



CANADA

Debates of the Senate

1st SESSION

•

39th PARLIAMENT

•

VOLUME 143

•

NUMBER 31

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Wednesday, September 27, 2006



THE HONOURABLE NOËL A. KINSELLA
SPEAKER

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

Wednesday, September 27, 2006

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

Prayers.

SENATORS' STATEMENTS

THE HONOURABLE MADELEINE PLAMONDON

TRIBUTE

Hon. Francis William Mahovlich: Honourable senators, I would like to thank my fellow senators on all sides of this chamber who took the time to write and phone me during my recent medical challenges. Your encouragement helped my speedy recovery. A word of advice, if I may: After 68 years, avoid all ladders.

I would like to take a moment to speak about our former colleague, Senator Madeleine Plamondon. Of all the questions that have been brought up, one that stood out in my mind was presented by Senator Plamondon. She asked: What are our priorities in this Senate?

My ears perked up. I am not sure if she received the correct answer, but since Biblical times, priorities have been the fishes and the loaves, which are the committees on fisheries and agriculture.

I hope she can go home with that answer.

THE LATE HONOURABLE J. MICHAEL FORRESTALL

Hon. Terry Stratton (Acting Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I rise today in honour of our friend and former colleague, Michael Forrestall, a man from Deep Brook, a small town in Nova Scotia, who went on to do great things for this nation.

He started out as a journalist for *The Chronicle Herald* in Halifax, but soon switched to a career in politics. In 1965, at the age of 33, he ran in and won the federal riding of Halifax, beginning a career that lasted until he died last June.

He won the same seat seven times, a remarkable accomplishment by any measure. Within two years of the 1988 election, the only one he ever lost, Michael Forrestall earned the title of "senator" when he was appointed to this chamber by the Right Honourable Brian Mulroney.

In all, Senator Forrestall served the people of Canada as a parliamentarian for 38 years, eight months and 24 days. If he were with us, he would have celebrated 39 years on the Hill on this day.

Soon after Senator Forrestall was elected in the other place, he was given the position of defence critic for the Progressive Conservative opposition, the job he held until 1979. He was a voice for the veterans of Canada's Merchant Navy, and he played a key role in the recognition of the Merchant Navy war veterans of the Second World War. They were the forgotten arm of the

Canadian Forces, often made up of boys too young to enlist. Their sacrifice kept the Atlantic lifeline intact, contributing significantly to the allied victory.

[Translation]

As you know, Senator Forrestall took a special interest in health- and heritage-related issues. He introduced a private bill to develop a national cancer research strategy. He also worked for the protection and maintenance of heritage lighthouses.

[English]

Senator Forrestall was someone who toiled unceasingly for the people of Halifax-Dartmouth and, indeed, for all the people of Canada. He truly died in the harness.

At the time of his death, he was Deputy Chair of the Standing Senate Committee on National Security and Defence, a member of the Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs and a member of the Interim Committee of Parliamentarians on National Security.

On May 8, a month before he died, Senator Forrestall was at the Standing Senate Committee on National Security and Defence, where, always concerned about ensuring there was adequate support for the needs of the Canadian Forces, he suggested to the Minister of Defence:

We would encourage you to increase the budget should it be necessary.

We will miss his booming voice, cutting questions and the sight of this powerful man striding through the halls of this building, but our loss cannot compare with that felt by his family — his children, and his wife, Marilyn — nor that felt by those who worked closest with him, Kathryn Meerberg and Joe Varner.

God bless.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

• (1340)

WORKSHOP ON CHILD SOLDIERS

Hon. Rod A. A. Zimmer: Honourable senators, I rise today to applaud the success of a workshop entitled "Expanding the Dialogue: Preventing the Use of Children as Soldiers," which took place this year in Winnipeg, from August 28 to 30. The workshop was part of a long-term project undertaken by our honourable colleague Senator Dallaire in partnership with organizations such as UNICEF Canada, the University of Winnipeg and Search for Common Ground. I was proud to be part of this workshop because my cause in the Senate is youth.

About 300,000 children are currently serving as child soldiers around the world, especially in regions with an enshrined governance crisis and easy access to arms. In countries such as Sri Lanka, Sierra Leone and Burundi, children are recruited as scouts, spies, sentries, bush wives, armed members of rebel groups and suicide bombers. Some boys and girls are snatched

from their families through force, as in the case of the “one child per family” rule in parts of northern and eastern Sri Lanka and the abduction of children from schools in Burundi. Others are lured with the promise of education or celebrated martyrdom. Families most vulnerable to losing children to combat are those who live in poverty and unstable security conditions.

Programs undertaken by organizations such as UNICEF to disarm, demobilize, rehabilitate and reintegrate child combatants have met with various degrees of success. In addition to increasing access to such programs, it is widely accepted that, in order to prevent recruitment in the first place, poverty and systematic human rights abuses must be addressed and children must be given alternatives to violence.

To address these complex issues, the three-day workshop in August brought together representatives from various stakeholder groups, including former child soldiers and peace and security agencies. Discussions led to the definition of three areas of interest which will be expanded upon in the next phase of the project, including the engagement of youth in peace building; determining the full effect of security on children and then placing them at the centre of a security paradigm, and involving all stakeholders in the development of solutions.

With these important factors, in mind, the next two phases will involve developing and implementing creative tools to use in addressing a variety of scenarios in countries in which children are being recruited as soldiers.

There is no better way for me to articulate the spirit of this project than to read a few lines from a poem written by a youth participant from Uganda:

Dear nation, the international community,
Parents, brothers, sisters,
Let us wake up,
And we struggle for peace together,
For the new generation.
And to stop recruiting children,
In armed forces.

Thank you for your attention, honourable senators. In conclusion, I wish to commend the work of Senator Dallaire and his partners in shedding light on this deeply disturbing issue and developing new approaches to eliminating the use of child soldiers. Some call him “General Dallaire” and some call him “Senator Dallaire”; I call him “Saint Dallaire.”

CITIZENSHIP STATUS OF THE DALAI LAMA

Hon. Consiglio Di Nino: Honourable senators, on Saturday, September 9, 2006, in Vancouver, the Honourable Monte Solberg, the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, awarded His Holiness the Dalai Lama honorary Canadian citizenship. On behalf of the Tibetan-Canadian communities and all peace loving people, I express my gratitude for the support of the Senate of Canada in passing the resolution to grant His Holiness this honour. I am sure I speak on behalf of all colleagues in congratulating His Holiness on receiving this unique recognition and in urging him to continue his work as a world leader for peace, compassion and mutual understanding.

[Senator Zimmer]

[Translation]

THE HONOURABLE JEAN-ROBERT GAUTHIER

CONGRATULATIONS ON RECEIVING ORDER OF CANADA

Hon. Claudette Tardif: Honourable senators, it gives me great pleasure to announce that one of our former colleagues and a strong advocate for Canada's Francophonie, linguistic duality and francophone minority communities, the Honourable Jean-Robert Gauthier, will soon be awarded the Order of Canada in recognition of his many years of public service.

He began his political career as a school board trustee and worked to set up homogeneous French-language elementary and secondary schools. As with many other advocates and activists for francophone minority communities, his political commitment and involvement stem from a real desire to improve the quality of the French-language education that not only his own children, but all francophone children and youth receive.

His contribution to education was recognized recently when the Conseil des écoles catholiques de langue française du Centre-Est inaugurated the Jean-Robert Gauthier Catholic Elementary School in an Ottawa suburb.

Throughout his lengthy political career, Jean-Robert Gauthier has worked to promote the French fact across Canada and linguistic duality in Canadian society.

Even at the start of his career in Parliament, he worked tirelessly to amend the Official Languages Act through his Bill S-3. Francophone communities have always had a staunch ally in Jean-Robert Gauthier.

Honourable senators, I invite you to join me in congratulating our former colleague on his appointment to the Order of Canada in honour of his public work.

• (1345)

[English]

THE LATE HONOURABLE EDWIN A. GOODMAN, O.C., P.C.

Hon. Hugh Segal: Honourable senators, on August 23, 2006, Canada lost a distinguished son and patriot. In fact, if one were to look for two words that expressed, for more than 60 years, soldier, nationalist, partisan, leader, philanthropist and advocate, those two words would be Eddie Goodman. I know that at his funeral his wife, Joan Thompson, and daughter, Diane, were very much appreciative of the presence of Senator Smith, Senator Grafstein and Senator Di Nino from this chamber to express their condolences on that occasion.

Eddie was a giant in all aspects of his life. He was a decorated war hero, a respected corporate lawyer, a sought-after political strategist, confidant and adviser. He never did anything halfway. He was a risk taker and an adventurer. His boundless energy was legendary and contagious. Anyone involved in one of Eddie's projects, such as the Committee for an Independent Canada, or fundraising efforts

for the National Ballet of Canada, was expected to bring to it the same determination and thoughtfulness that Eddie demonstrated. He expected nothing less and gave nothing less.

In war, after his tank was shot out from under him on the beaches of Normandy, and his wounds required him to be shipped to hospital in the U.K, he snuck out of hospital to rejoin his squadron to fight in the battle for the liberation of France. The news of Eddie's passing understates how much we have lost. His enthusiasm fuelled generations with courage and achievement. To have been a friend is to have had the greatest gift ever bestowed outside one's own kith and kin. What we have lost is beyond description.

When named to the Privy Council, on the recommendation of former Prime Minister Mulroney, and as a member of the Security Intelligence Review Committee, he acquired the honorific, "Honourable," before his name. No Canadian merited that designation any more than Eddie Goodman. None of his generation created more incentive for others to follow and earn that same designation.

Hon. Jeremiah S. Grafstein: Honourable senators, I rise to add my words of condolence to the Goodman family. Eddie Goodman and I were great friends and political contestants for the heart of Toronto and Ontario. Sometimes he won and many times I won, but we were always friends.

I would like to tell a story to elucidate our relationship. He was the chairman of a Conservative convention when Mr. Diefenbaker ran again in 1966-67 for the leadership. Mr. Diefenbaker became a mentor of mine when I first spoke to him upon my arrival here in 1965. He called me to his office and told me about the "dos and don'ts" of Parliament, and we became fast friends, despite the fact that in the Liberal Party he was considered an ogre. At that convention, I called his office for an observer pass, and he sent me two seats, insisting that I bring my wife. We sat behind Mr. Diefenbaker at that convention. Eddie Goodman was the chairman, but he and Mr. Diefenbaker were on the outs and, therefore, not on good speaking terms. Eddie walked down the aisle and, when he saw me sitting behind Mr. Diefenbaker, said, "What are you doing here?" I turned and pointed to "The Chief," who turned around and said, "He's with me." Goodman replied, "Grafstein, you're impossible."

I want to wish Eddie's family all the best. He was a great Canadian and he will be sorely missed, not only by his friends, but also by those who were his honourable opponents.

• (1350)

VISITORS IN THE GALLERY

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I would like to draw your attention to the presence in the gallery of Mr. Michael Pownall, Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Legislation in the British House of Lords, and Dr. Isolde Victory, Head of Research Services at the House of Lords Library.

On behalf of all senators, I welcome you to the Senate of Canada.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

[Translation]

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT TABLED

Hon. Terry Stratton (Acting Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the certificate of appointment for the position of Commissioner of Official Languages.

[English]

INDIAN SPECIFIC CLAIMS COMMISSION

2004-05 ANNUAL REPORT TABLED

Hon. Terry Stratton (Acting Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the Indian Specific Claims Commission's 2004-05 annual report.

HAMID KARZAI PRESIDENT OF THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF AFGHANISTAN

NOTICE TO APPEND ADDRESS TO MEMBERS OF THE SENATE AND THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Hon. Terry Stratton (Acting Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I rise to give notice to append the address of His Excellency Hamid Karzai, President of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, to members of both Houses of Parliament, delivered September 22, 2006, together with the introductory speech by the Right Honourable the Prime Minister of Canada and the speeches delivered by the Speaker of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Commons to the *Debates of the Senate* and to form a part of the permanent record of this house.

BANKING, TRADE AND COMMERCE

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE TO EXTEND DATE OF FINAL REPORT ON STUDY OF PROCEEDS OF CRIME (MONEY LAUNDERING) AND TERRORIST FINANCING ACT

Hon. Jeremiah S. Grafstein: Honourable senators, I give notice that, at the next sitting of the Senate, I will move:

That, notwithstanding the Order of the Senate adopted Tuesday, May 16, 2006, the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce, which was authorized to

undertake a review of the *Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Act*, be empowered to extend the date of presenting its final report from September 28, 2006 to October 5, 2006; and

That the Committee retain until October 31, 2006 all powers necessary to publicize its findings.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE TO EXTEND DATE OF FINAL REPORT ON STUDY OF MATTERS RELATING TO AFRICA

Hon. Hugh Segal: Honourable senators, I give notice that, at the next sitting of the Senate, I shall move:

That, notwithstanding the Order of the Senate adopted on Tuesday, May 9, 2006, the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, which was authorized to examine and report on issues dealing with the development and security challenges facing Africa; the response of the international community to enhance that continent's development and political stability; Canadian foreign policy as it relates to Africa; and other related matters, be empowered to extend the date of presenting its final report from October 31, 2006 to December 22, 2006; and

That the Committee retain until January 31, 2007 all powers necessary to publicize its findings.

• (1355)

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE TO EXTEND DATE OF FINAL REPORT ON STUDY OF SOFTWOOD LUMBER AGREEMENT

Hon. Hugh Segal: Honourable senators, I give notice that, at the next sitting of the Senate, I shall move:

That, notwithstanding the Order of the Senate adopted on Wednesday, June 28, 2006, the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, which was authorized to study and report on the Canada-United States agreement on softwood lumber, be empowered to extend the date of presenting its final report from October 2, 2006 to November 30, 2006.

RULES, PROCEDURES AND THE RIGHTS OF PARLIAMENT

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE TO EXAMINE NAME CHANGE OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE TO INCLUDE INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Hon. Hugh Segal: Honourable senators, I give notice that, at the next sitting of the Senate, I shall move:

That the Standing Committee on Rules, Procedures and the Rights of Parliament be authorized to examine and report on the following:

That rule 86(1)(h) of the *Rules of the Senate* be amended to read:

“The Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade, composed of twelve members, four of whom shall constitute a quorum, to which shall be referred, if there is a motion to that effect, bills, messages, petitions, inquiries, papers and other matters relating to foreign and Commonwealth relations generally, including:

- (i) treaties and international agreements;
- (ii) external trade;
- (iii) foreign aid;
- (iv) territorial and offshore matters.”; and

That the Committee submit its final report no later than December 22, 2006.

QUESTION PERIOD

FINANCE

SPENDING CUTS TO COURT CHALLENGES PROGRAM

Hon. Serge Joyal: Honourable senators, my question is for the Leader of the Government in the Senate.

Yesterday, one of our colleagues in this place used a particular expression when he was stunned by the government's decision to cut the Court Challenges Program.

At first I did not believe the government had taken this decision. If there is an issue that the Senate is sensitive to, it is the issue of minority rights, especially of linguistic minority rights, whether English or French. To me, it is an important decision when the government decides to do away with such a small program in terms of money; namely, \$2.8 million per year.

Can the Leader of the Government in the Senate tell us the criteria that the government applied, since she mentioned that she was part of the exercise? What criteria were applied by the government to conclude that the program was useless?

Hon. Marjory LeBreton (Leader of the Government): I thank the honourable senator for his question. There was a significant amount of discussion about many programs existing in the government and where we might find savings on behalf of the taxpayer. There is no question that the Court Challenges Program has handled some interesting files, but it was generally felt that if Parliament did its work and properly submitted legislation and laws, a program for groups to challenge laws passed by this place was something whose time had come.

Even the previous Mulroney government there was much discussion about the Court Challenges Program. It was a decision of the current government to cut the Court Challenges Program as part of its savings. If the honourable senator were to ask me what category it fell within, I would say it probably falls into the efficiency category.

Senator Joyal: I have a list of all the cuts. Canadian Heritage operating program efficiencies: \$1.1 million is eliminated.

• (1400)

I understand that the government wants to review administrative efficiencies, something which I think is a fair process. It is fair for the government to do that kind of exercise. However, when it comes to evaluating a program that deals with minority rights, a further step must be taken.

The honourable leader has made mention of the first time the Court Challenges Program was eliminated in 1992. At that time, I believe she was a member of the previous government. Was it eliminated at that time on the basis that those court challenges proved to be futile and a loss of time for the courts; or did they provide opportunity to get from the courts decisions in relation to section 23 of the Charter, which section concerns education rights? Without those court challenges, many francophone communities across Canada would not now have access to education in their mother tongue. Without those challenges, they would not have the right to manage their own schools, something for which former Senator Gauthier fought all his life. He even voted against the Charter because he thought section 23 should contain that right.

I do not understand how the government can conclude that it should chop the program without reviewing the court decisions that were rendered from 1983 to 1992 and from 1993 to today. This is a strategic program that goes to the essence of what Canada stands for. We are not talking here about an administrative decision. We are talking about something that goes to the heart of this country, that is, the recognition of both languages, whether it be the education system or the administration of government.

It seems to me there is a sensitivity here that does not exist with regard to the other decisions of the government. I am trying to understand what kind of sensitivity the government leader expressed to her colleagues on that committee to draw their attention to the specific nature of this program and its benefits for English-speaking Quebecers, French-speaking Ontarians or even the people of Ottawa. From the government's answers I do not understand the crux of the decision. What was the determining factor that brought about this conclusion?

Senator LeBreton: I thank the Honourable Senator Joyal for his question.

Am I to take it, then, that Senator Joyal agrees with all the other spending announcements that we made? He seems to be referring only to the Court Challenges Program.

This was a decision of cabinet and officials in the various departments who were assisting us. In no way is any organization prevented from bringing challenges to the courts. They have that constitutional right.

After much discussion, first in our committee and then collectively in cabinet and with the officials advising us, we felt that this was a decision that we could make in the name of savings for the government.

People may agree or disagree with it, but that is the decision we made. I can say quite categorically that we will abide by and live with our decisions.

Senator Joyal: I want to draw the attention of the Leader of the Government to the fact that this house is the house of sober second thought. Through an administrative exercise that has its merits, decisions sometimes are taken without proper attention being paid to their fallout.

I plead with the Leader of the Government to reconsider this decision on the basis of the essential nature of our country. We are not talking here about any kind of rights. We are talking here about the minority rights that are enshrined in the Constitution, and for centuries minorities have been fighting to have their rights recognized. One purpose of the Charter is a reparative objective. It is the nature of things to right wrongs. This program has that merit.

• (1405)

I would feel uneasy if we voted unanimously to amend the Official Languages Act through Bill S-3, as the honourable leader at the time enthusiastically did. I remember it well.

We must now say to the minorities, "We are sorry, guys, you are a minority. Fight the majority if you want to, but the government will cross its arms and wait until you win in court. If you are able to raise money by selling chocolate bars at the church exit on Sunday morning and take it to the Supreme Court, then we will recognize your rights."

I thought we had matured in this country. I thought that the rights enshrined in the Charter are as much the concern of the federal government as they are of the provincial government.

I ask if the Leader of the Government in the Senate will take that issue back to her colleagues. She may consider speaking with her seatmate, Senator Comeau. Without this program, the right to schools for the Acadians in Nova Scotia and the right to a cultural centre for the Acadians in Summerside, Prince Edward Island would not have been realized. This is the reality.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

Senator Joyal: I invite the honourable leader to a dispassionate discussion. Maybe I get too passionate for dispassionate discussions in this chamber. I ask her to have sober discussion with her colleagues from the minorities and those senators on the opposite side who receive the benefit of this program in their communities.

Senator Stratton accomplished an objective whereby a community in Manitoba was able to have the management of their schools recognized. This is a sensitive issue.

I ask all honourable senators on the other side to discuss this issue again, review it, and come back to us with a clearer set of criteria as to why this program should be eliminated.

Senator LeBreton: I thank the honourable senator for his comments. I do not think anyone on either side of this chamber would, in any way, take away from the importance of supporting our two official languages. I can go back to Mr. Diefenbaker's time and reiterate some of the things he tried to do.

I do not think for a moment that anyone in this chamber of sober second thought would ever suggest that we are saying to minority language groups they should sell chocolate bars to raise money to challenge a particular law.

I will simply say that the government, after much deliberation, made the decisions that we announced on Monday. As a matter of fact, I am pleased to see they have been generally well received —

Some Hon. Senators: Oh, oh!

Senator LeBreton: — in the country at large, including in an editorial of *The Globe and Mail*.

Some Hon. Senators: Oh, oh!

Senator LeBreton: It is dangerous for me to quote from *The Globe and Mail*.

Senator Fox: An opposition newspaper.

Senator LeBreton: In any event, I appreciate the passion with which the honourable senator speaks on this issue. People have varying views on the Court Challenges Program. There is no question that there have been cases where minority language rights were challenged, but they have been settled.

There have been many other occasions where the Court Challenges Program was used for purposes that dragged on when the solution would have been to enact proper laws in the first place.

• (1410)

Senator Fox: Change the Constitution.

Senator Joyal: As a final question, the minister indicates that some of the cuts have been well received, according to the editorial in *The Globe and Mail*. Perhaps the leader could look into another quote from *Le Droit*, a newspaper in the other official language, whereby the president of la Fédération des communautés francophones et acadiennes du Canada seeks to meet with the honourable minister to try to draw attention to this subject and to evaluate the impact of this decision by the government. It might be well received by the majority, but she should seek the opinion of the minorities, because minorities are the ones who have something at stake here. If one tries to get the opinion of the majority on the rights of the minority, one will not get what one needs.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Senator Joyal: In our process of sober second thought, the honourable government leader should meet with the representatives of the Acadian and francophone minorities, as well as anglophone minorities in Quebec. She should meet with them to evaluate the impact of her decision and the government's decision generally, and to look at criteria to add to the program

and to improve the efficiency of it. Everyone has a reasonable approach to those issues, as the honourable leader has mentioned. To simply chop the program on the basis of the argument that we essentially want to have efficiency, "efficiency" means to abandon the program, does not seem to be a reasonable decision.

Senator LeBreton: I thank Senator Joyal for his comments. However, I do not think anyone on this side needs any lessons about the treatment of minorities. My own husband traces his origins back to the Acadian community in New Brunswick. Prime Minister Mulroney's first act when he became leader of the party was to take a courageous stand on Manitoba languages. We do not need to take any lessons on the importance of minority rights.

Senator Fox: We want Mulroney back!

An Hon. Senator: Remember the Meech Lake Accord?

Senator LeBreton: I remember the Meech Lake Accord, of course. We do not need to take any lessons on who is more credible on the issue of minority languages, or minorities, period. I will simply say to the honourable senator that I have listened to his arguments. He is certainly entitled to his strong views and, in a democracy, we are entitled to ours as well.

SPENDING CUTS TO NATIONAL LITERACY SECRETARIAT

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn: Honourable senators, I raised some questions yesterday about the \$17.7 million in cuts to the federal government support of the literacy community in Canada. It appears that there is a mandate to concentrate on national and federal programs. Naturally, this change has caused a concerned reaction from the provincial organizations that have carried the banner for this extremely difficult issue, doing outstanding work on the ground, in urban and rural communities throughout the country, to help teach people of all ages who have fallen through the cracks through no fault of their own.

Could the Leader of the Government explain to us why the new cabinet feels that being a direct partner with the provinces in local and regional programs that have had a fundamental effect on assisting what is clearly a nationwide concern is an unacceptable role for a federal government? To date, this collaboration has been extraordinarily helpful.

Hon. Marjory LeBreton (Leader of the Government): I thank the honourable senator for that question. As I mentioned yesterday, and as the honourable senator rightly pointed out today, although she did not mention the amount, we are investing over \$81 million this year and next in adult training, literacy and skills development. It was clear during the election campaign, and certainly since, that one thing about which the federal government has been definitive is that we would not tread into areas where the provinces were already involved, therefore tripping over each other in providing services. The issue here is simply the fact that we will put in \$81 million, and we will not overlap services already provided by provinces and municipalities.

Senator Fairbairn: I hear what the minister is saying, but I do not believe that the people on the ground across the country would say that the federal government has been treading on toes or causing difficulties. The federal government and the provinces have been working extremely well together.

On International Literacy Day, Human Resources and Social Development Minister Diane Finley issued an encouraging statement in which she said, "The Government of Canada remains committed to working collaboratively with provincial and territorial governments and other learning and literacy stakeholders to promote the importance of literacy and to facilitate the creation of opportunities for Canadians to acquire the literacy and essentials skills they need."

• (1415)

I have followed her comments then and in other matters very closely. From reading this, it is obvious that she is on the right track. However, surely we are past the days when attitudinal barriers dictated that each level of government must act on its own to protect its citizens. Literacy, as we all know, cuts across all borders, be they geographical or constitutional. The federal government has been a major player and has made a huge difference.

Can the Leader of the Government in the Senate assure us that her government is open to further discussion on what has been a hugely productive partnership? In literacy, as in many other things, every day matters, and federal support is critical to many of those programs.

Senator LeBreton: I thank Senator Fairbairn for the question. I agree with what Minister Finley said, because that is exactly what we intend to do. We intend to work in cooperation with the provinces in a host of areas, including literacy.

The issue here is simply that there were funds in the program for work that was already being done by other jurisdictions. As I said yesterday, the \$81 million that the federal government is intending to spend in this area will obviously be of assistance to people in the provinces. There will be a high level of cooperation.

We are committed to working closely with the provinces. Again, the provinces have programs and we have programs. The ideal situation is to work together toward a shared goal. The federal government intends to put into these programs \$81 million, which is no small amount. This in no way takes away from the ability of the people running these programs to work with each other. As with any issue, the origin of the funding, be it federal or provincial, does not detract from our commitment.

Senator Fairbairn: Honourable senators, I certainly hope that as the government moves along that course it will be able to retain the very productive connections between the people on the ground in the provinces working on the programs and the federal administration.

The important thing is not who provides the money, but rather, that there be no barriers between the levels of government and to ensure that the right programs are put in place to help, in the most productive way, the people who need them most.

Senator LeBreton: Honourable senators, that is more or less what I said in my last answer. I agree totally. Senator Fairbairn is certainly a champion of literacy issues. I am certain that her commitment to literacy will not change as a result of some rearranging of funding or programs.

• (1420)

Obviously, any good citizen of this country, whether they are part of a federal scheme or provincial scheme or both, will not in any way diminish their activities in pursuit of goals such as dealing with the literacy problem that is facing this country.

Senator Fairbairn: The leader can count on me. I will not be sitting down or standing back. I certainly will be assisting in any way I can.

My only concern, and their only concern, is that although changes have been and are being made, the connecting link between the two levels of government, which some would argue is not necessary or worthwhile, is absolutely imperative on this issue.

Senator LeBreton: Honourable senators, I would have expected that answer from Senator Fairbairn. She is absolutely right. I would not expect her to sit back, and I know she will not. The honourable senator is to be commended for always keeping this issue at the forefront.

I am quite certain that if we were to discuss this issue a year from now, we would find that the programs the federal government has announced will not adversely affect the country's literacy programs. I remember some of them being announced during the election campaign. I am particularly interested in these areas as well, and I particularly remember announcements on training to build a skilled labour force for people who work in the trades. They happen to be the people that I care the most about. Therefore, I am quite sure that a year from now the honourable senator will be able to say the literacy programs in this country have not suffered as a result of this measure.

SPENDING CUTS TO INTERNATIONAL YOUTH INTERNSHIP PROGRAM

Hon. Jim Munson: Honourable senators, I have a question for the Leader of the Government in the Senate. I rise today to address the latest example of the Conservative government's ill-advised cut, slash and burn budgeting style.

Last year, in their haste to scrap the Canadian Unity Council, a program for youth was threatened by this government; but under pressure, everyone came to their senses and backed off, and Encounters with Canada and programs like that continued. Yesterday, the President of the Treasury Board announced that Canada's new government will be cutting \$10.2 million from the International Youth Internship Program. Once again, the argument is that it did not deliver value for money.

The International Youth Internship Program was part of the Government of Canada's youth employment strategy. It was introduced in 1997 and addressed issues facing youth in transition from school to full-time employment, such as "no experience, no job; no job, no experience."

My question to the Leader of the Government in the Senate is this: How can one put a value on a child's future? Will the government do the right thing and re-establish funding for the International Youth Internship Program?

Hon. Marjory LeBreton (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I will start off by making a comment on the Canadian Unity Council. There was never an intention to end the program. We did not restore an Encounters with Canada program under pressure. I happened to be involved in contacting to the various people on the Canadian Unity Council, advising them that we would not be putting more money into the council. At the same time, I advised them that we would be maintaining the Encounters with Canada program, which we have.

Therefore, honourable senators, Senator Munson is quite wrong in saying that we restored the program under pressure. We never intended to end the Encounters with Canada program. I thought I had better correct the record on that point. Journalists, like the honourable senator, often get their facts wrong.

Senator Robichaud: Like *The Globe and Mail*!

Senator LeBreton: On the Youth Employment Strategy, we will be looking at programs to assist young people living in areas of the country where there is difficulty getting employment. We do not see the need to subsidize large corporations and businesses to hire students when they will be hiring them in any event.

Senator Munson: Honourable senators, I have a supplementary question. The leader may have had that impression about Encounters with Canada, but if she had gone on the website at that particular time, she would have seen that they were closing shop. People were told this program was coming to an end. With all due respect, the honourable senator should check the record herself.

This fiscal year, 2006-07, there were 300 students in this internship program. Over the past nine years, the program placed 400 students per year. Why should students, who are the new ambassadors for Canada, not have the opportunity to look, work and study beyond our borders?

• (1425)

Senator LeBreton: I thank the honourable senator for that question. Again, on the preamble to the question, I do not know what website the honourable senator was looking at but it was never —

Senator Munson: It was theirs.

Senator LeBreton: They may have changed the name. I was one of the people making the calls to the people on the board of CUC and I made it clear to them that the Encounters with Canada program would not be abandoned.

I think the honourable senator will find, when he looks at our platform in the last election, that we are committed to ensuring that young Canadians are well trained, well educated and have access to high paying and good jobs.

[Senator Munson]

[Translation]

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

MEMBERSHIP OF DELEGATION TO THE SUMMIT OF LA FRANCOPHONIE IN BUCHAREST, ROMANIA

Hon. Maria Chaput: Honourable senators, I have two questions for the Leader of the Government in the Senate.

My first question concerns the Summit of la Francophonie in Bucharest, Romania. No doubt we have a delegation at the summit. How many Canadian delegates are attending, and who are they?

[English]

Hon. Marjory LeBreton (Leader of the Government): I do not know the exact number of people in the Canadian delegation or who they are. I will be happy to provide that and any other information on the Francophonie in a delayed answer.

[Translation]

FINANCE

IMPACT OF SPENDING CUTS TO INDUSTRY CANADA

Hon. Maria Chaput: My second question concerns the summit's theme of new information technologies and the programs offered by Canada.

The government has made major cuts to Industry Canada. Has the Canada Fund for Africa been cut? If so, will this affect the plan to establish a Canadian centre for supporting sustainable economic development through technology in African countries?

[English]

Hon. Marjory LeBreton (Leader of the Government): I intended to say we will take the entire question as notice and I will give the honourable senator a delayed answer shortly.

Senator Prud'homme: May I ask a supplementary question?

[Translation]

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, the time for Question Period has expired. Several other senators remain on the list for Question Period. Their names can be added to the list for tomorrow.

[English]

DELAYED ANSWERS TO ORAL QUESTIONS

Hon. Terry Stratton (Acting Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I have the honour to table the answers to three oral questions, one asked by Senator Callbeck on June 8, 2006, concerning maternity benefits for women entrepreneurs; and two asked by Senator Robichaud on June 15 and June 28, 2006, concerning the status of literacy programs and the proposal submitted by the Kent dyslexia support committee.

HUMAN RESOURCES AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

MATERNITY BENEFITS FOR WOMEN ENTREPRENEURS

(Response to question raised by Hon. Catherine S. Callbeck on June 8, 2006)

Government supports available to women entrepreneurs and more specifically, the potential to extend the Employment Insurance (EI) maternity and parental programming to this population are significant issues that warrant ongoing discussion.

The current EI program design is one that is adapted specifically for workers in jobs characterized by traditional employer-employee relationships. As such, at the present time self-employed workers such as entrepreneurs, do not pay into, or receive EI. Adapting a program such as EI to respond to the needs of the self-employed, would represent a very significant undertaking requiring consideration and resolution of a considerable number of policy and program design issues. A policy initiative in this regard would also need to take into account the range of needs and preferences of the full population of self-employed workers, a diverse group with a range of work patterns and needs.

While EI represents one potential instrument of support, there are also others that would be appropriate to consider. Other potential instruments of support include: Loan programs, sector-based funds and self-funded tax-sheltered programs.

HRSD officials have been examining the issues around insurance based coverage of the self employed and the work to date suggests they are numerous and complex. For example, information from surveys has indicated that there is no clear consensus among self-employed workers — or organizations that represent them — concerning the desirability of gaining coverage for any of the benefits available under EI. Although some self-employed have expressed interest in gaining access to EI maternity and parental benefit coverage, their willingness to pay premiums for this coverage is limited.

An important development in this area has been the conclusion of an Agreement between the Government of Canada and Quebec regarding the establishment of its own parental plan, which replaces EI maternity and parental benefits in that province. As Quebec's plan will offer coverage of the self-employed, data and information concerning Quebec's experience will be very valuable for all governments in evaluating the benefits, practicality and policy considerations associated with serving this population.

Given the complexity of the issues involved, it will be important that the Government proceed in a careful and prudent fashion in assessing potential new policies for self-employed women — and all entrepreneurs. The Parliamentary Standing Committee on the Status of Women has tabled a report on parental benefits for

self-employed workers and the Government's recent response to the recommendations of the report provides additional insight into the government's position on this matter.

STATUS OF LITERACY PROGRAMS AND FUNDING OF VARIOUS PROGRAMS

(Response to questions raised by Hon. Fernand Robichaud on June 15 and 28, 2006)

The Government of Canada recognizes that literacy and essential skills are the foundation for skills development and lifelong learning. They are important for Canada's productivity and for the well-being of Canadians.

The Government of Canada will continue to work with provinces and territories, employers, unions and community groups to help Canadians develop the literacy and essential skills they need every day — at work, at home, and in life.

Minister Finley stated at HUMA Standing Committee on Main Estimates (June 6, 2006) that:

"I agree wholeheartedly on the importance of literacy. Our department invests a lot in skills development, but if people can't read and if they don't understand what they're reading, it's hard for them to learn how to do a better job or to do their job better. It's fundamental that we have a literate population".

Human Resources and Social Development Canada (HRSDC) programming supports the transfer and application of knowledge and innovations in adult learning, literacy and essential skills. HRSDC programming also helps to strengthen the capacity of the adult learning, literacy and essential skills sectors while working to promote adult learning, literacy and essential skills across Canada. These activities complement other literacy-related initiatives in federal departments and agencies more broadly.

The Adult Learning and Literacy Directorate (ALLD) within HRSDC is responsible for delivering federal government support for adult learning, literacy and essential skills.

Effective April 1, 2006, HRSDC implemented a single set of program terms and conditions integrating the former program authorities of the National Literacy Program, the Office of Learning Technologies Program and the Learning Initiatives Program into the Adult Learning, Literacy and Essential Skills Program (ALLESPP). The objectives of the ALLESPP are to promote lifelong learning by reducing non-financial barriers to adult learning and to facilitate the creation of opportunities for Canadians to acquire and develop the learning, literacy and essential skills they need to participate in a knowledge-based economy.

The ALLESPP funds activities along four streams:

- generation, transfer and application of knowledge;
- innovations in adult learning, literacy and essential skills;

- strengthening the capacity of the adult learning, literacy and essential skills sectors; and
- adult learning, literacy and essential skills promotion.

This year's call for proposals was posted on August 10, 2006. It was delayed for a variety of factors, including suspension of program postings over the federal election period, the Treasury Board approval of the merger of HRSDC learning and literacy terms and conditions into the consolidated Adult Learning, Literacy and Essential Skills Program, and various administrative and common system modifications that were required.

Applications are reviewed based on eligibility, merit and available funding.

The proposal entitled *Service d'appui aux troubles d'apprentissage "Les Mots magiques"* submitted by Le Comité de soutien aux personnes dyslexiques de Kent, has been approved. The organization has been informed of this.

ANSWER TO ORDER PAPER QUESTION TABLED

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION— IMMIGRATION POLICY AND STATISTICS

Hon. Terry Stratton (Acting Deputy Leader of the Government) tabled the answer to Question No. 15 on the Order Paper—by Senator Callbeck.

• (1430)

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SENATE REFORM

SPECIAL COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO EXTEND DATE OF FINAL REPORT

Hon. Daniel Hays (Leader of the Opposition), pursuant to notice of September 26, 2006, moved:

That, notwithstanding the Order of the Senate adopted on Wednesday, June 21, 2006, the date for the Special Senate Committee on Senate Reform to submit its final report be extended from September 28, 2006 to October 26, 2006.

[Translation]

Hon. Terry Stratton (Acting Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, can the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate explain the reasons for this decision?

Senator Hays: I thank Senator Stratton for his question. We began examining Bill S-4 last June. In September, the committee met for two weeks to hear testimony from experts and from the

ministries of intergovernmental affairs from Ontario, Quebec and Alberta. Unfortunately, more time is needed to draft our report.

It was difficult to determine in advance the deadlines for the work, although we were confident that we could submit the report on the date specified. There is too much work to be done, which is why we are asking for an extension until October 26. However, we hope to have the report ready before that date.

[English]

Senator Stratton: Honourable senators, I have a follow-up question. The honourable senator used two phrases in respect of when the report would be finished: one, "hope to be finished," disturbs me, and the other, "fairly certain to be finished," assures me. Could the honourable senator give this chamber the assurance that the latter will govern, that he will not ask for an additional extension and that the report will be finished?

[Translation]

Senator Hays: Honourable senators, I am certain that, if this motion is adopted, we will be able to table the report by October 26, and perhaps even earlier.

The Hon. the Speaker: Is it your pleasure, honourable senators, to adopt the motion?

Motion agreed to.

[English]

NATIONAL DEFENCE ACT

MOTION CALLING UPON GOVERNMENT TO PROCLAIM SECTION 80 OF THE PUBLIC SAFETY ACT, 2002—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. Hugh Segal, pursuant to notice of September 26, 2006, moved:

That the Senate calls upon the Government of Canada:

- (a) to cause the bringing into force of section 80 of the *Public Safety Act, 2002*, Chapter 15 of the Statutes of Canada 2004, assented to on May 6, 2004, which amends the *National Defence Act* by adding a new Part VII dealing with the reinstatement in civil employment of officers and non-commissioned members of the reserve force;
- (b) to consult with the provincial governments as provided in paragraph 285.13(a) of the new Part VII with respect to the implementation of that Part; and
- (c) to take appropriate measures in order for the provisions under the new Part VII to apply to all reservists who voluntarily participate in a military exercise or an overseas operation, and not to limit the provisions to those reservists who are called out on service in respect of an emergency.

[Senator Stratton]

Hon. Tommy Banks: Honourable senators, it is hardly my place to ask this question of the honourable senator, but I will. I need to understand whether this would provide job protection for those members of the reserve forces who are called to duty such that they will have their jobs waiting for them when they return from duty.

Senator Segal: That is precisely the case, senator. I prepared a brief speech on the matter, if it please the house.

Honourable senators, I rise today to speak to the serious inequity suffered by the brave men and women who proudly call themselves members of the Canadian Forces reserves. These people are more than weekend soldiers and many are called on to backstop our regular forces. They are standing alongside regular force members, fighting, being wounded and, sadly, dying. To date, five of our volunteer reservists serving in Afghanistan have given the ultimate sacrifice in the fight for the freedom of the Afghan people. There are 300 Canadian reservists serving in Afghanistan supplementing our regular forces. These people are mechanics, bank tellers and public servants in private life. They are men and women who choose to train on weekends and during vacations and, subsequently, serve overseas. In order to do this, they must request leaves of absence and rely on the goodwill and understanding of employers to hold their positions during training and service in overseas missions, for months, if necessary.

• (1440)

Unfortunately, while the goodwill of employers exists in many sectors, all too often these reservists must make a choice: Do I serve my country or do I step back and not risk my current employment? Unfortunately, some employers, including government employers, are less than enthusiastic about their employees' requests for unpaid leaves for training or overseas service purposes.

A recent article in *Maclean's* magazine recounted the story of one young reservist who returned from a training exercise and was called in by a senior executive, and told, "You were one of our best employees until you got involved in this silly army thing."

As far back as 1987, a "total force" concept was instituted by the Canadian Forces and this concept was reaffirmed with the 1994 White Paper on defence, where reservists are trained to the level of their regular force counterparts and serve in the same unit. This concept, while still in the implementation phase in the late 1980s and 1990s, faced its biggest challenge during Canada's UN involvement in the Yugoslavian operations. Canada had earmarked 2,000 peacekeepers to fulfill our duties to our missions abroad overall, but by 1993 all these 2,000 members were assigned exclusively to the former Yugoslavia. Reservists had to be deployed so that Canada might fulfill its other commitments worldwide.

Much in this world has changed since Yugoslavia and the defence White Paper in that the need for our reservists is greater than ever. However, Canada has yet to provide even the peace of mind for these men and women serving in Afghanistan, Bosnia or elsewhere, that their jobs, their livelihoods and their ability to provide for themselves and their families will be intact upon their return home.

Without assurances of any kind, how are our reserve forces to recruit and train needed personnel? The cadet program of the reserve forces also counts on its members to train new recruits. One deputy commanding officer at a reserve training facility stated publicly that the shortage of training officers was due directly to the lack of job security afforded them. In one instance, the employer guaranteed the young officer that there would not be a job waiting for him at the end of his unpaid leave of absence.

The Public Safety Act, introduced in 2002 — and this falls into the category of Senator Banks' proposal that we deal with acts that have not been fully proclaimed, to his credit — contained a detailed section relating to the job protection of Canadian reservists. Unfortunately, the section was not brought into force by the Governor-in-Council. Furthermore, it applied only to reservists who are called up in respect of an emergency situation.

The compulsory call-up of reservists in an emergency situation has not actually occurred since the Second World War. Even if all provisions listed in section 80 of the Public Safety Act were brought into force, they would not be of use to the men and women who currently serve Canada so bravely as volunteers in our operations overseas.

The issue of job protection for reservists has been the subject of discussion for many years. It was supported at length in the 1995 Special Commission on the Restructuring of the Reserves and the 2005 Commission on the Restructuring of the Reserves: Ten Years Later as well. With our commitments overstretching our armed forces and the need for even more reservists to enter active duty, it is our duty as parliamentarians to provide incentive and do whatever is possible to support those who wish to volunteer.

The Canadian Forces Liaison Council attempts to act in support of the Department of National Defence in the absence of job protection legislation by educating employers, promoting support of reservists and outlining the advantage of hiring reservists. When necessary, the council also attempts to mediate employment situations to allow for job security or unpaid leave — all worthwhile efforts, and I am grateful that such an organization exists, especially since current laws do not afford any protection to those who serve in that fashion.

Sections 285.01 to 285.13 of section 80 of the Public Safety Act are well-thought-out and comprehensive parts of the legislation that would afford job protection for members of the reserve forces. As mentioned earlier, the legislation applies only in situations where these women and men are called up in respect of an emergency and would not apply to those who volunteered for duty. I humbly ask for your support in, first, urging the government to amend this section of the Public Safety Act so that it includes all reserve members volunteering for training and service, and, second, that the provisions be brought into force by the Governor-in-Council as quickly as possible.

The discussion has gone on for 20 years, honourable senators. How many times must we reach the same conclusions? Members of Canada's reserve forces, who serve this country bravely at home and abroad, deserve meaningful job protection. This chamber has the capacity to advance that cause.

Senator Banks: I apologize for jumping the gun earlier. I am still new here.

I will take the adjournment of the debate for the rest of my time, but I want the honourable senator to know that my colleagues on the Standing Senate Committee on National Security and Defence are grateful to him for raising this question. We have wrestled with it long and hard from time to time in respect to recommendations we have made. Before I engage in the debate, I want to be a little surer of my ground than I am today. I will adjourn the debate in my name, when the time comes, for the remainder of my time.

Hon. Michael A. Meighen: Would Senator Segal entertain a question? I am sure he has looked at this matter, as we have on the Standing Senate Committee on National Security and Defence. The argument, as the honourable senator is well aware, against such legislation is that, were it in place, employers would be loath or less willing to employ young men and women, knowing full well that they might at any time volunteer for deployment and, therefore, could perhaps be considered less reliable than one who was not involved with the reserves.

Is that a serious objection? Do you have any evidence whatsoever? I tend to share the honourable senator's view, but I want to be able to dismiss the argument that introducing this legislation would do more harm than good.

Does the honourable senator have any views with respect to the payment of reserves, whether they should be paid the same amount as regular serving members of our forces when they are on deployment in active service?

Senator Segal: I thank the honourable senator for the question. With respect to the issue that people will be deprived of employment opportunities because companies will cease hiring people who are of an age and capacity to join our reserves, we have a long list of legislative changes made in the interest of a humane and caring society with respect to maternity leave, with respect to whether or not smoking is allowed, and with respect to a host of other important labour standards. While there is always some resistance at the beginning, that legislation tends to effect a cultural shift. It becomes apparent that leaving people out of an employment option because those people might be loyal enough to want to join the reserves will become socially and economically unacceptable.

Yes, there will be some of those difficulties. However, I would rather begin with the premise that we have legislation in place that establishes a clear obligation, and if corporations and others want to engage on how they manage some of these issues, whether there are tax or other considerations that must be put in place, that is a fair discussion. It is fundamental, certainly in those areas governed by federal legislation, that we have a clear and precise statutory position. Some provinces would go along with that, while others, for other reasons, may choose not to.

With respect to the second issue, I have had the benefit of living in Kingston, where many reservists are part of the community. One of our realities — and this is true of the Americans, the

British and others — is that we have had great difficulty paying reservists both on time and fairly.

My view has been that, for all the NATO countries, until we hold the salary of the high command in escrow until such time as reservists are paid on time, we will not get their attention. That is a debate for another time and another place, but it is an idea I would embrace.

I believe I am correct in saying that our Commonwealth brothers and sisters in Australia and the United Kingdom, as well as the United States, have legislation that guarantees work for reservists who are serving their country. There are precedents in other places.

Senator Meighen: Does the honourable senator have a view on whether or not the difference between the salary paid to the reservists and the salary that reservists were earning in the private sector should be made up by somebody and, if so, by whom?

• (1450)

Senator Segal: I would not be of the view that a reservist should be paid at a level beyond the rank and burden which he or she carries as compared to a comparable member in the regular force. When a reservist makes a decision to respond to a voluntary call-up, to sign up for disposition abroad, he should be treated equally to every other member of the force. It is probably an unfair expectation that Her Majesty compensate for any gap that exists between his or her private-sector income and what is being paid by the forces at that time.

The more interesting question is in the context of the way in which reservists are ranked and treated. For example, if someone leaves the regular force and stays in the reserve, he or she often has to go down a rank. Those are issues we should discuss because that has a more direct impact upon a reservist's income, benefits and acquired pension rights than might be the case relative to the private-sector job from which he comes.

On motion of Senator Banks, debate adjourned.

SOCIAL AFFAIRS, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO EXTEND DATE OF FINAL REPORT ON STUDY OF ISSUES CONCERNING MENTAL HEALTH AND MENTAL ILLNESS

Hon. Marilyn Trenholme Counsell, pursuant to notice of September 26, 2006, moved:

That the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology, which was authorized by the Senate on Tuesday, April 25, 2006, to examine issues concerning mental health and mental illness, be authorized to extend its power to publicize its findings from September 30, 2006 until March 31, 2007.

Hon. Joan Fraser (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, might the honourable senator give us an explanation about this motion on two grounds? First, what will it involve and what is planned in the way of publicizing the report? Is it travel? How much money will be involved? Second, why is it deemed necessary to extend this power? The mental health report,

which I believe is an excellent report, has already had a lot of publicity since it was brought down. This motion, running until the end of March next year, would give a longer period of authorization for publicity than I believe has been the practice for Senate reports.

Why is this report special?

Senator Trenholme Counsell: I thank the senator for her question. It is a great privilege and source of pride for me to speak to questions, to this motion, and indeed to the report. I am sure all senators would agree that this report has brought great honour to the Senate of Canada, especially to all the senators who participated in this study and in the preparation of the report, and, of course, to all those who have cooperated with us.

There seems to be a great hunger across the nation to have this report presented in person by honourable senators. I know that both the Honourable Senator Kirby and the Honourable Senator Keon have ongoing speaking engagements. Of course, we know that Senator Kirby will take his retirement from the Senate, but we sincerely hope that the Honourable Senator Dr. Wilbert Keon will not follow in his footsteps. He is most valuable. The senators are receiving speaking invitations constantly, so it is to enable this most important and highly respected work of the Senate to continue to be presented to the people of Canada in response to requests.

There is a need to produce an additional printing because the demand has been far greater than expected. Also, because of the size of the report, we have had to contract outside. I do want to reassure honourable senators that the budget for this part of the study, the presentation of the actual report to the Canadian public, was \$54,000, and of that \$32,000 remains. I was given the words that "in a sense, the motion extends the life of the budget," but far more important, in my mind, and I expect in yours, honourable senators, is that it extends life of this important work. It extends the possibility of getting important messages out about reducing stigma surrounding mental illness, about calling people to action, about listening to people who suffer from the many forms of mental illness and addiction, and as well, listening to their families and all the people in the community who work for them.

This motion promotes a worthy cause. It does not require additional dollars. It is an administrative motion. There are precedents for it. I cannot cite other committees, although I believe they exist. I know that this kind of extension has been granted to the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology in the past.

I would be glad to answer any other questions.

The Hon. the Speaker: Is it your pleasure, honourable senators, to adopt the motion?

Motion agreed to.

NATIONAL FINANCE

COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO STUDY ISSUES RELATING TO FISCAL BALANCES AMONG ORDERS OF GOVERNMENT

Hon. Nancy Ruth, for Senator Day, pursuant to notice of September 26, 2006, moved:

That, the Standing Senate Committee on National Finance be authorized to examine and report on issues relating to the vertical and horizontal fiscal balances among the various orders of government in Canada; and

That the Committee report no later than June 30, 2007.

Hon. Lowell Murray: Just a word, honourable senators, in support of this motion that will allow the Standing Senate Committee on National Finance to inquire into the important and current issues surrounding both the vertical and horizontal fiscal imbalance, or balance, as the Minister of Finance would have it.

I believe, and the chairman believes, that we could probably have undertaken this within the authority granted by the rules because we are authorized to study matters relating to, among other things, government finance. However, the chairman decided that the prudent thing to do would be to bring a motion asking for a reference, if only to alert honourable senators that the committee is about to undertake this study. As far as the horizontal imbalance is concerned, the work that the committee will do will update a report that our committee made in 2002 on the question of equalization.

While I am on my feet, I want to congratulate the Honourable Senator Ruth on her election yesterday as deputy chair of the committee and to say that my congratulations are not at all lessened by my regret, which she will understand, at the departure of the Honourable Senator Cools from the deputy chairmanship of that committee.

During a period when I had the honour of chairing the committee, Senator Cools, then a Liberal, was deputy chair of the committee and we had a very productive and harmonious collaboration. In congratulating Senator Ruth, I voice what I am sure are the sentiments of the other members of the committee in thanking Senator Cools for her devoted service to the committee and to the Senate in that post.

Hon. Joan Fraser (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, Senator Murray was faster on his feet than was I. I will direct a question to him, since I am following upon him. It is a little late for me to put a question directly to Senator Nancy Ruth. I will assume that Senator Murray's explanation of this study would have been given by Senator Nancy Ruth had I been quicker on my feet. I see no indication to the contrary.

I would like to add my voice to Senator Murray's congratulations to Senator Cools. I have crossed swords with her on occasion on other matters, but on matters of national finance before the committee, when I was a member of it some time ago, I stood in awe of her capacity to understand, to grasp quickly what was going on and to understand both the superficial and fundamental issues at stake.

• (1500)

It is entirely appropriate on this occasion to congratulate her on that ability and to thank her for her work, while at the same time offering warm congratulations to her successor. I hope I will get a chance to put a question to her successor before very long.

The Hon. the Speaker: Is it your pleasure, honourable senators, to adopt the motion?

Motion agreed to.

ANTI-TERRORISM ACT

SPECIAL COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO EXTEND DATE OF FINAL REPORT

Hon. David P. Smith, pursuant to notice of September 26, 2006, moved:

That, notwithstanding the Order of the Senate adopted on Tuesday, May 2, 2006, the date for the presentation of the final report of the Special Senate Committee on the Anti-terrorism Act be extended from October 5, 2006 to December 22, 2006.

The Hon. the Speaker: Senator Smith, do you wish to explicate?

Senator Smith: Honourable senators, this motion is required because we cannot deal with the current time frame. As some honourable senators will know, a report came out by Mr. Justice O'Connor a week ago. However, he will be making another report, with recommendations, in about a month. It seems logical to do this. There is agreement. There have been consultations. The motion speaks for itself.

Hon. Marcel Prud'homme: Honourable senators, this is such an important subject. If someone had disagreed, I would have participated in the debate and stated why I think we should extend the date. Since everyone seems in agreement, I do not see why I should bore you at this time by telling you why you should say yes.

The Hon. the Speaker: Is it your pleasure, honourable senators, to adopt the motion?

Motion agreed to.

ENERGY, THE ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO EXTEND DATE OF FINAL REPORT ON STUDY OF THE CANADIAN ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACT

Hon. Tommy Banks, pursuant to notice of September 26, 2006, moved:

That, notwithstanding the Order of the Senate adopted on Thursday, April 27, 2006 the Standing Senate Committee

on Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources, which was authorized to examine and report on the review of the *Canadian Environmental Protection Act* (1999, c. 33) pursuant to Section 343(1) of the said Act, be empowered to extend the date of presenting its final report from October 2, 2006, to March 31, 2007.

The Hon. the Speaker: Would the Honourable Senator Banks care to explain?

Senator Banks: Honourable senators, the reasons for the motion before you have to do with what is probably the largest act of Parliament that exists. I do not know if all honourable senators have seen the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, but it looks like an old family Bible. It is many inches thick.

When first devised, it was an effort to bring together and to streamline all previous legislation having to do with the environment and the ecology and the environmental protection we wanted to afford. It is hard to believe, looking at something as substantive as the CEPA, that it is in fact an effort at streamlining, but it is.

This act deals directly with 37 other pieces of legislation. Before we rose in the summer, our committee held five weeks of hearings trying to get a handle on this act. We tried to circumscribe exactly how we will do what is set out in the reference to our committee by the Senate, which is to do a comprehensive review of CEPA, as is mandated in the legislation. It took us that long to figure out the process by which we would try to do that.

We have broken it down into three basic sections and rails along which we will drive that examination which, as I said, is mandated by the legislation itself and which is two years overdue by virtue of elections, changes in government and so on.

It is the committee's view that we will require the time, in Ottawa, between now and the end of the fiscal year to complete the mandate of the committee given in the reference by the Senate, to deliver a comprehensive review of the Canadian Environmental Protection Act.

The Hon. the Speaker: Is it your pleasure, honourable senators, to adopt the motion?

Motion agreed to.

The Senate adjourned until Thursday, September 28, at 1:30 p.m.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, September 27, 2006

	PAGE		PAGE
SENATORS' STATEMENTS		Spending Cuts to National Literacy Secretariat.	
The Honourable Madeleine Plamondon		Hon. Joyce Fairbairn	764
Tribute.		Hon. Marjory LeBreton	764
Hon. Francis William Mahovlich	759	Spending Cuts to International Youth Internship Program.	
The Late Honourable J. Michael Forrestall		Hon. Jim Munson	765
Hon. Terry Stratton	759	Hon. Marjory LeBreton	766
Workshop on Child Soldiers		International Cooperation	
Hon. Rod A. A. Zimmer	759	Membership of Delegation to the Summit of la Francophonie	
Citizenship Status of the Dalai Lama		in Bucharest, Romania.	
Hon. Consiglio Di Nino	760	Hon. Maria Chaput	766
The Honourable Jean-Robert Gauthier		Hon. Marjory LeBreton	766
Congratulations on Receiving Order of Canada.		Finance	
Hon. Claudette Tardif	760	Impact of Spending Cuts to Industry Canada.	
The Late Honourable Edwin A. Goodman, O.C., P.C.		Hon. Maria Chaput	766
Hon. Hugh Segal	760	Hon. Marjory LeBreton	766
Hon. Jeremiah S. Grafstein	761	Delayed Answers to Oral Questions	
Visitors in the Gallery		Hon. Terry Stratton	766
The Hon. the Speaker.	761	Human Resources and Social Development	
<hr/>		Maternity Benefits for Women Entrepreneurs.	
ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS		Question by Senator Callbeck.	
Official Languages		Hon. Terry Stratton (Delayed Answer).	767
Certificate of Appointment Tabled.		Status of Literacy Programs and Funding of Various Programs.	
Hon. Terry Stratton	761	Question by Senator Robichaud.	
Indian Specific Claims Commission		Hon. Terry Stratton (Delayed Answer).	767
2004-05 Annual Report Tabled.		Answer to Order Paper Question Tabled	
Hon. Terry Stratton	761	Citizenship and Immigration—Immigration Policy and Statistics.	
Hamid Karzai President of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan		Hon. Terry Stratton	768
Notice to Append Address to Members of the Senate		<hr/>	
and the House of Commons.		ORDERS OF THE DAY	
Hon. Terry Stratton	761	Senate Reform	
Banking, Trade and Commerce		Special Committee Authorized to Extend Date of Final Report.	
Notice of Motion to Authorize Committee to Extend Date		Hon. Daniel Hays	768
of Final Report on Study of Proceeds of Crime		Hon. Terry Stratton	768
(Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Act.		National Defence Act	
Hon. Jeremiah S. Grafstein	761	Motion Calling Upon Government to Proclaim Section 80	
Foreign Affairs		of the Public Safety Act, 2002—Debate Adjourned.	
Notice of Motion to Authorize Committee to Extend Date		Hon. Hugh Segal	768
of Final Report on Study of Matters Relating to Africa.		Hon. Tommy Banks	769
Hon. Hugh Segal	762	Hon. Michael A. Meighen.	770
Notice of Motion to Authorize Committee to Extend Date		Social Affairs, Science and Technology	
of Final Report on Study of Softwood Lumber Agreement.		Committee Authorized to Extend Date of Final Report on Study	
Hon. Hugh Segal	762	of Issues Concerning Mental Health and Mental Illness.	
Rules, Procedures and the Rights of Parliament		Hon. Marilyn Trenholme Counsell.	770
Notice of Motion to Authorize Committee to Examine Name Change		Hon. Joan Fraser	770
of Foreign Affairs Committee to Include International Trade.		National Finance	
Hon. Hugh Segal	762	Committee Authorized to Study Issues Relating	
<hr/>		to Fiscal Balances Among Orders of Government.	
QUESTION PERIOD		Hon. Nancy Ruth	771
Finance		Hon. Lowell Murray	771
Spending Cuts to Court Challenges Program.		Hon. Joan Fraser	771
Hon. Serge Joyal	762	Anti-Terrorism Act	
Hon. Marjory LeBreton	762	Special Committee Authorized to Extend Date of Final Report.	
		Hon. David P. Smith.	772
		Hon. Marcel Prud'homme.	772
		Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources	
		Committee Authorized to Extend Date of Final Report on Study	
		of the Canadian Environmental Protection Act.	
		Hon. Tommy Banks	772



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