CANADA

Debates of the Senate

2nd SESSION • 39th PARLIAMENT • VOLUME 144 • NUMBER 6

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Thursday, October 25, 2007

THE HONOURABLE ROSE-MARIE LOSIER-COOL
SPEAKER *PRO TEMPORE*

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue).

Debates and Publications: Chambers Building, Room 943, Tel. 996-0193

Published by the Senate
Available from PWGSC – Publishing and Depository Services, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5.
Also available on the Internet: http://www.parl.gc.ca

THE SENATE

Thursday, October 25, 2007

The Senate met at 1:30 p.m., the Speaker *pro tempore* in the chair.

Prayers.

SENATORS' STATEMENTS

KYOTO PROTOCOL

Hon. David Tkachuk: Honourable senators, I am sure all colleagues interested in the question and the serious problem of climate change will be scrambling to buy the latest issue of the British science journal, *Nature*. According to a story in the *National Post* on the latest issue of *Nature*, two British scientists, one from Oxford and one from the London School of Economics, have written an article entitled, "Time to Ditch Kyoto." They back our government's claim that the Kyoto Protocol does not work. The scientists argue that not only has Kyoto not delivered cuts in greenhouse gases but also it is the wrong tool for the job. The fact that greenhouse gases, GHGs, soared worldwide under Kyoto should have been evidence enough for any of us, much less for Oxford scientists.

Now, the easy route is to blame the non-signatory countries, such as the United States and Australia, for the rise in emissions, but that too would be wrong, say the scientists. Kyoto was the wrong tool for the nature of the job. Moreover, the scientists warn delegates to the next United Nations climate change meeting in Bali against creating a bigger version of Kyoto — more of what is not working, as they say — and argue instead for a radical rethink in climate policy.

What is needed instead of another Kyoto is a massive increase in spending on clean energy and on research and development in general.

I urge all senators interested in this subject and interested in doing something about climate change to read and consider this article carefully.

CANADIAN FEDERATION OF STUDENTS

MEETINGS WITH PARLIAMENTARIANS

Hon. Catherine S. Callbeck: Honourable senators, this week representatives from the Canadian Federation of Students, which speaks for more than half a million students from every province in this country, met with parliamentarians on the Hill. I had the great pleasure of meeting with two young graduate students, Faiz Ahmed, P.E.I. representative, and Ben Lewis, National Treasurer, who ably outlined the major concerns and challenges facing post-secondary students today.

Rising tuition costs and increasing debt loads have an effect on whether Canadian youth are able to pursue their studies. As honourable senators may know, Statistics Canada released the average tuition costs for the 2007-08 academic year earlier this month. Tuition rose by 2.8 per cent this year, an even faster rate than inflation. The average tuition for an undergraduate student is $4,524, up from $4,400 the year before. More and more post-secondary education is an option available only to those from high income families or to students who end up with overwhelming personal debt upon graduation.

We all know how important post-secondary education has become in the 21st century. It is not only absolutely necessary to the success of individual Canadians but also vital to the country's overall success on the world stage.

Despite the increasing importance of ensuring that young people receive a top-notch post-secondary education, the Conservative government's approach has been wholly insufficient. The one mention of post-secondary education in the recent Speech from the Throne stated only that families worry about the rising costs of higher education. The speech itself offered no measures or initiatives to dispel that worry.

• (1340)

Over the past 20 months, we have seen no direct assistance to students, just two small tax measures that will have little impact on our young people. These small tax credits on a future income tax return provide nothing for a student who needs assistance up front to pay their tuition.

Honourable senators, post-secondary education should be accessible, regardless of income, for all young Canadians capable of attending. All Canadians will benefit from the work of these graduates. The federal government must do all it can to ensure that our young people can effectively participate in an increasingly competitive global economy. In doing so, they will help to ensure the success of the country.

Hon. Hugh Segal: Honourable senators, I am delighted to join with Senator Callbeck to underline the presence in Ottawa today of the Canadian Federation of Students, who, as Senator Callbeck informed us, have come to Ottawa to advance the cause of university students across Canada.

Among the recommendations they will be sharing with the government and parliamentarians of all parties will be the winding down of the Millennium Scholarship Foundation, and the redeployment of the $2-billion endowment established by a previous administration into needs-based student grants to increase equality of access for qualified university applicants so that no young Canadian is barred from university attendance because of financial hardship.

This constructive and helpful policy recommendation is being advanced today in Ottawa by two Canadian Federation of Student delegates, amongst others, from York University, Mr. Ben Keen and Mr. Fuad Abdi, who are also officials of the York University Federation of Students.

I know all senators will want to join with me in wishing these leaders every success in fighting for better management of the federal presence in this field and, above all, better coordination with the provinces, which the Millennium Foundation established by a previous government never fully achieved.

I know that honourable senators will also want to wish these young leaders every success in their academic and professional careers in the months and years ahead.

HEALTH

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO SOCIAL AFFAIRS, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE REPORT ON FUNDING FOR TREATMENT OF AUTISM

Hon. Jim Munson: Honourable senators, we have received from the Minister of Health the government's response to the final report of the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology, *Pay Now or Pay Later — Autism Families in Crisis*.

That report brought to the government's attention the plight of Canadian families who have children with autism and are scrambling to obtain the care and treatment they need. As honourable senators know, families are trying to fend for themselves; they are making huge sacrifices to buy treatment and the stress is tremendous. Our report said it well; families are in crisis.

The Senate report made several recommendations. It called on the government to play a leadership role on behalf of autism families, in particular, leading a national autism strategy.

It was disheartening then to read the government's response and learn the primary role that the government sees for itself is that of "facilitator of enhanced evidence."

Honourable senators, families who have children with autism need help. If I am disappointed with the government's response, think how disappointed autism families are. Much of the 11-page report is devoted to explaining what the government is already doing — words like "ongoing support" and "continued collaboration" pepper the document.

Autism families already know how little the government is doing. Their bank books confirm it. They do not need a bureaucratic report to back this up. The bottom line is that the government thinks the status quo is good enough. We know it is not.

In the last election, the Prime Minister proposed a $100 monthly payment for families with children to help defray the cost of child care. At that time, he urged opposition parties to support the plan even though we know $100 a month is less than one tenth of what full-time child care actually costs. The Prime Minister said that this amount is better than the "status quo, which is zero."

Let us take a page from the government's playbook and call it an "autism allowance," perhaps providing $500 or $1000 a month to families with autistic children. Like a child care allowance, that is about one tenth of what they actually need. That will not even come close to covering the full cost of treatment, but it will sidestep any jurisdictional concerns. Using the Prime Minister's own words, funding will allow parents to choose the option that best suits their needs and will certainly be better than the status quo, which is zero.

• (1345)

Like the child care allowance, an autism allowance would be far from adequate, but it would be a start; at least a step toward acknowledging the hardship and stress that autism families live with every day. I remind honourable senators that this government posted an historic $14-billion surplus this year. Let us use it wisely and help autism families.

[*Translation*]

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

CANADIAN POSITION WITH RESPECT TO THE MARITIME LABOUR CONVENTION, 2006

TABLED

Hon. Gerald J. Comeau (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, a document entitled *Labour Program — Canadian Position with Respect to the Maritime Labour Convention, 2006*.

[*English*]

QUESTION PERIOD

THE HONOURABLE MICHAEL FORTIER

ALLEGED CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Hon. Grant Mitchell: Honourable senators, section 10 of the Senate's Rules of Conduct states:

> . . . a Senator shall not act or attempt to act in any way to further his or her private interests. . .

Section 11 states:

> A Senator shall not use or attempt to use his or her position as a Senator to influence a decision of another person so as to further the Senator's private interests. . . .

Yet, Senator Fortier is using his official website to promote himself in an MP-like role and, of course, he is not an MP, in the riding of Vaudreuil—Soulanges, which does not fall within his senatorial constituency.

Will Senator Fortier please admit that he is using his position as a senator, and probably his senatorial budget, to promote his personal interest to be elected so he can resign from the Senate, which he dismisses and diminishes so readily and so often?

Hon. Marjory LeBreton (Leader of the Government and Secretary of State (Seniors)): Honourable senators, much like a question I received yesterday, this is not a matter of government business. Senator Fortier has made no secret that he would like an election as soon as possible so he can run for a seat in the other place. All matters with regard to his candidacy in Vaudreuil—Soulanges are funded by the political riding association for that constituency.

Senator Mitchell: Honourable senators, if that is the case — and we would like to be reassured and my colleague will be asking questions further about that — the concern remains that the honourable senator may be using his public office to promote his personal interests in contravention of the Federal Accountability Act.

Will the Leader of the Government in the Senate please confirm whether Senator Fortier is using his position as a senator or his position as a minister in this manner? He is certainly construing himself to be the representative of that riding in a way to further his personal interest; that being to get himself elected so that he can get out of this Senate, which he clearly dislikes, diminishes and dismisses at every opportunity.

• (1350)

Senator LeBreton: Each and every one of us as members of Parliament, whether members of the House of Commons or members of the Senate, when asked by citizens of this country to assist them in various cases, do so. I am sure the honourable senator would do the same; I am sure Senator Mitchell is contacted often to inquire about a particular case before the government. I do believe that honourable senators act in accordance with all of their senatorial responsibilities. Of course, senators undertake many political responsibilities, and there is never any question about their ability to do that.

Hon. Yoine Goldstein: I am disappointed that the Honourable Senator Fortier chooses to hide behind the skirts of the honourable leader to respond to this question. Having said that, the website, which is headed "Vaudreuil—Soulanges," and not with the Senate logo, says, amongst other things, "What kind of issues can the constituency office deal with?"

The answer is:

> Our office can assist with federal government matters, including but not limited to:
>
> - Revenue Canada
> - Citizenship and Immigration
> - Passports
> - Income Securities
> - Employment Insurance

Honourable senators, Vaudreuil—Soulanges is in my division and is represented in the House of Commons by Member of Parliament Meili Faille. The privilege and the responsibility of representing constituents' needs to government is that of the senator and of the Member of Parliament. It is not universal.

This purports to be a site where the honourable senator, honourable minister, honourable candidate, presents himself as a senator and then proceeds to say that he can do these things for constituents, who are not his.

My questions are the following: Who paid for the website — each name, amount and date? Did any corporations contribute? Who does the maintenance of the website? Who pays for it and how much? When the honourable minister started the website, did he check with the Senate Ethics Officer before he finished it?

I would like a date before which this information will be furnished.

Senator LeBreton: I thank Senator Goldstein for those questions. The website in question is paid for entirely by the Conservative riding association. As far as I can determine, no Member of Parliament has any right, no matter what political stripe, to make demands as the honourable senator just made. However, since the honourable senator is making demands, we are still waiting to figure out where the $40 million went that was spent out the back door in the sponsorship scandal.

Senator Goldstein: Honourable senators, these people who carry the Holy Grail of accountability and transparency obviously refuse to account and be transparent. I am not finished with this. I expect to be elsewhere in this connection.

Senator LeBreton: I would not get too worked up about it. The fact that our political party is able to get donations from individual Canadians to fund the party and our riding associations causes stress for the senator, but this is a legitimate political association.

• (1355)

It is no secret that Senator Fortier is the nominated candidate. That riding association is completely within its rights to promote their efforts in that riding. There is absolutely nothing illegal or wrong about this practice, and the honourable senator should know that better than most.

Senator Goldstein: Four corporations contributed $1,000 to Senator Fortier's constituency. Is that accountability? Is that transparency? Is that being used for the website? Would the leader like the names of the corporations?

Senator LeBreton: The last time I looked, that activity is completely legal in this country. Thanks to this government, we have changed the situation whereby this activity is open and transparent. No longer do we have situations where people can go to an Italian restaurant and obtain an envelope full of $50,000 without being accountable to the Canadian public.

Senator Goldstein: That is not being transparent. However, the leader is the accuser and she must therefore be transparent.

ACCESS TO INFORMATION

DISCLOSURE AND RESPONSE TO REQUESTS

Hon. Jim Munson: Honourable senators, I would be careful in talking about money going back and forth between political leaders in the past. I say no more.

My question is for the Leader of the Government in the Senate. It has to do with transparency and public accountability.

The Globe and Mail reported earlier this week that obtaining access to information or simply obtaining information has not been easy since the Conservatives came to power. With access to information requests, it seems that more information is censored under the Conservative government. When the information is finally revealed, it has taken an awful long time. Could the leader explain?

Hon. Marjory LeBreton (Leader of the Government and Secretary of State (Seniors)): Honourable senators, for an old journalist like Senator Munson, one would think he could get his facts straight. He was supposed to be an objective journalist, yet his maiden speech in the Senate was about his everlasting commitment to Lester Pearson.

If the honourable senator had reviewed the material instead of allowing *The Globe and Mail* to do his research, he would have found that since we have come into government — and many people have difficulty with accepting this — the number of requests for access to information has risen incredibly. When one looks at the number of responses that have been sent out, the numbers have grown inasmuch as the number of requests has grown.

This government is committed to transparency and openness. We are working as hard as we can to deal with the vastly increased number of requests for access to information.

Senator Munson: I take offence to the comments of the honourable senator. I am not an "old journalist;" I am a young senator. I am only 61.

If one reads the figures in *The Globe and Mail*, and figures do not lie, the number of requests has dropped from 77.5 per cent to 74.7 per cent. When it comes to full disclosure, the picture is worse than ever. Only 23 per cent of documents were fully released, and that is a drop of 5 per cent.

The words from David Gollob of the Canadian Newspaper Association are as follows: "Your government cannot have accountability without having transparency."

What is it about reporters' requests for information or reporters in general that the government does not like?

Senator LeBreton: Actually, nothing. The fact is that the number of requests, as I have just stated, has increased incredibly. Therefore, the people who are tasked with responding to access to information requests are working hard, and the government is committed to responding.

As I have stated to Senator Munson previously, the numbers in the article indicate a dramatic increase.

PROPOSED PUBLIC INTEREST OVERRIDE

Hon. Joan Fraser: Honourable senators, it is well enough to say that one is committed to being accountable and transparent. The problem lies in keeping one's word.

Honourable senators, the Conservative campaign platform in last year's election, entitled *Stand up for Canada*, at page 12, under the heading "Strengthen Access to Information Legislation," solemnly said:

> A Conservative government will:
>
> - Provide a general public interest override for all exemptions, so that the public interest is put before the secrecy of the government.

• (1400)

A public interest override would authorize the head of a government institution to disclose information if it was in the public interest to do so.

That initiative has been supported by Justice John Gomery, one of Senator LeBreton's favourite people; the Office of the Information Commissioner; and the Canadian Newspaper Association. It is similar to provisions in effect in the provinces of Alberta, British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario and Prince Edward Island. It was not a bad promise at all, but surprise, surprise, when the Federal Accountability Act came before us, it was not there.

Colleagues may recall that the Senate inserted a public interest override, which the government, in its wisdom, then refused to accept. What are we supposed to think? Will this override remain one more in the long list of broken promises, or will the government at last try to keep at least this one useful promise?

Hon. Marjory LeBreton (Leader of the Government and Secretary of State (Seniors)): I thank the honourable senator for putting that excellent promise of ours on the record in the Senate. The Federal Accountability Act is a sweeping act that has already shown to the Canadian public that the government is sincere about accountability, openness and transparency.

With regard to the Federal Accountability Act, it is so large that regulations for portions of the act are still being drawn up by officials of the government. However, no one on this side needs to take any lessons about broken promises. The party on the other side was going to get rid of the Free Trade Agreement and hack the GST.

FULFILLMENT OF CAMPAIGN PROMISES

Hon. Lorna Milne: Honourable senators, as the Leader of the Government in the Senate has said, some of the promises in *Stand up for Canada* were excellent. However, when a government says one thing and does another, the perception of many Canadians is that there is something to hide. Perhaps this in-and-out scandal is only the tip of the iceberg of what the government does not wish to reveal to Canadians.

Can the Leader of the Government in the Senate tell honourable senators if this government ever plans to live up to any of the following commitments that it promised Canadians in *Stand up for Canada* on pages 12 and 13: First, implement the Information Commissioner's recommendations for reform of the Access to Information Act; or, second, give the Information Commissioner the power to order the release of information.

I ask because in the recent Speech from the Throne, the Governor General stated that Canadians wanted a government that sets clear goals and delivers concrete results. This government has set a number of goals to amend the access to information regime in Canada yet has not achieved them.

Furthermore, no commitment was made in the Throne Speech to fulfilling these commitments to Canadians. Will this government commit to fulfilling these promises they made to Canadians and, if so, when?

Hon. Marjory LeBreton (Leader of the Government and Secretary of State (Seniors)): First, the Speech from the Throne laid out five priorities of the government. We have also brought in a law whereby prime ministers would —

Senator Milne: Do not forget the question. I will repeat it.

• (1405)

Senator LeBreton: You people on that side are something else, with your hand gestures and everything.

As I started to say, the Speech from the Throne laid out five priorities for the next phase. The next election will be in October 2009, because this Prime Minister brought in a law whereby Canadian prime ministers could not, for their own political and personal advantage, call elections at the whim of their own political desires.

The honourable senator mentioned the Canada Elections Act and advertising. As I said in this place yesterday, this was completely legal. We followed the law, unlike the honourable senator. When the Federal Accountability Act was before the Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs, the honourable senator put on the record that her party allowed donations for the caucus fund where they buy their meals as a taxable donation. She actually put that on the record. It is interesting that no one seemed to pick up on that.

As I stated before, and as the government has said many times, the implementation of the Federal Accountability Act is under way. There is no doubt that it is a huge act. Some provisions came into force immediately and others will come into force over time. On September 19, Senator Fortier and Minister Toews announced a code of conduct for procurement and the appointment of a procurement ombudsman designate. An expansion to the Access to Information Act came into effect on September 1, covering seven additional Crown corporations and all wholly owned subsidiaries. On July 9, the new Conflict of Interest Act came into force, administered by the new Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner, Mary Elizabeth Dawson. Also, Christiane Ouimet, who appeared before us here in the Senate, is the new Public Sector Integrity Commissioner. The Public Servants Disclosure Protection Act came into effect on April 15.

The government is currently laying the groundwork for the establishment of a public appointments commission and is also working with the Library of Parliament to establish the office of the parliamentary budget officer.

As I have said before, this act is large with many components. Instead of getting up and criticizing, the honourable senator should get up and congratulate the government for the great effort we have made so far in implementing it.

Senator Milne: Honourable senators, that is such a great long list of things to respond to that I am not sure where to begin.

We can start with the honourable senator's statement that Senator Fortier has done such marvellous things; he is opening up the Access to Information Act. Honourable senators, less than a quarter of requests for access to information were met with full disclosure of the requested information in 2006-7. This number represents a drop of 5 per cent in only one year of governing. Will there be another 5 per cent drop this year? Will it be 15 per cent next year? Come on, guys. Let us actually open government up to the public.

Senator LeBreton: Now the honourable senator is calling me a guy! Maybe she needs new glasses.

The honourable senator obviously did not hear my answer to Senator Munson. The number of requests for access to information has dramatically increased. As the honourable senator knows, requests create a lot of work for officials. I know the government and officials are working hard to answer them.

Senator Angus: The answers are all on Senator Goldstein's website.

• (1410)

ORDERS OF THE DAY

CRIMINAL CODE

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING— DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. David Tkachuk moved second reading of Bill S-3, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (investigative hearing and recognizance with conditions).

He said: Honourable senators, I want to start by quoting from page A-3 of the *Ottawa Citizen* of October 24. The article is written by Richard Foot and Juliet O'Neill and quotes Stéphane Dion with respect to this bill:

> Liberal leader Stéphane Dion, who strenuously opposed the measures earlier this year —

That is, the measures in this bill. The article goes on to state:

> — as a threat to civil liberties, signalled that his party would likely reverse itself, because the government had incorporated some changes proposed by parliamentary committees.

I would like to thank my colleague Senator Smith on his obvious influence with his new-found friend. Come to think of it, he is my new-found friend as well.

In speaking in favour of Bill S-3, I wish to indicate that this bill proposes to reinstate, with modifications, the investigative hearing and recognizance provisions of the Anti-Terrorism Act.

Honourable senators, terrorism is a scourge that has been with us in one form or another, even before the advent of nation states, although it has most definitely evolved through the ages. Among the first known terrorists was a group in the 13th century known as the Assassins. That name was derived from the hashish they had a habit of smoking. You would think they would be too blissed out to cause any trouble, but that was not the case. They were a breakaway faction of Shia Islam, living in the mountains of Northern Iran, who targeted enemy leaders for assassination at the cost of their own life. They were the first suicide bombers, if you will.

The advent of modern terrorism awaited the advent of the modern state, following the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648. In fact, the word "terrorist" was first coined during the French Revolution to describe the members of the Committee of Public Safety and the National Convention, who carried out the revolutionary government's reign of terror. The Royalists, who opposed the Revolution, used terrorist tactics themselves — such as assassination — in their fight against the revolution.

The modern era of terrorism began in the 19th century with the anarchists and the rise of nationalism, as well as improvements in weaponry. In the late 20th century, groups such as the IRA in Ireland, Shining Path in Peru, the Baader-Meinhof gang in Germany, and Black September in the Middle East became world famous in the era of modern communications. Today, of course, we have the dawning of the era of international terrorism, spearheaded most notably by al Qaeda.

Honourable senators, as I said at the outset, terrorism has long been with us in one form or another. It has evolved to take advantage today of every advance in technology and, of course, differing ideologies, spreading its evil wings in an effort to accomplish through widespread terror what it cannot accomplish through legitimate means. We, on the other hand, must avail ourselves of every legitimate means to combat it.

Honourable senators, the government is aware that the provisions in Bill S-3 were sunset provisions in the Anti-Terrorism Act and that the majority of the House of Commons voted last February against renewal. They thus expired on March 1, 2007, when the sunset provision came into effect. However, the provisions of this bill have been modified to take into account many of the objections of those who opposed them in the House. They are critical tools in the fight against the ongoing and insidious threat of terrorism and should be supported this time. These provisions are in fact crucial to preventing and investigating terrorist attacks.

The investigative hearing provisions would allow the courts to compel a witness who may have information regarding a terrorism offence to testify and provide information or produce anything in the person's control. The recognizance with conditions provision would allow a judge to impose a recognizance on a person in order to prevent the carrying out of a terrorist activity.

Honourable senators, three arguments were advanced for allowing these provisions to sunset, or expire, earlier this year. Many of you were involved in the Special Committee on the Anti-Terrorism Act study here in the Senate. They were essentially that the provisions were not necessary, the provisions offended human rights, and their extension was not coupled with comprehensive legislative reform that would respond to the numerous parliamentary recommendations, including those that had been made concerning these provisions. In fact, those were some of the very reasons that Liberal leader Stéphane Dion used last February when the measures were defeated. However, now, because of the recommendations that were put forth by the Commons committee and the Senate committee, he has seen fit to support this bill.

I will respond to each of these concerns in turn, after which I hope honourable senators will agree that we have turned a page and the bill deserves the support of all senators.

The first concern is necessity. The threat of terrorism to Canada and to Canadians persists. Since the introduction of the Anti-Terrorism Act in 2001, following 9/11, there have been horrific attacks on innocent civilians in many countries around the world. In October 2002, terrorists struck the U.S. embassy and tourist sites in Bali, Indonesia, and 202 innocent people were killed. In the Madrid train bombings in March 2004, al Qaeda-inspired terrorists killed 199 innocent people and injured 2,050. In September that year in Jakarta, a vehicle bomb outside the Australian embassy killed nine innocents. On July 7, 2005, terrorists attacked the subway system in London, killing 52 innocents and injuring 700. Later that month, they failed in a second attempt on London buses. Let us also not forget the arrests in Toronto in June 2006, the 17 alleged terrorists who were planning attacks against various targets in Southern Ontario. How many more innocent people would have been added to the death list last year had they succeeded? Canadians have been publicly identified by leaders of al Qaeda as targets of future terrorist attacks.

Honourable senators, terrorism does not announce itself ahead of time. It does not advertise coming attractions. It does not invite you to an event and ask you to RSVP. Terrorism is a surprise party. It lies dormant for months and years, waiting for you to let your guard down. Terrorists know — at least the ones we are dealing with today — that one colossal act of terrorism, like that which took place on 9/11, sends reverberations not only across societies but also down through time. We react with shock and horror and grief to the initial event, and we scramble in the days and months that follow to prevent future ones.

Terrorists hope, through their horrific acts, to accomplish a variety of goals beyond mass death and destruction. They want to instil widespread fear. They hope that democratic societies will react to that fear in response to the terrorist act by introducing harsh measures to prevent future attacks — measures they hope will cause a democratic backlash in democratic societies. They also hope that eventually, after the furor over the initial attacks has evaporated, democratic societies will let their guard down, including repealing even those sensible measures instituted in the wake of the initial attack to protect society. Terrorists have all the time in the world. They lie in wait for democracies to become complacent once again so that they can engage in acts for which there is no rational motive, or at least not a rationality of the kind that you and I subscribe to.

We need to remain vigilant. We need to avail ourselves of these measures that help safeguard society in extraordinary times, while at the same time preserving constitutional and legal rights. Just

because Canada has not been attacked by al Qaeda does not mean we will not be. Just as we do not throw out our smoke alarms or cancel our fire insurance because, well, it has been five years and the house still has not burned down, we cannot dispense with those measures designed to protect us against an attack.

• (1420)

Given the obvious threat, the government is convinced that it is necessary to reinstate these provisions in order to provide police with the tools necessary to investigate terrorism and to disrupt nascent terrorist activity.

Some will argue that the current Criminal Code provisions are adequate and provide the necessary investigative tools to deal with terrorism. However, there is a difference between terrorist activity and what we would call ordinary criminal activity.

How many criminals, for instance, carry out suicide operations in furtherance of their aims? The modern-day terrorists, or at least the brains behind them, care not a wit for human life, whether it is that of the innocents they target or that of the junior partners in crime carrying out their operations.

Criminals seek to skirt, break or flaunt the law. Modern-day, international terrorists seek to destroy the very legal and democratic institutions that promulgate these laws, along with the societies they hold together.

Make no mistake: All terrorists are criminals, but not all criminals are terrorists. The run-of-the-mill criminal wants to enjoy the fruits of our society, however misguided is his approach to doing that. The terrorist wants to destroy our society.

The potential catastrophic results associated with terrorist activity and the zeal with which terrorists pursue their aims, even contemplating and carrying out suicide bombing attacks, sets terrorism apart.

Our challenge is to respect human rights and preserve legal principles but at the same time give no quarter to an enemy with no respect for those same human rights or any of the conventions of a civilized society — an enemy determined to destroy us.

Our government believes that these measures meet the criteria I just mentioned and are warranted to combat the ever-present threat of terrorism. That was also the view of the previous government after the 9/11 attacks.

The investigative hearing would allow the courts to compel a witness who may have information regarding a terrorism offence to testify and provide information relating to that offence. Such hearings have a strong preventive aspect. There is no analogous provision in the Criminal Code, although a similar procedure can be found in the Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Act, but only to provide testimony in relation to foreign offences alleged to have been committed outside Canada.

It has been suggested that recognizance with conditions is not necessary, given the Criminal Code's arrest power in section 495 and the peace bond in section 810.01.

Section 495(1)(*a*) of the Criminal Code, in part, sets out the power of a peace officer to arrest without warrant a person who is reasonably believed to be about to commit an indictable offence. The person, in other words, must be on the verge of committing a serious crime, such as someone standing outside of a bank with a gun.

On the other hand, the recognizance with conditions provision in this bill is not as narrow as section 495. It requires that a peace officer believe on reasonable grounds that a terrorist activity will be committed and suspect on reasonable grounds that the imposition of a recognizance with conditions on a person is necessary to prevent a terrorist activity.

Although it may not be as blatant, a seasoned police officer may suspect that a terrorist activity is about to take place. For example, he may have reasonable grounds to believe that a terrorist activity will be committed but may be unable to take action against a person because the officer lacks, at the point of identifying the threat and the person, the grounds necessary to support the ordinary criminal standard of a belief on reasonable grounds in relation to that particular person. The officer may only have reasonable suspicion. Given the grave nature of the harm posed by terrorist activity, there is a need to be able to act quickly to address the threat.

The peace bond provisions found in section 810.01 apply, in part, when a person fears on reasonable grounds that another person will commit a terrorism offence. This is a higher standard than that found in section 83.3, which requires reasonable grounds to believe that a terrorist activity will be committed and a reasonable suspicion that the imposition of a recognizance with conditions is necessary to prevent the commission of the terrorist activity. The peace bond lacks the power to arrest without warrant in limited exigent circumstances that is outlined in section 83.3 and, as a result, lacks the preventative scope of section 83.3 as set out in the bill before honourable senators.

The argument has been made that since these provisions were essentially never used, then they are not needed. Let me ask, if your neighbour has experienced a fire and the people on the next block have too, and you have not, do you discount the need for fire prevention? No, you do the opposite. You do everything reasonable to prevent it, knowing the consequences in the event of a catastrophic fire.

Finally, it should be noted that the Senate Special Committee on the Anti-terrorism Act, which had the benefit of studying these provisions and hearing witnesses on this issue, believed that the provisions continued to be necessary. Both the Senate and the House committees made recommendations for amending the provisions, and those have been incorporated in this legislation.

I shall now turn to the subject of the perceived lack of human rights safeguards. In the case of the investigative hearing, the evidence is conclusive. In June 2004, in a reference related to the Air India prosecution, the Supreme Court of Canada upheld the constitutionality of the provision. The government is confident that a recognizance with conditions provision would also have been judged constitutional had this provision been challenged.

There have been misleading reports that the investigative hearing violated the right against self-incrimination. The reality is the exact opposite. There is strong and a robust protection against self-incrimination by legislating use and derivative use immunity, except for prosecutions for perjury and giving contradictory evidence.

In a 2004 decision which upheld the constitutionality of this provision, the Supreme Court of Canada pointed out that the protection against self-incrimination found in this provision "goes beyond the requirements and jurisprudence."

In addition, experience has shown that law enforcement and prosecutorial authorities have been restrained and cautious in deciding whether to use these powers, but absence of use should not be interpreted as absence of need. Rather, the authorities should be commended for accomplishing what they have accomplished without resorting to these measures.

Finally, honourable senators, another objection to these provisions was that the renewal should not have been considered by Parliament in the absence of comprehensive reform and, in particular, in the absence of the government responding to the recommendations of the two parliamentary committees that reviewed the Anti-terrorism Act.

The subcommittee of the House of Commons made recommendations concerning the investigative hearing and the recognizance with conditions in an interim report in October of 2006.

The date for the sunset of these provisions was March 1, 2007, just days after the release of the Senate report and weeks before the final report of the House subcommittee was issued. Thus, the government was not in a position to respond comprehensively to parliamentary recommendations on the Anti-terrorism Act and related issues before the commencement of the debate on the sunset provisions.

However, we have these parliamentary reports, and the bill responds to the recommendations of these two committees. The proposed legislation incorporates some but not all of their recommendations.

First, taking into account the recommendation of the Special Senate Committee, the annual reports of the Attorney General of Canada and the Minister of Public Safety on the use of these provisions should include the relevant minister's opinion, supported by reasons, on whether they should remain in force.

Second, taking into account the first two recommendations of the House subcommittee, the bill proposes that these provisions be in force for five years rather than the three years that the Senate committee recommended from the date that the bill comes into force, at which time they could be sunset, much like the previous legislation, or be extended for up to a further five-year period by resolution or resolutions passed by both Houses of Parliament.

Third, the bill addresses a recommendation of the House subcommittee by clarifying that section 707 of the Criminal Code, which sets out the maximum period of detention for a witness, applies to a person arrested with warrant and detained in order to ensure his or her appearance at the investigative hearing.

• (1430)

Fourth, the bill allows for a further parliamentary review of these provisions as recommended by the House of Commons Subcommittee and as suggested by the Special Senate Committee. However, the bill calls for a discretionary review, instead of a mandatory review, on the basis that Parliament should be left to decide whether such a review is necessary. We in the Senate make up our own minds whether we want to review a bill.

Fifth, this bill contains additional technical amendments that were based on some of the recommendations of the House Subcommittee.

There is an additional safeguard in this bill that was not proposed by any of these committees. In all cases, an order for an investigative hearing can be obtained only if the judge to whom an application is made is satisfied that reasonable attempts have been made to obtain information by other means. Previously, a similar but narrower provision applied only to future terrorism offences, not to past ones. Clearly, this bill does not simply reintroduce the previous provisions. It has made changes to these provisions to take into account recommendations of both parliamentary committees. However, the bill does not implement the House of Commons subcommittee's recommendation to restrict the applicability of the investigative hearing power to cases of imminent-future-terrorism offences, which they had recommended. There are sound policy reasons for this. For example, the proposed limitation would forestall entirely the possibility that the investigative hearing could be used in relation to the ongoing Air India investigation. Also, this recommendation would prevent the use of an investigative hearing to gain information about a terrorist offence after the offence had already occurred, even in the very recent past. For example, if a terrorist attack were to occur in Canada similar to the attacks in the U.K. on July 7, 2005, the police, on the day after the attack, would not be able to use this power because the attack would have taken place already.

This recommendation seems to be premised on the notion that terrorists would commit only one terrorist offence. We know better than that. After a terrorist group has committed an offence, whether participating in a training camp, fundraising or committing an act of violence, the justification for the use of an investigative hearing is even more compelling. The same person may plan a consecutive series of attacks, and the ability to hold an investigative hearing in relation to the first attack might serve to prevent subsequent attacks. The credibility of this argument is illustrated by the attack in London on July 7, 2005, and the unsuccessful attack attempted on the London bus system later that month. There can be a preventive aspect to the investigative hearing, even in relation to past terrorism offences.

Moreover, this recommendation, if implemented, would add an odd characteristic to our legal system. Consider an ongoing investigative hearing into a terrorist plot having to be halted because the plot has already been carried out, making the status of the offence under investigation not imminent but past. The terrorist would then have derailed an investigation simply by committing a further crime.

I note that the Special Senate Committee did not share the view of the House of Commons subcommittee that the application of the investigative hearing should be limited to imminent terrorism offences, despite having the benefit of the October 2006 interim report of the subcommittee in the other place when considering their recommendations. Thus, Bill S-3 on this issue adopts the view of the Special Senate Committee chaired by Senator Smith.

In conclusion, honourable senators, I emphasize that this bill should not be viewed in isolation as a stand-alone piece of proposed legislation. It is meant to be but one element of a comprehensive approach being taken by the government to address national security matters. The government has already tabled its response to the report of the House of Commons subcommittee, which formally requested a response to its report in which it sets out areas of potential law reform. The government has not yet tabled a response to the special Senate committee because it has not been formally requested to do so.

As well, the government is working on further law reform measures, including in response to recommendations made in the second part of Mr. Justice O'Connor's report. Honourable senators will understand that other legislative initiatives in development require more time before they will be ready for introduction.

As mentioned, this bill seeks to reinstate with modifications the provisions of the investigative hearing and recognizance with conditions. This would give law enforcement the necessary tools to investigate terrorism offences and to disrupt nascent terrorist activity, while ensuring respect for fundamental human rights. For the reasons set out in my remarks, I support this bill and urge all honourable senators to do the same.

On motion of Senator Tardif, debate adjourned.

[*Translation*]

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

MOTION FOR ADDRESS IN REPLY— DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

> Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Comeau, seconded by the Honourable Senator Brown:
>
> That the following Address be presented to Her Excellency the Governor General of Canada:
>
> To Her Excellency the Right Honourable Michaëlle Jean, Chancellor and Principal Companion of the Order of Canada, Chancellor and Commander of the Order of Military Merit, Chancellor and Commander of the Order of Merit of the Police Forces, Governor General and Commander-in-Chief of Canada.
>
> MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY:
>
> We, Her Majesty's most loyal and dutiful subjects, the Senate of Canada in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Excellency for the gracious Speech which Your Excellency has addressed to both Houses of Parliament.

Hon. Joan Fraser: Honourable senators, as others have done before me, I would like to begin by expressing my gratitude to Her Excellency for the Speech from the Throne she delivered. I am grateful not so much for the content of the speech, as the motion suggests, but for the gracious and elegant manner in which she delivered it.

Unfortunately, the content of the speech does not inspire such feelings of gratitude in me. In many respects, I find the speech utterly appalling. However, I will discuss only that part of the speech dealing with the Senate reforms the Prime Minister plans to reintroduce in Parliament.

The Prime Minister plans to reintroduce two bills that he introduced during the last session. This time, he will put everything in the hands of the House of Commons. I have tremendous respect for my colleagues in the other place, but I must say that they are not experts on the Senate. They do not fully understand how the Senate works, nor do they understand this institution's strengths, weaknesses and issues.

I would like to begin with senators' term of office. The Prime Minister is planning to bring back Bill S-4, as introduced in the last session, but with a few small changes. Clearly, as Talleyrand said in another context, they have learned nothing and forgotten nothing.

[*English*]

Honourable senators will recall that Bill S-4, as then written, was given profound study by two committees of this place. In particular, the second committee found that the bill was gravely flawed. Even the first committee found serious flaws in the bill as written. There were both political and constitutional problems. On the political level, senators may recall that, with the exception of the Government of Alberta, the provinces were opposed to the package proposed by the Prime Minister. The government of my province, Quebec, wrote to the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs in a long letter that repays careful study. It was an excellently reasoned letter that concluded by saying:

> The Government of Quebec, with the unanimous support of the National Assembly, therefore requests the withdrawal of Bill C-43. It also requests the suspension of proceedings on Bill S-4 so long as the federal government is planning to unilaterally transform the nature and role of the Senate.

• (1440)

One of our duties in this place is to reflect regional interests. When the government of my region makes such a learned and clear plea, I pay attention.

Senator Comeau: Seriously?

Senator Fraser: Seriously, I pay attention.

Senator Comeau: Seriously?

Senator Fraser: Indeed.

Political doubts were not the only ones; there were constitutional doubts as well. In particular, the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs heard from eminent experts who raised profound doubts about whether we have, as a Parliament, the capacity to implement unilaterally a change to the term of senators as great as is proposed by the Prime Minister.

That there is such doubt is, in itself, a serious problem. I do not know, no one in this chamber can know, what the Supreme Court of Canada would rule but we do know there is doubt. In the excellent report that the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs prepared, they said:

> The irrefutable fact . . . is that no one can say with certainty what the Court would hold the consequences to be. "Constitutional chaos" remains a serious concern.
>
> The stakes are high. This is not a situation where we can accede to the Government's wish for speedy Senate reform, and wait to find out later whether the government was right, or whether in fact the many constitutional experts who expressed concern about the constitutionality of this bill were right.

I should point out that "constitutional chaos" was not a phrase the committee invented. It comes from the eminent professor Errol Mendes, and he was warning of the chaos that could ensue if we adopted this law, the government acted on it and then the Supreme Court said, "no, you cannot do that."

One of the major problems with that bill is that it was clear to both committees that we cannot have a bill that addresses the necessary reform, necessary in my view, of senators' terms that will be appropriate for both an elected and an appointed chamber because the nature of such chambers is so different.

Both committees decided they would proceed as if the bill were suitable for reform of an appointed chamber, as the Prime Minister alleged, which is the key reason both committees proposed far longer terms than Mr. Harper does. However, he is going back to his original proposal for eight years so we are faced with the same problem all over again.

Of course, he could get around that by trying to put both term limits and elections into a single package; but no, he will not do that. He will bring back Bill C-43 in the other place. He calls it a bill for the direct consultation of voters in the selection of senators, but it is a bill about elections. It bears reading, although you may end up more confused than you were at the beginning if you do in fact read it, colleagues. I have never seen such a convoluted explanation of a voting system as that bill contains.

I understand that the object of some form of proportional representation has merit, but as I read that bill, I thought that the voters will not understand the system. Surely, the greatest merit of a first-past-the-post system is that every single voter understands it and there is no confusion in anybody's mind. I read that long, tedious passage of the Prime Minister's bill two or three times, and if there are more than 10 people in the country who understand it, I will be astonished.

I think it is a bad bill on its merits. I do not think it is appropriately done. The electors must know what they are doing even if we go to an elected Senate.

However, it is also clearly, in my view, in contempt of the Constitution. First, it changes the method of selection, which section 42 of the Constitution Act, 1982, says we cannot do unilaterally.

It also ignores various other constitutional requirements for senators. It ignores the constitutional requirement that senators reside in the province that they represent. Welcome to the era of carpetbaggers; there is nothing to stop people from Quebec running in Alberta. I do not know how the Albertans would like it, but they could do it under this act.

It ignores the constitutional age requirements; it ignores the constitutional property qualification requirements; and it utterly ignores the Quebec districts. Let me tell you, the notion of a province-wide election where the majority of voters in Quebec are electing representatives for individual districts strikes me as profoundly undemocratic. Never mind; the Prime Minister has this obsession and so he wants to barrel on with it, however bad it may be.

What is really odd is that there are, in fact, things we could do to improve this institution without going into the dreadful constitutional quagmire that Mr. Harper proposes.

I hope to speak at some other time on what I believe to be Senator Segal's ill-advised motion. For things we could do, I refer honourable senators to the interesting paper that Senator Hays produced for us last spring. It was the last part of his long and impressive legacy in this place, and it contained a number of extremely interesting proposals.

Senator Tkachuk: Much like his report.

Senator Fraser: Senator Hays knows that I do not agree with everything he proposed.

Senator Tkachuk: Of course not.

Senator Fraser: But I do agree with a number of things he has proposed and I think we could do them. Some we could do by unilateral changes to the Constitution under Section 44 within Parliament, and some we could do by changing the rules. Why do not we act on those things?

For example, we could abolish the property qualification unilaterally — the archaic, embarrassing, property qualification for senators. We could do this for every province except Quebec. I am willing to bet that if we were to open negotiations with the Province of Quebec for a bilateral amendment simply involving the property qualification, we would be able to achieve that. We may not be able to, but it would be worth a try. We could certainly get rid of it for every other senator.

We could reform our attendance rules. At the moment, senators must be absent for the whole of two sessions of Parliament — in the normal run of things, that is four years — before they lose their seat. I do not think that is a defensible rule.

We could change it and we should change it. I suggest as a starting point for discussion, that if senators are absent for the whole of one session or for the whole of one year, whichever comes first, they could lose their seat.

We could address the question — current right now — of vacancies in the Senate. We could oblige the Prime Minister to advise the Governor General to fill vacancies in this place within 180 days of their occurring.

We could address the oath of allegiance. I tend to agree that it is, again, archaic that the only oath of allegiance we take when we come here is to the Queen. The Queen is the head of state of this country and I was proud to swear allegiance to her, but we might also swear to uphold the Constitution of Canada.

• (1450)

We could contemplate the method of selection of senators without getting into constitutional amendments. We could do it by pure convention. Senator Hays suggests an appointments commission on the British model. I am not at all persuaded that that is the way to go in a chamber that has a limited membership such as ours. The British do not have limited membership in the House of Lords, and that makes an inherent difference in the dynamic of the two chambers.

However, as Senator Hays suggests, there could be a convention adopted tomorrow that after the government party has achieved a moderately comfortable majority in this chamber — say 55 per cent of the seats — future appointments to this place would be based on consultation with the Leader of the Opposition and no more than two thirds, or a 60/40 split of those of the seats to be filled after that, would go to representatives of the government. There is no need to actually change the law, I do not think, to do that.

Senator Hays also had an interesting suggestion for dispute resolution, which, as the Honourable Stéphane Dion has suggested, is one of the biggest problems we have in this place. Where we have amended a bill and the other place has refused our amendments, Senator Hays suggested a joint conference of the two chambers within 20 sitting days, to be followed by a report back to each chamber within 10 days, to be voted upon within another 20 days. If there were still no agreement, the government could reintroduce the bill. The details of that mechanism are interesting but not essential. The point is that we should address the recommendation.

The Hon. the Speaker *pro tempore***:** I am sorry to interrupt, but I must advise that the honourable senator's time has expired.

Senator Fraser: May I have leave for a very few more minutes, honourable senators?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

The Hon. the Speaker *pro tempore***:** Five minutes, Senator Fraser.

Senator Fraser: Thank you very much, honourable senators. I must say that it is delightful to see the attention being paid to this by senators opposite.

On a more minor level, we could certainly tidy up some of the language in the Constitution that affects matters, for example, such as saying a senator loses their seat if they become bankrupt or are suffering from insolvency or being a public defaulter. Senator Hays suggested deleting the references to insolvency and being a public defaulter, and that seems to me sensible. I should also really like to tidy up the language about infamous crimes and felonies, grounds for losing a seat if a senator commits an infamous crime or felony or treason. Senator Hays, who is a lawyer, unlike me, had some sensible suggestions on that ground.

Senator Hays also suggested that senators should elect our Speaker. I know there is substantial support for that. As long as we are an appointed chamber, I believe we should probably continue to have an appointed Speaker because the nature of elections is that those elected assume power. One of the most interesting features of this chamber is that our Speaker, unlike the Speaker in the other place, does not have absolute power. This chamber can vote to overturn the Speaker's rulings because that is the nature of the body that we are.

If we ever get an elected chamber — although I do not see much appetite in the public for a twin of the House of Commons — that will be the point at which we should contemplate electing our Speaker.

Finally, although I do hope to speak to this issue later, but since Senator Segal is listening so attentively, let me say that I am mystified why his proposed motion about a referendum contemplates only abolition and not reform, not either the "reforms" that his leader proposes or the other reforms that I have suggested. The only option he would offer is abolition. That seems to me to be putting several carts before a great many horses.

Therefore, honourable senators, I found the Speech from the Throne a disappointment in general and in particular on those grounds. That said, I will await with interest others' comments on other elements of it.

On motion of Senator Hubley, debate adjourned.

FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION ACT
BANK OF CANADA ACT

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. Hugh Segal moved second reading of Bill S-201, An Act to amend the Financial Administration Act and the Bank of Canada Act (quarterly financial reports).—(*Honourable Senator Segal*)

He said: Honourable senators, I have no intention of repeating the arguments I made when this bill was first introduced as Bill S-217. When it passed second reading in the previous session, it was referred to committee. I deeply appreciate the time spent by committee members from the minority and the majority who interviewed witnesses and made recommendations for change. Time ran out, just barely, and the previous bill did not get out of the committee room before prorogation. I understand their constraints. They were, after all, dealing with a government budget and other pressures, and I very much appreciate the time that they put into this bill and the opportunity to reintroduce it as Bill S-201.

The amendments made by the committee, which, it struck me, were thoughtful and well considered, have now been incorporated into the bill that is now being presented for your consideration. My arguments now are the same as they were then. The surrendering, in the 1970s, of Parliament's pre-control of government expenditure, bringing in of the deemed-to-be-reported rule where the estimates committee has spawned a backward-looking accountability process that in no way serves the Canadian taxpayer or any government's accountability at any time.

Retroactive reporting and assessing serves little purpose, provides ammunition for finger pointing and blame, and does nothing for timely corrective parliamentary action. The notion that a corporation the size of Canada's government is not able to track, in real time, its expenditures, and when necessary apply remedial action to potential spending in year, is unthinkable in the world of business. How can we promote confidence with the Canadian taxpayer and assure them that their dollars are being managed prudently if we have no controls as parliamentarians whatever while the money is actually being spent?

I made my arguments regarding this inequity in June of 2006. At that time, this chamber, in its wisdom, saw fit to refer this bill to committee, and for that I am grateful. I ask that the same consideration be given to Bill S-201, and that when a committee is formed and adopted and put into place the matter be considered on its merits at that time.

On motion of Senator Comeau, debate adjourned.

• (1500)

[*Translation*]

DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE ACCOUNTABILITY BILL

SECOND READING—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

> Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Dallaire, seconded by the Honourable Senator Moore, for second reading of Bill C-293, An Act respecting the provision of official development assistance abroad. —(*Honourable Senator Dallaire*)

Hon. Roméo Antonius Dallaire: Honourable senators, I am pleased to continue the speech I started yesterday at second reading of Bill C-293, respecting the provision of official development assistance abroad.

I would like to take this opportunity to restate the subject of my speech as part of our deliberations this afternoon to enable the new senators sitting on the committee, Senators Jaffer, Rivest and Nolin, to continue studying the issue, a process that was started in committee last session.

[*English*]

Honourable senators, the peer review report of Canada's development assistance programs that was prepared by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's Development Assistance Committee was released last Friday in a rather timely fashion. The following countries are members of the Development Assistance Committee: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the United States.

This is not an insignificant group of developed countries. They are very much committed, one would hope, to the advancement of international development and to the overall objective of the 0.7 per cent of GDP target.

The DAC produces an evaluation of the development assistance programs of each of its member countries every four or five years.

In this new report on Canada the DAC found, among other things, that Canada needed to:

> Strengthen the mandate for development cooperation and for CIDA.

The committee further outlined Canada's need to:

> Produce a policy for development cooperation which focuses on reducing poverty.

It was noted in the DAC report that Canada's ODA is adversely affected by frequent changes in political circumstances; that is, changing ministers every two weeks, or thereabouts, with their introduction of priorities. CIDA seems to be a training ground, a place of on-the-job training for junior ministers from one government to another.

How can we ensure that CIDA has a more stable mandate when ministers change that often? Is there another tool we might be able to introduce to assist both CIDA and the minister in accomplishing their missions, perhaps to offer some depth and continuity to the program? By giving CIDA a legislative mandate, this might be one methodology to achieve this end. This is exactly what Bill C-293 proposes to do and it places the focus on poverty reduction, as recommended by the DAC. This is not a major reform of CIDA; it is a refocusing or step in that direction.

Honourable senators, both the OECD and the UNDP's Millennium Project have specifically called on Canada to give its ODA the direction that this bill intends. These must be considered strong recommendations in favour of this bill. Money must be focused on poverty reduction.

Alleviating international poverty is not a partisan issue. In recent years, all parties have called for legislation making poverty reduction the goal for Official Development Assistance. When our current Prime Minister was in opposition, he called for such a bill in the context of reporting and accountability.

In addition to giving the mandate of poverty reduction to our ODA, this bill calls for greater accountability of CIDA. This is crucial to ensure that the goal of poverty reduction is met. CIDA would not be more bureaucratic. Heaven forbid; that would be disastrous. We do not want or desire to introduce methodologies to stymie the current trickle of international development by creating an increased overhead, particularly in Ottawa. On the contrary, this proposed legislation should ensure better and timelier reporting from CIDA, not more reporting.

If one reads the bill, one will see that one report per year is requested from the minister responsible for ODA in the six months following the end of the fiscal year. In addition, the bill makes provision for a statistical report on disbursement of ODA that may be submitted up to one year after the end of the fiscal year. These provisions allow plenty of time for CIDA to prepare these two reports. These are the ways to hold the minister

and the department accountable before parliamentarians. The Minister of Finance is responsible for a third report discussed in this bill, which is a report on Canada's activities at the Bretton Woods institutions.

Demanding these reports is in no way excessive or superfluous. It simply and essentially ensures that parliamentarians and the Canadian public have the tools to discuss Canada's Official Development Assistance with all the correct information. This is not available at this time.

There are points raised in regard to free markets, economic growth and poverty reduction, including their possible links. I will address arguments that favour principles of free markets and economic growth over principles of poverty reduction.

While free market principles play an undeniable role in lifting countries out of poverty, we know that without other measures such as the intervention of the state — these principles will not have a beneficial effect on all classes of society and will not automatically contribute to bettering the standards of living of the poor.

The middle class is an example. To illustrate my previous point, new research on the rise and decline of middle class around the world has proven the importance of this class to the economic prosperity and political stability of countries. While middle classes in most Western countries are in decline, such as in Canada, the U.S., and others, there is a rise in the number of people identified with the middle class in up-and-coming countries such as India and China.

American economist Steven Pressman stated in a recent paper that the single most important factor in the survival and stabilization of a middle class of beneficial size is a state policy regarding income taxes and redistribution of wealth. In a world in which the free market is the backdrop, a large middle class is created and upheld by government policies. Without these policies, most middle class people would fall into the lower-class category, while a small portion would move upward to the upper class, thereby widening the gap between the rich and the poor.

The purpose of my digression is to alert honourable senators to the importance of state policies in creating conditions for economic fairness and thus reducing poverty and creating stability in a country. It is not enough to promote economic growth. Aid must, among other things, contribute to encouraging developing countries, to put in place such policies aimed at the redistribution of the wealth. The situation in Darfur is primarily the result of that country not receiving the benefit of its own wealth. That poverty has led to friction, conflict and genocide.

Honourable senators, I believe that the goal for our Official Development Assistance should not be termed "wealth creation" or "economic development," or something to that effect. Development is not simply a matter of inducing economic growth in a country; it requires a broad range of policies and programs in order to be successful. Thus, I strongly believe that we must use the term "poverty reduction." We must not camouflage or reassess this subject. We must hit the target, the poor, in stating our goal for Official Development Assistance. That is our true aim. That will put the focus on those whom we seek to help; the poor.

If we use a term such as "wealth creation," it would not guarantee that our ODA would be used to better the living conditions of the poor; it would only guarantee that wealth would be created, with no consideration for those who would benefit. Under this type of mandate, the rich may well get richer and the poor become relatively poorer, but it could still be considered as wealth creation.

• (1510)

Wealth creation is not simply a more positive way of saying "poverty reduction." The creation of wealth sometimes leads to consequences that worsen or do not improve the standard of living of the poor. We have seen a number of imploding nations whose misdistribution of wealth and aid in the pockets of certain have, in fact, created conflict and outright humanitarian disasters.

The creation of wealth is, however, an important part of a holistic development strategy and should receive ODA funding. However, it cannot be the only goal of ODA, and it must be done in a manner consistent with the aim of poverty reduction. It must be pro-poor growth.

Let me affirm also that poverty reduction is by no means a limiting term. Programs aimed at environmental sustainability, wealth creation and education, just to name a few, can all contribute to poverty reduction, but they must be evaluated with this objective in mind: Reduce the value, reduce the scale, reduce the suffering, reduce the inequality of resources in countries and reduce the poverty.

By giving CIDA a mandate for poverty reduction and by specifically using that term, we will ensure that CIDA can use a broad range of approaches to better the living conditions of the poor and ultimately achieve the development of that nation.

New priorities also have a significant impact on ODA. While I condemn the government for seemingly dropping Africa from its priorities in favour of the Americas, and for thinking that it could not actually pursue both causes at the same time, I should like to state that this bill will not hinder a Canadian commitment to Afghanistan nor to the Americas; rather, it would ensure that the money coming out of the aid development that is spent there would actually be spent on aid and in the interest of the poor.

Obviously, money is needed to develop other areas, such as peace and security in Afghanistan and the Americas. This money should not, however, come from the budget allocated by parliamentarians for Official Development Assistance. A clear focus on poverty reduction, such as the one proposed by this bill, will ensure that aid money goes to aid in Afghanistan, in the Americas and anywhere else we provide ODA.

It is no secret that poverty and despair fuel terrorism, and it is crucial to note that, with regard to Afghanistan, this has certainly been one of the dimensions. Darfur, if we ever decide to go there, might also be an example that we might want to use. It is therefore only logical to combat terrorism, not only with force but also by striving to eradicate poverty. This bill is therefore well in tune with Canada's role and objectives in that country. If we want to do more, then you allot more, but you do not take from what you have when you can actually focus it to handle one significant dimension of the problem.

[*Translation*]

I would like to say a few words about the background or historical context of Bill C-293.

This is not the first time, honourable senators, that such a bill or such recommendations have been presented to our Parliament. In 1987, parliamentary committees and the Auditor General looked into Canadian assistance to developing countries and the role of CIDA. All these reports were clear. Starting in 1987, the goal of reducing poverty became increasingly clouded by foreign policy objectives, and these reports called for greater clarity in our official development assistance mandate.

Allow me to give a few examples. In 1987, the House of Commons Foreign Affairs Committee published a report on official development assistance in Canada, better known as the Winegard Report, since the committee was chaired by William Winegard from the Progressive Conservative Party.

This report recommended the creation of a development charter, which would form the backbone of a legislative mandate for development assistance. This charter had to contain the following principles: first, the primary purpose of development assistance is to help the poorest countries and people of the world; and second, development priorities should always take priority over foreign policy objectives.

In 1994, a report by the Special Joint Parliamentary Committee reviewing Canadian Foreign Policy recommended, once again, having legislation setting out basic principles in order to guide official development assistance and to clarify CIDA's mandate.

In 1998, the Auditor General's Report on CIDA encouraged the department to provide a better indication of the potential impact of its activity, since the reports were not submitted systematically, making it difficult to see what had truly been accomplished over the year, which led to a lack of clarity.

In 2002, the report of the OECD's Development Assistance Committee was particularly critical of Canada. I quote:

> Poverty reduction is not necessarily treated as the overarching goal.

Thus, in 2002, the OECD committee recommended that Canada make the reduction of poverty a principal objective:

> It will need to be mainstreamed throughout the agency with a clearer message of CIDA's mandate, stronger leadership and a more rigorous monitoring system.

It also indicated that the United Kingdom was a model that Canada should emulate to create legislation aimed at reducing poverty. One of the principal authors of this methodology in the United Kingdom appeared before the committee last spring.

In 2005, this legislation received multi-party support, which was manifested in an open letter sent to the Prime Minister of the time, the Right Honourable Paul Martin, on February 17, 2005. That letter, written by the Bloc Québécois, the NDP and the Conservative Party — and signed by Mr. Harper himself — called on the government of the day to implement a legislative framework that would establish poverty reduction as the ultimate goal of development assistance.

This is not ancient history. It happened just before this government took office, and it was the position taken by its current leader. We can assume that there is consistency in his philosophy regarding the matters he dealt with at the time.

[*English*]

I will come back to this letter. More specifically, the letter states — and I quote:

> The legislation should include an unequivocal statement of purpose that poverty-reduction is the central lens through which Canada's aid program should be delivered. Key elements of a legislated mandate must include mechanisms for monitoring; accountability and reporting to Parliament; and enhanced public transparency.

This is in line with what has been espoused by the current government.

> Such legislation would increase the effectiveness of Canada's aid contributions and consolidate public support for this important work.

Honourable senators, if the 1987 Winegard report was the first document that called upon our government to look into the allocation of foreign aid in developing countries, then we can affirm that this bill builds on 20 years of reflection and discussion on the importance to have a clearer aid mandate that will really be contributing to poverty reduction.

There is similar legislation in other countries stating poverty reduction as the goal of ODA already exists. We have seen that the United Kingdom is already a leader in this area, and the OECD tells us that we should learn from them.

• (1520)

The U.K. is joined by Sweden, Switzerland, Spain, Luxembourg, Denmark and Belgium to introduce legislation that limits ODA to poverty reduction purposes and to differentiate ODA from other foreign assistance envelopes. Bill C-293 builds on those models. Why adopt this bill, if that question is still on the table.

Out of nearly 200 recognized states, we are the world's ninth economic power. We are a leading middle power in the world. In addition, we are the only G8 country that can boast the success of having balanced books. We have a history of that now, and it is continuing. There is no stress on the economic depth of this nation. These facts give us a role of leadership in the world, if only we take it. However, with leadership comes responsibility, and maybe that is what we are afraid of.

Including helping the economically disadvantaged in other countries, Canada could reduce the tensions, conflict and humanitarian disasters that cost much more than investing in international development to preclude, to obviate, to prevent, in a fashion, some of these catastrophic failures by investing properly in the near term. Canada should lead by example and be a model for other countries to adopt such legislation. We should not aim

to be the last developed country to do so. It has been debated in our Parliament for the past 20 years, but there has been no real leadership to implement this proposal.

This bill has extensive grassroots support from several civil society organizations, including the Canadian Council for International Co-operation, which is comprised of more than 100 voluntary-sector organizations. At times, one might think that this support is a disadvantage. We must recognize that the NGO world is growing in power, strength and will become a significant factor in how policies and decisions will be taken in the future.

Moreover, Bill C-293 is backed by a worldwide movement that stated in 2005 that it is against world poverty. The Make Poverty History campaign has urged the Canadian Parliament for increased aid and to enact legislation to make ending poverty the exclusive goal of Canadian foreign aid.

On October 16 and 17, 2007, I joined a group on Parliament Hill demonstrating to pressure the government to make poverty history. Many members of the Liberal Party, including its leader, attended and were seen encouraging people on the Hill in an activist and peaceful way, to advance this dossier. Thousands in Canada and millions worldwide participated in this global day of action against poverty.

The number of youths committing themselves is interesting. The youth of this country are those 18 to maybe 25, if we use the United Nations definition. If one day those youth decide to coalesce and vote, they would change the nature and face of politics in this country for a long time.

To summarize, Bill C-293 strives to give a clear focus on poverty reduction to the Official Development Assistance provided by Canada, a focus that is currently lacking. It also details measures for accountability whereby the minister responsible is required to report to Parliament on the activities of CIDA. Finally, it states the minister shall consult with governments, NGOs and even with the clients.

ODA at home and around the world has been serving increasingly donor interests rather than the interests of the poor. We must flip this trend on its head and make aid about the needs of the poor. Failing to do so demonstrates that our country has not matured enough to put the neediest before, possibly, its self-interest, or the interest of those who espouse it and, what is more, does not have the integrity to allocate aid relative to its true purpose: helping the poor.

Honourable senators, no matter how much technological advancement we are able to achieve, how much our economies grow or how our work ethic permits this country to continue to be of significant influence, real progress can be measured only in terms of the progress of humanity toward justice. This justice is fundamental to our beliefs, standards, way of life, values, and a fundamental law, even, of this country, the Charter.

We can, therefore, measure our progress only by how well we treat the most vulnerable in society. In Jeffrey Sachs' book, *The End of Poverty: Economic Possibilities for Our Time*, he describes how the global community today has the ability to end global poverty, a worthwhile read.

To think that we could turn away from our ability to end global poverty is, for me, and I hope for all of us here in this chamber, an unbearable thought. Furthermore, it is unjustifiable, if not irresponsible.

Vis-à-vis these absolutely fundamental aims, Bill C-293 is a humble proposal. It is a first step. It is not a massive reform of our development policies. It is not even screaming for us to throw more cash at it. It is the first step to make what is there more responsible and more equitable to the objectives that we should maintain, and that is poverty reduction.

[*Translation*]

Honourable senators, we do not allocate enough money to international aid or international development, but Bill C-293 gives us an opportunity to make that aid more effective because its aim is to reduce poverty. We must not miss this opportunity to help the most underprivileged people in the world.

In closing, I would like to mention how hard the Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade worked on its study of the bill before the summer recess.

This is not an easy issue to deal with, especially when it comes on the heels of the report on Africa and the committee's analysis of CIDA's activities and performance in relation to Canadian funds invested in international development. But I hope that the testimony the committee has already heard will be kept and that the committee can use it in its work.

I therefore hope that the bill will be sent back to the committee as soon as possible and that it will finally have a chance to pay off, thanks to its members' decisions.

On motion of Senator Segal, debate adjourned.

[*English*]

CANADA PENSION PLAN

SENIORS' BENEFITS—INQUIRY— DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. Catherine S. Callbeck rose pursuant to notice of October 18, 2007:

> That she will call the attention of the Senate to the thousands of Canadian seniors who are not receiving the benefits from the Canada Pension Plan to which they are entitled.

She said: Honourable senators, many seniors across the country rely on the Canada Pension, Old Age Security and the Guaranteed Income Supplement for their income, according to data from Statistics Canada. In fact, these programs account for about 60 per cent of total income for Canadian seniors. Canada Pension entitlements alone make up approximately 25 per cent to 30 per cent of their overall income.

These programs have an impact on the lives of seniors. They are all tremendously worthwhile income supports, but programs such as these are only effective if seniors receive the benefits to which they are entitled.

I want to focus on one program in particular: the Canada Pension Plan, CPP. I was shocked to learn that there are Canadian seniors not receiving benefits from a plan they paid into during their working years.

• (1530)

Indeed, many thousands of Canadian seniors do not benefit from the Canadian Pension Plan simply because they do not know they are entitled to it. CPP benefits are not paid out automatically. Seniors must apply for CPP benefits, but many seniors do not realize that they are entitled and therefore they do not apply.

According to documents received through an access to information request, Human Resources and Social Development Canada estimated that in July 2005 there were as many as 70,000 people over the age of 70 who paid into the Canada Pension Plan, who might still be alive, but who were not in receipt of their CPP retirement benefits. Of those 70,000, 26,000 eligible people were already getting survivor benefits, Old Age Pension or the Guaranteed Income Supplement. So, because they are already getting a payment, the department already knows exactly where they are. It should not be difficult to get these people signed up for their Canada Pension Plan benefits.

Often, the people missing out on CPP benefits are older women who worked only a few years after the pension was introduced. Of the more than 26,000 eligible individuals that I previously mentioned, more than 22,000 are women. They have all contributed to the Canada Pension Plan and meet the criteria for receiving benefits, but, for one reason or another, they have not applied.

In addition to regular CPP benefits, an unknown number of Canadians, mostly women in this case as well, may also be missing out on CPP survivor benefits. These benefits include a death benefit of a maximum of $2,500, plus a monthly pension paid out to a person who at the time of death is the legal spouse or common law partner of the deceased CPP contributor. Although the benefit exists, many Canadians just do not know that CPP will pay benefits to widows or widowers if their spouse has paid into the Canada Pension Plan.

This lack of knowledge can translate into many seniors doing without. Think about it this way: Even though most Canadians know about the Canada Pension Plan, tens of thousands still do not know they are entitled to benefits and they do not apply. Even fewer Canadians know about CPP survivor benefits, so it is very possible that many more seniors are missing out on these benefits as well.

These problems are further compounded by the plan's retroactivity provisions that come into effect when Canadians apply late for their benefits. Generally, when seniors apply late, the federal government will only pay one year of retroactive benefits — that is, the current month in which the first payment is made, plus the previous 11 months. They cannot receive more than 12 months' worth of retroactive payments, unless they were given erroneous advice by federal officials or because benefits were not paid due to an administrative error. In some cases, this policy can mean a loss of many years' worth of benefits — benefits for which seniors paid with their contributions.

What is essentially a policy issue is made all the more real when you see how an individual is affected. I should like to share one woman's story with you. Her name is Ernestine. She did not apply for her CPP retirement benefits until the age of 91, when her son discovered that she was entitled to Canada pension benefits. When Ernestine applied for her OAS, she could have been told of her CPP benefits, but no one checked to see if she was eligible. According to officials, they assumed she would not have worked because of her age and gender. She had applied for CPP survivor benefits when her spouse died, and again could have been told of her own CPP, but she was not. Because she did not know about her entitlements, Ernestine did not apply for her Canada pension. Ernestine lost out on 26 years of benefits — approximately $65,000.

As you can see, the limit on retroactive payments has a serious effect on seniors such as Ernestine. It is all the more disconcerting when we consider that retroactivity provisions are not even consistent with other federal contribution-based pension plans in this country. In fact, even the Quebec Pension Plan, which is the equivalent of the CPP in the Province of Quebec, has a retroactivity period of 60 months. It is difficult to believe that these two sister programs have such unequal retroactivity provisions, but they do.

The public service superannuation, which is the pension plan for federal employees, has no retroactivity limits at all. Individuals can claim all of their pension benefits retroactively at any time. Even if an individual is deceased, the pension can be claimed by the estate or through inheritance.

Despite these problems, however, Canadians do have much to be proud of in reducing the poverty rate for seniors. In one generation, seniors have gone from having a poverty rate that was extremely high to one that is below the rate of other Canadians.

However, while there has been much progress, we need to acknowledge that more needs to be done to ensure that seniors are utilizing the support programs that have been put in place. It is not acceptable that seniors who are not getting the benefits to which they are entitled can be in dire circumstances.

In order to think about how we can improve the situation, it is important to look at the current policies of the federal government on advising Canadians of their CPP entitlements.

Application forms are mailed to all Canadians regardless of pension eligibility when they reach 64 years of age. General information on the CPP is also included to OAS recipients with their T4 slip.

The federal government makes general information available about pension benefits through various sources: the Service Canada website; toll-free call centres; the *Guide to Government of Canada Services for Seniors*; and at in-person Service Canada centres. Service Canada is also engaged in regional outreach activities such as setting up booths at trade fairs, advertising in the media, and making presentations to clients and potential clients.

• (1540)

Human Resources and Social Development Canada also has a policy for mailing statements of contributions to clients who specifically ask for them. These statements show their earnings,

contributions and estimates for benefits. However, statements may also be mailed in a targeted manner, generally by age group. For example, last year HRSDC was engaged in a targeted mailing to Canadians over the age of 70 who were eligible for CPP. They sent these seniors a letter explaining their status and an application to apply. Out of the more than 20,000 letters mailed, only 1,877 applications were returned. Less than 10 per cent of seniors applied for the CPP that they should be getting. It is clear that a letter is not sufficient, and that the federal government needs to find more effective ways to reach out to seniors.

As for the survivor benefit, the department relies mainly on funeral service providers to inform families about benefits and provide application forms. There again, as with CPP benefits, information can be found on the Service Canada website; by calling the CPP toll-free call centres; and in the *Guide to Government of Canada Services for Seniors*.

While the federal government is making some inroads, it is evident that more can be done by looking at what is happening in the province of Quebec. I found it very interesting to learn that virtually all eligible seniors are registered in Quebec for the Quebec Pension Plan. This is because the Quebec government has taken it upon themselves to seek out and register all seniors who should be receiving benefits. I am told that Quebec officials will even phone and knock on doors to find seniors who should be getting their retirement benefits. Even better, they have integrated computer files across government programs, making it easier to identify seniors who are missing out and to sign them up.

Honourable senators, it is clear that there are still significant problems in ensuring that all our seniors receive their benefits.

Some progress has been made to assist Canadian seniors. As honourable senators know, Senator Downe has been a strong advocate for eligible low-income seniors who have not been receiving the Guaranteed Income Supplement. He introduced an inquiry on this subject in 2004, and some of us spoke during that debate. Senator Downe has been pushing for changes ever since, and some results have been seen.

In addition, Bill C-36 received Royal Assent in May of this year. Among other things, this legislation will simplify the application process so that seniors can apply for their Guaranteed Income Supplement when they apply for Old Age Security.

Honourable senators, this is all good news. However, we need to do more to ensure that seniors receive the benefits to which they are entitled. I have written to the Honourable Monte Solberg, Minister of Human Resources and Social Development, to outline my concerns and to urge him to work quickly to find solutions to these problems. I also believe that the Standing Senate Committee on National Finance would be well placed to study this most pressing issue in the context of its normal examination of departmental activities through the estimates process. I suggest that the committee consider examining this issue with a view to bringing forth recommendations on how the government could be more proactive in its outreach activities, and how it could address retroactivity limits for those seniors who apply late for benefits.

In the end, the federal government must work much harder to reach out and solve these problems. The Canada Pension Plan contributors paid into the program. It is simply not acceptable that there are seniors living in this country who are not receiving benefits to which they are entitled. We must do better.

On motion of Senator Robichaud, debate adjourned.

[*Translation*]

ADJOURNMENT

Leave having been given to revert to Government Notices of Motions:

Hon. Gerald J. Comeau (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, with leave of the Senate and notwithstanding rule 58(1)(h), I move:

> That when the Senate adjourns today, it do stand adjourned until Tuesday, October 30, 2007, at 2 p.m.

The Hon. the Speaker *pro tempore***:** Is leave granted, honourable senators?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

The Senate adjourned until Tuesday, October 30, 2007, at 2 p.m.

THE SENATE OF CANADA
PROGRESS OF LEGISLATION

(*indicates the status of a bill by showing the date on which each stage has been* ***completed***)

(2nd Session, 39th Parliament)

Thursday, October 25, 2007

(**Where royal assent is signified by written declaration, the Act is deemed to be assented to on the day on which the two Houses of Parliament have been notified of the declaration.*)

GOVERNMENT BILLS (SENATE)

No.	Title	1st	2nd	Committee	Report	Amend	3rd	R.A.	Chap.
S-2	An Act to amend the Canada-United States Tax Convention Act, 1984	07/10/18							
S-3	An Act to amend the Criminal Code (investigative hearing and recognizance with conditions)	07/10/23							

GOVERNMENT BILLS (HOUSE OF COMMONS)

No.	Title	1st	2nd	Committee	Report	Amend	3rd	R.A.	Chap.

COMMONS PUBLIC BILLS

No.	Title	1st	2nd	Committee	Report	Amend	3rd	R.A.	Chap.
C-280	An Act to Amend the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act (coming into force of sections 110, 111 and 171)	07/10/17							
C-292	An Act to implement the Kelowna Accord	07/10/17							
C-293	An Act respecting the provision of official development assistance abroad	07/10/17							
C-299	An Act to amend the Criminal Code (identification information obtained by fraud or false pretence)	07/10/17							

SENATE PUBLIC BILLS

No.	Title	1st	2nd	Committee	Report	Amend	3rd	R.A.	Chap.
S-201	An Act to amend the Financial Administration Act and the Bank of Canada Act (quarterly financial reports) (Sen. Segal)	07/10/17							
S-202	An Act to amend certain Acts to provide job protection for members of the reserve force (Sen. Segal)	07/10/17							

No.	Title	1st	2nd	Committee	Report	Amend	3rd	R.A.	Chap.
S-203	An Act to amend the Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) (Sen. Bryden)	07/10/17							
S-204	An Act respecting a National Philanthropy Day (Sen. Grafstein)	07/10/17							
S-205	An Act to amend the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act (student loans) (Sen. Goldstein)	07/10/17							
S-206	An Act to amend the Food and Drugs Act (clean drinking water) (Sen. Grafstein)	07/10/17							
S-207	An Act to repeal legislation that has not come into force within ten years of receiving royal assent (Sen. Banks)	07/10/17							
S-208	An Act to require the Minister of the Environment to establish, in co-operation with the provinces, an agency with the power to identify and protect Canada's watersheds that will constitute sources of drinking water in the future (Sen. Grafstein)	07/10/17							
S-209	An Act to amend the Criminal Code (protection of children) (Sen. Hervieux-Payette, P.C.)	07/10/17							
S-210	An Act to amend the Criminal Code (suicide bombings) (Sen. Grafstein)	07/10/17							
S-211	An Act to regulate securities and to provide for a single securities commission for Canada (Sen. Grafstein)	07/10/17							
S-212	An Act to amend the Parliamentary Employment and Staff Relations Act (Sen. Joyal, P.C.)	07/10/18							
S-213	An Act to amend the Criminal Code (lottery schemes) (Sen. Lapointe)	07/10/23							
S-214	An Act to amend the Income Tax Act and the Excise Tax Act (tax relief for Nunavik) (Sen. Watt)	07/10/24							

PRIVATE BILLS

No.	Title	1st	2nd	Committee	Report	Amend	3rd	R.A.	Chap.

CONTENTS

Thursday, October 25, 2007

PAGE

SENATORS' STATEMENTS

Kyoto Protocol
Hon. David Tkachuk 87

Canadian Federation of Students
Meetings with Parliamentarians.
Hon. Catherine S. Callbeck 87
Hon. Hugh Segal 87

Health
Government Response to Social Affairs, Science and Technology Committee Report on Funding for Treatment of Autism.
Hon. Jim Munson 88

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Canadian Position with Respect to the Maritime Labour Convention 2006
Tabled.
Hon. Gerald J. Comeau 88

QUESTION PERIOD

The Honourable Michael Fortier
Alleged Conflict of Interest.
Hon. Grant Mitchell. 88
Hon. Marjory LeBreton 89
Hon. Yoine Goldstein. 89

PAGE

Access to Information
Disclosure and Response to Requests.
Hon. Jim Munson 89
Hon. Marjory LeBreton 90
Proposed Public Interest Override.
Hon. Joan Fraser 90
Hon. Marjory LeBreton 90
Fulfillment of Campaign Promises.
Hon. Lorna Milne 90
Hon. Marjory LeBreton 91

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Criminal Code (Bill S-3)
Bill to Amend—Second Reading—Debate Adjourned.
Hon. David Tkachuk 91

Speech from the Throne
Motion for Address in Reply—Debate Continued.
Hon. Joan Fraser 95

Financial Administration Act
Bank of Canada Act (Bill S-201)
Bill to Amend—Second Reading—Debate Adjourned.
Hon. Hugh Segal 97

Development Assistance Accountability Bill (Bill C-293)
Second Reading—Debate Continued.
Hon. Roméo Antonius Dallaire 98

Canada Pension Plan
Seniors' Benefits—Inquiry—Debate Adjourned.
Hon. Catherine S. Callbeck 101

Adjournment
Hon. Gerald J. Comeau 103

Progress of Legislation i

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

Available from PWGSC – Publishing and Depository Services
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5