spirit in mind that I brought my motion.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

This is the last comment. Do you have a comment, Ms. McDonough?

**Ms. Alexa McDonough:** I hope that spirit continues as well. It is quite inspiring, given a lot of the other things going on.

I gather that what we're now dealing with is the motion with the friendly amendment of not establishing a precedent. Far be it from me to ever contest the assertions of Mr. Boudria, who's an acknowledged procedural expert, but I am a bit surprised to know there are a lot of examples of it never going to second reading at all but ending up in committee as a private member's bill. I'm surprised that's something that happens often.

I accept the explanation, which is that it's not about the private member's bill per se; it's about the several related matters so we can take a more comprehensive view. That being the case, I'm certainly prepared to support it.

• (1555)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

**Hon. Dan McTeague:** Excuse me, Mr. Chair, could I just add to that?

**The Chair:** Yes, very quickly.

**Hon. Dan McTeague:** On a personal side, I'm a weak person these days, and frankly, I'm pretty tired of getting beaten up on this issue either way.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Now, I have two amendments from Mr. Abbott. The first one is notwithstanding the usual procedure for private members' business in the beginning, and after that, on bullet 7, that the review be completed and reported to the House within the 30 sitting days after the House resumes.

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

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Now we'll go to the presentation of the third report of the Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Development, entitled "Mining in Developing Countries - Corporate Social Responsibility".

Mr. Bains, please.

**Mr. Navdeep Bains:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I apologize for the misunderstanding that took place before. There was a report provided, but that was a draft. You should have received the final draft of the report.

Basically, you summarized what the report is about. In the big picture, it's about corporate social responsibility. Then we looked at Canadian mining companies, especially their operations in the developing nations. As a case example, we specifically used TVI, a company that exists in the Philippines. We met with many NGOs and stakeholders. We have about 10 recommendations, two of which pertain to TVI specifically. The report was drafted with unanimous consent.

I also want to take this opportunity to thank the clerk and the research staff for their hard work as well in helping me to put together this report.

So I hope you guys can adopt it.

**The Chair:** Are there any comments?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Paquette, please.

**Mr. Pierre Paquette (Joliette, BQ):** I know that Ms. Lalonde went to check, since we unfortunately did not have an opportunity to discuss this with our representative on our subcommittee.

But in point 2, I would like it to be made clear in the following way:

2. Put in place stronger incentives to encourage Canadian mining companies to conduct their activities outside Canada in a socially and environmentally responsible manner [...]

Social responsibility is also mainly a provincial responsibility.

We are talking primarily about investment activities outside Canada. At the domestic level, the federal government has jurisdiction, but the provinces do as well. I do not consider this a major amendment.

**The Chair:** Can you explain your amendment?

**Mr. Pierre Paquette:** I would simply add the words "outside Canada". The sentence would read as follows:

2. Put in place stronger incentives to encourage Canadian mining companies to conduct their activities outside Canada in a socially and environmentally responsible manner [...]

**The Chair:** Thank you. That's fine.

**Mr. Pierre Paquette:** It is a question of foreign trade here, which is a federal responsibility.

**The Chair:** I understand.

**Mr. Pierre Paquette:** I have another question.

**The Chair:** Yes, go ahead.

**Mr. Pierre Paquette:** Point 4 talks about "when there is evidence of serious human rights violations". Are there violations that are somewhat serious? As a definition, is this something that has been legally tested? This wording is in point 4.

**The Chair:** The way I see it, a human rights violation, whether it is serious or not, is a violation, and that is that.

**Mr. Pierre Paquette:** I would drop the adjective "serious".

[*English*]

**The Chair:** A violation of human rights is a violation. It doesn't need to be a big one or a small one. A violation is a violation.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pierre Paquette:** It would suggest that less serious violations are tolerated.

[*English*]

**Mr. Navdeep Bains:** I think the issue is the word "serious". Just take that word out. I have no problem with that.

**The Chair:** Delete the word "serious".

Are there any other comments?

Mr. Sorenson.

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson (Crowfoot, CPC):** There are a lot of countries out there where we can find human rights violations, but then there are those—

**Mr. Navdeep Bains:** Mining companies.

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** So this would be the same with any kind of Canadian company.

•(1600)

**Mr. Navdeep Bains:** Absolutely. This tenor applies to all Canadian companies. Even though corporate social responsibility was dealt with as a major topic, we specifically looked at mining companies as an example, but this recommendation speaks to all companies. Let me give specific examples about TVI later on, but this could pertain to any company. It could be in mining or any other field.

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** Ms. Lalonde.

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** Honestly, Mr. Chairman, I have not had time to look at this in detail, but I feel that this issue is important. I know that things went very quickly in the committee. From what I understand, they never looked at the amended text. It also seems that if Canada has no policy on respect for the environment or working conditions, we can hardly require companies to assume their social responsibilities.

**The Chair:** Ms. Lalonde, I would point out that recommendation 17 in the report by the Subcommittee on International Trade, Trade Disputes and Investment, which we have just accepted, states:

That the Government of Canada draft legislation under which Canadian companies operating abroad should continue to be subject to Canadian laws as they pertain to human rights.

It is very much in line with what we have just adopted.

There will be a vote in half an hour.

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** But corporate social responsibility also concerns the environment, yet there is no similar legislation governing environmental matters. I am concerned by the fact that the report is of a general nature and does not define its scope.

**The Chair:** Mr. Paquette.

**Mr. Pierre Paquette:** The document makes mention of the OECD guidelines, which provide us with a recognized framework. I hope that puts Francine's mind at ease.

**The Chair:** They provide us with some basic criteria.

Mr. Bains.

[*English*]

**Mr. Navdeep Bains:** There are a couple of things, as a point of clarification. I do understand the concerns you've brought forth, but this report was unanimously discussed by all members, including the Bloc. We went paragraph by paragraph, line by line, so this wasn't done in a rush. Everything was agreed upon by all the members in the subcommittee.

With respect to the concerns you brought forth with regard to social responsibility—it was mentioned by Mr. Paquette—we have indicated OECD guidelines. They're voluntary guidelines, but nevertheless, that's the framework we used to have this discussion, and it's within the 10 recommendations. Those concerns are valid, but they have been addressed.

A lot of effort and time were definitely put into this report. We met with various NGOs and other stakeholders as well. We listened to many witnesses, and we spent, actually, two committee meetings

reviewing the recommendations, the introduction, and the preamble for this report as well.

**The Chair:** Are there any other comments?

Madame Lalonde.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** I just wanted to say that I would not want Mr. Bains to think we are upset with him.

**The Chair:** No, of course not.

[*English*]

Ms. McDonough, please.

**Ms. Alexa McDonough:** I just wanted to say that I think it's an extremely good piece of work, and it would be an awful shame for us to delay bringing it forward as a report to the House, since the House isn't going to be sitting for a great deal longer and we may or may not get to do further work on it. I hope we can pass it here today.

**The Chair:** Okay.

I have the third report, and there are two amendments. The first amendment is to add, in the second recommendation, after, "Put in place stronger incentives to encourage Canadian mining companies to conduct their activities", the words "outside Canada".

In the fourth recommendation, second line, we delete the word "serious"—in French, "*grave*"—so that it reads simply, "human rights violations".

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** In what?

**The Chair:** In the fourth recommendation. It now reads:

Establish clear legal norms in Canada to ensure that Canadian companies and residents are held accountable when there is evidence of serious human rights violations associated with the activities of Canadian mining companies;

This would delete the word "serious".

Are you opposed to the word?

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** I would like it to be left in.

**The Chair:** The problem with serious is that it means we're dealing with serious and non-serious violations.

•(1605)

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson:** I think we all realize what serious is. We've been through the whole question of Talisman and others, so we knew there were serious human rights violations.

You know, when all of a sudden there's a serious human rights violation, we have a responsibility, but when something that may be a human rights violation in one country, even here, may not be over there, I don't know if we need to step in and—

**The Chair:** The point is that a violation is a violation. For me, that's the point.

Mr. Bains, do you want to answer that?

**Mr. Navdeep Bains:** On the words here, I don't know; either way, personally, I'm fairly indifferent to it. We could get into a whole discussion about the various degrees of human rights violations. I'm of the belief that human rights violations are human rights violations, period. If you want to take the word out, fine. If you want to keep it in, I don't think it will really change the overall recommendations.

I'm just saying I'm flexible. It really is up to you guys on the committee.

**The Chair:** Mr. Menzies.

**Mr. Ted Menzies:** I'm glad Mr. Sorenson brought this up. It starts to bother me when we look at taking out the word "serious". In our trade subcommittee we dealt a lot with corporate social responsibility. What it comes down to is asking whether we're forcing our standards on the countries we're trading with. Every country has different standards.

So I guess I'm concerned by this. What is the definition of "serious"? Are we forcing our standards on other countries? I mean, we saw what happened to the Seattle trade talks when Bill Clinton stepped in and started talking about negotiating labour agreements amongst the WTO countries. There was a lot of push-back.

[Translation]

**The Chair:** Mr. Paquette.

**Mr. Pierre Paquette:** I think we have to consider the question in the context of the fourth recommendation:

4. Establish clearly the norms in Canada to ensure that Canadian companies and residents are held accountable [we have not yet defined exactly how they will be held accountable] when there is evidence of [...] human rights violations [...]

Mention is made of evidence and the need to establish legal norms; however, these norms will be based on the definitions of human rights violations used by international conventions. Perhaps the legislator will put forward a scale of sanctions, but we cannot, a priori, simply use such definitions.

[English]

**The Chair:** Any other comments?

Madam McDonough, then Madam Lalonde.

**Ms. Alexa McDonough:** Mr. Chairman, like the chair of the subcommittee, I actually was a little bit indifferent as to whether serious remained in or out, but now I'm actually concerned about what I think is some confusion created by Mr. Menzies' comment.

This isn't about our imposing something on other governments, or companies from other countries; this is about our taking some responsibility, as I understand it, for the conduct of Canadian companies abroad and Canadian residents abroad who might actually otherwise be willing to accept much, much lower standards and engage in serious abuses that we don't think we should be associated with, or be willing to look the other way.

So I don't think the debate is over whether the norms of the country in which those Canadian companies are violating human rights...is the subject matter here.

**The Chair:** That's fine.

[Translation]

Did you wish to make a comment, Ms. Lalonde?

**Ms. Francine Lalonde:** What I have to say is also a question for Mr. Bains. I have noticed that the report addresses human rights on several occasions, but makes no mention of the environment. However, businesses, and in particular mining companies, cause harm not only to people, but also to the environment. They cause significant problems in many countries, whether they shut up shop or continue business. At one point, the report addresses the three issues; however, on several other occasions, only human rights are addressed.

**The Chair:** On the second paragraph of the second page, the report states that the subcommittee "Recognizes that many [...] mining companies...". In the last two lines of the same paragraph the report states: "[...] to adequately address issues arising from the social, cultural, political or environmental context in which they seek to operate [...]" There's a clear reference to the environment.

**Two paragraphs further on, the report states:** The Subcommittee believes that more must be done to ensure that Canadian companies have the necessary knowledge, support and incentives to conduct their activities in a socially and environmentally responsible manner [...]

The term "environmental" is employed on two occasions.

• (1610)

[English]

My comprehension about these serious human rights is that it's when they have evidence of it. It's to look up the evidence of violations.

Mr. Bains.

**Mr. Navdeep Bains:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

There are a few examples.

I know the concern you're raising is that we should have a more holistic approach and not simply focus on human rights. We have addressed the notion of environmental issues. If you look at recommendation 2, we mention it there. It indicates environmental responsibility.

If you look at recommendation 5(c), we've indicated as well that they "have the capacity to conduct their activities in a socially and environmentally responsible manner". Wherever we feel we have an opportunity to use the term "environment" in our recommendations, we have done so.

It's also in the introduction. If you look on page 1, the second paragraph, it speaks to:

These hearings have underlined the fact that mining activities in some developing countries have had adverse effects on local communities, especially where regulations governing the mining sector and its impact on economic and social wellbeing of employees and local residents, as well as the environment, are weak or non-existent, or where they are not enforced.

It's also mentioned in that context. We tried to frame the term "environment" as well, in line with social responsibility and human rights.

I see your concern, but I think it's addressed. I acknowledge your concern and the fact that this is the first time you're looking at the report as well. You've had an opportunity to go through it. I recognize that.

I also apologize for the fact that we only distributed the final copy.



**The Chair:** Okay. I have an amendment from Monsieur Paquette on recommendation 2: "Put in place stronger initiatives to encourage Canadian mining companies to conduct...outside Canada". Do you all agree on the amendment of "outside Canada"? Fine.

On recommendation 4, I have an amendment from Monsieur Paquette to delete the word "serious" from "serious human rights", [Translation]

To delete the word "serious" in French.  
[English]

I'm going to take a vote on this one.

Are we in agreement to delete it?

Madam McDonough, do you want to talk to this or do you want to vote?

**Ms. Alexa McDonough:** Yes. I actually want to raise a question with Mr. Paquette on whether he would accept as a friendly amendment, very much in the spirit of what several people have said, including Madam Lalonde...in that one case, it seems to be an omission not to have a reference to environmental violations, when it is in just about every other place, as a kind of parallel. Would it not make it more consistent with the several other clauses to take out "serious" and put "human rights and environmental violations associated with the activities of Canadian mining companies"?

**The Chair:** "Environmental" could also be part of human rights, in a certain sense.

**Ms. Alexa McDonough:** But environmental is referred to, as has been pointed out, in just about every other section. It seems to me that the omission of it here could in fact be misunderstood. Wouldn't it make it parallel and consistent to insert a reference to evidence of environmental and human rights violations associated with the activities of Canadian mining companies? Particularly as it relates to mining, the omission of "environment" there seems to be ill-advised.

**The Chair:** Are there any other comments?

We have a motion from Mr. Paquette to delete the word "serious". I'm going to take a vote to delete the word "serious", [Translation]

To delete the word "serious".  
[English]

All those in favour of deleting the word "serious"?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Chair:** It's passed.

We're now going to adopt the motion with the two amendments. All those in favour of adopting the third report?

Yes, sorry.

**Ms. Alexa McDonough:** Mr. Chair, Mr. Paquette chose not to support the insertion of "environment". Fair enough; that's his decision. But I would like to propose separately, then, in paragraph 4, the insertion of:

...when there is evidence of environmental and human rights violations associated with the activities of Canadian mining companies;

I think it's for obvious reasons; they're just horrendous.

• (1615)

**The Chair:** Do you want to read it again?

**Ms. Alexa McDonough:** Yes, it's simply the assertion in paragraph 4.

**The Chair:** No, read your paragraph 4.

**Ms. Alexa McDonough:** It would read:

Establish clear legal norms in Canada to ensure that Canadian companies and residents are held accountable when there is evidence of environmental or human rights violations associated with the activities of Canadian mining companies;

**The Chair:** You didn't put in "serious". You want to amend it by having this. All in favour?

**Hon. Don Boudria:** I think "environmental and/or..."?

**Ms. Alexa McDonough:** Yes, I guess "and/or" would be correct. Thank you. That's better.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Mr. Bains, do you agree with this?

**Mr. Navdeep Bains:** I have no problem.

**The Chair:** Does everyone agree with this?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Chair:** I will take the votes. Are you all in agreement?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Chair:** Shall the third report carry with amendments?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Chair:** Shall I report to the House?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Chair:** I think the committee is requesting a response from the government. Shall I request a report from the government?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Navdeep Bains:** What is the number of days that we'll get a response by?

**The Clerk of the Committee:** If it's pursuant to Standing Order 109, it's 120 days.

**Mr. Navdeep Bains:** That's what I thought. That's correct.

**The Chair:** Mr. Day is not here for his motion. We'll postpone Mr. Day's motion until the next meeting.

Now we've got to vote. There is a little more than 15 minutes left, according to the sound.

[Translation]

**Hon. Don Boudria:** Are we reconvening after the vote, Mr. Chairman?

**The Chair:** No, we are not.

[*English*]

It's over for the day. We're adjourned.

---







**Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons**

**Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes**

**Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:  
Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique « Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire » à l'adresse suivante :  
<http://www.parl.gc.ca>**

---

**The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.**

**Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.**