



CANADA

Debates of the Senate

2nd SESSION

•

39th PARLIAMENT

•

VOLUME 144

•

NUMBER 20

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Wednesday, December 5, 2007



THE HONOURABLE NOËL A. KINSELLA
SPEAKER

This issue contains the latest listing of Senators, Officers of the Senate, the Ministry, and Senators serving on Standing, Special and Joint Committees.

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, December 5, 2007

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

Prayers.

SENATORS' STATEMENTS

NATIONAL SECURITY AND DEFENCE

OTTAWA CITIZEN ARTICLE ON NATIONAL DEFENCE SPENDING BY GOVERNMENTS

Hon. David Tkachuk: Honourable senators, yesterday, in the *Ottawa Citizen*, a front-page article was devoted to an analysis done by the Parliamentary Research Branch. The analysis apparently looks at defence spending under various prime ministers from the 1970s to 2007. I have not seen the analysis nor, when I canvassed them, had any of my fellow honourable senators from the Conservative Party who are members of the Standing Senate Committee on National Security and Defence.

However, according to the article: "The analysis was done for the Senate's committee on national defence." There are two glaring and highly misleading errors in that quote which need to be corrected. The analysis is not an analysis, but simply a collection of figures. No analysis of these figures was prepared by the Parliamentary Research Branch. I know that for a fact.

Additionally, the so-called "analysis" was not done by the Senate committee, but was requested by an individual member of that committee. I also know that for a fact. The only mystery is who that individual senator was. However, I am sure the chair can enlighten us given that he is quoted in that article drawing conclusions from the collection of figures masquerading as an analysis.

Citing Senator Kenny, the journalist from the *Ottawa Citizen* wrote:

Liberal Senator Colin Kenny said the figures show the Harper government has to start doing more in terms of military spending.

The article quotes Senator Kenny as saying further:

They talk the talk, but when it comes time to walk the walk, they're just not there. . . . They don't even come close to the so-called pinko days of Mr. Trudeau. Mr. Harper's got a long long way to go to match that.

There is no comment in that article from Senator Kenny that this collection of figures, from which he draws a rather sweeping conclusion, was prepared at the request of an individual senator and not at the request of the committee. Nor does he clarify that, in fact, no analysis of those figures had been done by the Library of Parliament.

Furthermore, Senator Kenny's remarks and participation in that article reinforced the impression that the so-called "analysis" was done on behalf of the committee and, even worse, that he is

presenting the committee's views on it. Nothing could be further from the truth given that the rest of us have not seen the document in question.

• (1335)

Honourable senators, the Chair of the Standing Senate Committee on National Security and Defence, by virtue of his comment on the so-called "analysis" in question to a local newspaper, has an obligation to correct the errors in that article before this chamber, in front of his colleagues on the committee and in the eyes of the public through the newspaper of record on this issue.

In order that there be no misunderstanding, the errors that need to be corrected are this: that there is no analysis, but that there is a collection of figures, that the collection of figures was not requested by the committee but by an individual senator on that committee; and that the chair does not speak on this or any other issue for the committee, unless explicitly specified.

INFRASTRUCTURE DEFICIT IN CITIES

Hon. Art Eggleton: Honourable senators, I rise today to speak about a growing problem in Canada, a problem that, if not dealt with, will cripple our ability to compete in the world economy.

I am speaking about the increasing infrastructure deficit that is found in Canadian cities and communities.

A recent report published by the Federation of Canadian Municipalities pegged the deficit at over \$123 billion. Honourable senators, this deficit affects Canadians in every city and every community across this country. It is reflected in the roads we drive on, the pipes that deliver water to our homes, the public transportation that we use and the places where our kids play.

Currently, an estimated 28 per cent of our infrastructure is more than 80 years old and, shockingly, 79 per cent of the life expectancy of Canada's infrastructure has been used up.

The \$123 billion figure can be broken down into such areas as water and waste water systems, \$31 billion; transportation, \$21.7 billion; waste management, \$7.7 billion; and community, recreational, cultural and social infrastructure, \$40.2 billion. Furthermore, this number does not even include what is needed in new infrastructure investment.

Honourable colleagues, more worrisome than the numbers was the reaction of the Harper government. Instead of reacting by saying they want to help, the federal Minister of Finance called mayors and local politicians "whiners."

Honourable senators, that is not leadership and this does not help to solve the problems that plague our cities and communities. With record surpluses at the federal level, it is time that the government invests and helps our cities and communities.

Problems may be found at the local level, but they are not owned by the cities and communities. These are problems that are owned by all Canadians and need to be solved by all Canadians. We in all orders of government need to work together to address the infrastructure situation.

CONCERT ON THE HILL

Hon. Leonard J. Gustafson: Honourable senators, it was snowing and blowing outside the Parliament buildings on Monday at noon, but it was warm and festive in room 200 of the West Block. The Parliamentary Spouses Association put on a concert on the Hill second to none. The music was tremendous — I am a music lover myself — and they did a great job.

Senator Tommy Banks began the festivities. He played as people came in and gathered, and played the old songs that we all know; it was great.

Christmas carols were sung by the House of Commons pages and they did a great job. The piano serenade by André Sébastien Savoie, a concert pianist and spouse of the Honourable Senator Champagne, was tremendous.

The Singing Senators, our own senators' choir, was excellent. The Conservative Quartet then brought the house down. It was great, as was the performance by the Upper Chamber Chorus.

I want to thank the parliamentary spouses for organizing this event, with a special thanks to Chair Val Day, Honorary Chair Ann Kinsella, and Kathy Hays for all the hard work they did.

The military families are most appreciative of what was done. I hope we will see a similar event next year and I would urge honourable senators not to miss it. It was great.

• (1340)

[Translation]

NATIONAL DAY OF REMEMBRANCE AND ACTION ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

EIGHTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF TRAGEDY AT L'ÉCOLE POLYTECHNIQUE

Hon. Lucie Pépin: Honourable senators, tomorrow marks the eighteenth anniversary of the tragedy at l'École Polytechnique in Montreal. We remember with great sadness the tragic deaths of 14 female students who had their entire futures ahead of them. On this day of remembrance, we also think of all the Canadian women who have died as a result of brutal acts of violence.

Over the years, December 6 has become more than a simple day of remembrance. It is a time to speak out against this ever-present type of violence in our communities. Unfortunately, violence is still a daily occurrence for thousands of women and girls.

This violence affects all communities and has devastating physical, emotional and psychological consequences. Many victims never fully recover. And we must not forget the children who grow up in this environment.

Aboriginal women are always among the most vulnerable to wanton brutality. The homicide rate for Aboriginal women is

higher than that for non-Aboriginal women. Another segment of the population that experiences much more violence is women with disabilities, and that is seldom mentioned. I could not ignore immigrant women who remain silent about abuse to protect the family's reputation.

In a fair and egalitarian society such as ours, this is a situation that cannot be tolerated. All Canadian women have the right to live in safety and security and with dignity. All of society, both men and women, must work hard to bring about a significant and lasting change.

Honourable senators, in memory of the tragedy at l'École Polytechnique in Montreal and of all Canadian women who have been victims of violence, I invite you to continue to work within your communities to get rid of this social scourge once and for all.

[English]

THE HONOURABLE MARCEL PRUD'HOMME, P.C.

CONGRATULATIONS ON RECEIVING ORDER OF FRIENDSHIP OF RUSSIA

Hon. Anne C. Cools: Honourable senators, I rise to praise Senator Marcel Prud'homme, who has been serving in this place since 1993. Before that, he served for almost 30 years in the House of Commons as the member for the Montreal riding of St. Denis. Throughout his long career in both Houses, Senator Prud'homme has been a great internationalist. A tireless advocate for peace in the Middle East and justice for Palestinian refugees, Senator Prud'homme has contributed much to building dialogue between Canadian parliamentarians and world parliamentarians — that is, building dialogue between nations.

On November 29 last, honourable senators, the Russians awarded Senator Prud'homme a very high honour, namely, the Russian Federation's Order of Friendship. In the Senate foyer, in the presence of our Senate Speaker Kinsella, diplomats and colleagues, the Russian Prime Minister, Viktor Zubkov, presented the award to our colleague on behalf of the Russian people and President Vladimir Putin. The Russians honoured our Senator Prud'homme for his significant contribution to Canada-Russia relations and for his work as the honorary chairman of the Canada-Russia Parliamentary Association. I congratulate Senator Prud'homme for this distinguished achievement and for this great honour.

On that same occasion, the Russian Prime Minister honoured a Canadian World War II veteran, Mr. Leslie Forrest, for his service in the famous Murmansk convoy runs. Mr. Forrest was awarded the Russian commemorative medal "60 years of the Victory in the Great Patriotic War." I congratulate him.

Honourable senators, I close with a quote from the Book of Ecclesiasticus, 44:7, which states:

All these were honoured in their generations, and were the glory of their times.

Honourable senators, our beloved Senator Prud'homme is a credit to this Senate, a credit to Canada and a credit to the world. I am honoured to know him and I am honoured to count him among my friends.

KYOTO PROTOCOL

[English]

COMMITMENT OF MANITOBA

Hon. Mira Spivak: Honourable senators, despite the conventional wisdom that has decided that Kyoto targets cannot be met, the Government of Manitoba has rushed in where angels fear to tread. It has committed to meet the Kyoto targets. "Rushed" is the wrong word, however, because the plan is very diversified and well-thought-out. The Manitoba government has been reducing its emissions from about 2.2 million tons to 100,000 tons.

Legislation will set out a mechanism to phase out the remaining coal-fired generating station operated by Manitoba Hydro. The government-owned utility will produce a new province-wide program to help lower-income Manitobans make cost-effective energy-efficient home improvements.

• (1345)

The government will support the Manitoba Forestry Association, community groups and others to plant a million trees a year for the next five years, and it will require the capture of methane emissions from large landfills.

Manitoba was the first jurisdiction in Canada to begin acting on climate change. It is now recognized as the North American leader in geothermal installations and the building of energy-efficient buses. Manitoba was recently ranked first in Canada for energy efficiency programming.

Manitoba is also committed to match California's vehicle emission standards. It is committed to incentives to get older cars off the road and to have fewer gas guzzlers. These and other initiatives reflect the government's response to Manitoba citizens concerned about climate change.

As well, Manitoba has joined both the Regional Midwestern Greenhouse Gas Reduction Accord and the Western Climate Initiative.

I commend both the citizens of my province and the Government of Manitoba for these actions.

[Translation]

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

TSAWWASSEN FIRST NATION AGREEMENT

DOCUMENTS TABLED

Hon. Gerald J. Comeau (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the Tsawwassen First Nation Final Agreement and related Appendices.

CANADA-UNITED STATES INTER-PARLIAMENTARY GROUP

NATIONAL GOVERNORS ASSOCIATION ANNUAL MEETING, JULY 20-23, 2007—REPORT TABLED

Hon. Jeremiah S. Grafstein: Honourable senators, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the report of the Canadian delegation to the National Governors Association 2007 Annual Meeting, "Innovation America," held in Traverse City, Michigan, from July 20 to 23, 2007.

PACIFIC NORTHWEST ECONOMIC REGION LEGISLATIVE LEADERSHIP ACADEMY, SEPTEMBER 28-OCTOBER 1, 2007—REPORT TABLED

Hon. Jeremiah S. Grafstein: Honourable senators, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the report of the Canadian delegation to the Pacific NorthWest Economic Region Legislative Leadership Academy held in Banff, Alberta, from September 28 to October 1, 2007.

[Translation]

QUESTION PERIOD

PUBLIC WORKS AND GOVERNMENT SERVICES

POSSIBLE MORATORIUM ON GOVERNMENT POLLING

Hon. Céline Hervieux-Payette (Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, yesterday, on the topic of government polling and the study conducted by Mr. Paillé, a study that we have yet to see, the Minister of Public Works and Government Services said:

... the government has announced a moratorium on all polls in every department, beginning today In order to impose parameters on polling, the government, effective today, will ask all its departments to refrain from using public funds for polls until further notice it will apply to the entire public service until parameters are established for polls commissioned and paid for by the public service.

[English]

A little later in the day, Jacques Gagnon, the minister's director of communication, said, "We might have been ahead of ourselves. . . We are considering this but you don't do it overnight. . . Ongoing polling will be allowed to be pursued."

An Hon. Senator: Resign!

Senator Hervieux-Payette: Who is making the decision in the minister's department? Is the director of communications taking direct orders from the Prime Minister's Office, or will the minister comply with the excellent decision he made yesterday?

• (1350)

[Translation]

Hon. Michael Fortier (Minister of Public Works and Government Services): Honourable senators, I thank the senator for her bilingual question. This is an important issue, as we know. I will repeat what I said yesterday: There is no connection between the report tabled last week and the one presented by Mr. Paillé. This report deals with federal spending for opinion polls. It, therefore, reflects considerable expenses made, basically, by all federal departments.

Again, as I said yesterday, this is a source of concern for the government. We intend to announce measures to better control polling expenses.

Regarding the moratorium, I suggested yesterday that one would be imposed. I regret having misled the honourable senators because there will not be any for the time being. It was quite unintentional, believe me. Let it be known that we take the findings in that report very seriously. We will take very swift action.

Senator Hervieux-Payette: I remind the minister that his colleague's parliamentary secretary, Mr. James Moore, told the other place that the government was surprised by the numbers and wanted to hold the departments responsible.

I wonder who prepares and adopts the budgets. Is it the officials or the government? And Mr. Moore added:

[English]

We are taking all the necessary steps to correct this in the future to safeguard taxpayers' money. Today we have a different version.

[Translation]

The minister says that his intention was to do it, but we do not have a moratorium yet. I would like to know the real reasons, other than electoral considerations, because we know that polls are expensive. On the eve of a possible election, does the Prime Minister's Office still need this tool? Why does the minister not confirm today that the moratorium will apply immediately? Canadians would find it much more plausible. They have had to pay the \$31 million price tag — the most ever paid for polls by any government. We could stop the haemorrhaging. After commissioning a study of Liberal polling practices over a number of years, a study that we still do not have before us, the minister should be saying that there is a moratorium and that it goes into effect now.

Senator Fortier: First, when the honourable senator refers to Mr. Paillé's study, it is both retrospective and prospective, as honourable senators will see when they receive the report. Moreover, the information on the actions the government plans to take has been available for some time now. The honourable senator and I both recognize that the amounts involved are sizeable. The government will take action. It will announce the measures it plans to take once they are ready. Rest assured that we are working on this. Clearly, we are going to do a much better job of overseeing the award of contracts for these polls. As I said yesterday, the contracts are awarded by the departments,

not the minister. In conclusion, opinion polls are issued every day by private firms. The government, as opposed to the departments, feels no need to have more information about how popular it is or other people are. This is by no means the reason or the purpose of these polls. They are first and foremost a tool that the government uses to get a better sense of whether its programs are meeting their objectives. That should be our primary goal in future.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF GOVERNMENT POLLING

Hon. Céline Hervieux-Payette (Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, I hope that the minister will give me an indication as to when he plans to table Mr. Paillé's report and when he plans to decide to impose a moratorium and set parameters for polling. He has had the report for a month. He could have set the parameters then and made them public.

When will we get an answer to these two questions? We are about to rise and it does not seem as though this issue can be resolved before the two Houses rise.

• (1355)

Hon. Michael Fortier (Minister of Public Works and Government Services): Honourable senators, in both instances, I will let you know. That is, when I am ready both to table the Paillé report and to announce the measures that the government intends to take.

[English]

Hon. Yoine Goldstein: I want to understand the honourable senator's answers. We now know that this government's expenses exceeded by almost one fifth those of the previous government with respect to public opinion polls.

We also know that this new government was purportedly scandalized by the quantity of money spent, as a result of which it named Mr. Paillé to do a report and to give recommendations. Apparently he has done so, but the government has not seen fit to release that report as yet. We have heard the minister say that the report will be released in due time.

Since we now know that this government has exceeded previous spending by at least 17 per cent, and since we know that this government purports to be an open, accountable, transparent government, will Mr. Paillé be named a second time to investigate this government's expenses?

Senator Fortier: I thank the honourable senator for his question. We will release the Paillé report. Once the honourable senator has read the report, we will be happy to answer questions coming from it. I would wait for the report before guessing as to what it does or does not say.

With respect to public opinion research as it now stands, along with everyone in the government, I am concerned about the amounts and how these contracts are awarded; hence, we will definitely look into this matter and address it in the foreseeable future.

REVIEW OF GOVERNMENT POLLING—INDEPENDENCE

Hon. Yoine Goldstein: Since it was this Conservative government that exceeded previous spending by at least 17 per cent, is it not the opinion of the minister that an

investigation into spending by this government should be carried out by someone who is independent of the government, as opposed to the government investigating itself?

Hon. Michael Fortier (Minister of Public Works and Government Services): These contracts are awarded by departments for various studies on all sorts of government policies, ranging from defence to health and through all the other departments.

No one is suggesting anything untoward here. It is a question of managing the volume of public opinion contracts that are being awarded and ensuring that, when we are polling Canadians on programs, the polling is documented and done properly and that the government, and hence taxpayers get their money's worth.

Senator Goldstein: With respect, does the honourable senator not think that those issues should be determined by someone independent of the government, rather than the government itself?

Senator Fortier: When the honourable senator goes back to the retrospective part of Mr. Paillé's report, he will recall that the Auditor General had looked at and commented on several of these contracts, which is why in our election platform, as the honourable senator will recall, we promised to address this issue, and we did.

What we are dealing with here is the volume of contracts currently emanating out of the public sector. As I said, we will deal with this matter shortly, and we obviously will communicate those decisions as soon as possible, in terms of how we will manage it in the future.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF GOVERNMENT POLLING

Hon. James S. Cowan: On October 13, *La Presse* reported that Mr. Paillé had submitted his report on October 5. Is that correct?

Hon. Michael Fortier (Minister of Public Works and Government Services): I do not recall the exact date that Mr. Paillé handed over the report. I shall have to come back with the exact date.

Senator Cowan: Surely the minister will be able to tell us approximately when he received the report. October 5 was two months ago. Did he receive the report approximately two months ago, or did he receive the report approximately two days ago? Could he give us a time frame?

Senator Fortier: The Department of Public Works and Government Services has had the report for some time, but I do not know whether the report was received on October 5 or October 25.

Senator Cowan: Would the minister take that question as notice and provide this house with the date on which the report was received?

Senator Fortier: Absolutely.

• (1400)

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

UNITED STATES AND RUSSIA—MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING ON INTEROPERABILITY OF DEFENCE FORCES

Hon. Hugh Segal: Honourable senators, my question is addressed to the Leader of the Government in the Senate. Several days ago, RIA Novosti in Moscow reported that top Russian and U.S. military officials have signed a memorandum of understanding in a bilateral military cooperation agreement with respect to the interoperability of those two countries' armed forces, air forces and navy in various parts of the world.

As Canadians have a concern with respect to Arctic sovereignty, and as both the Americans and the Russians are players in that process, could I ask the minister whether she might inquire as to the status of that agreement, whether that agreement is being made available to other allied governments, and whether the document might be tabled in this chamber?

Hon. Marjory LeBreton (Leader of the Government and Secretary of State (Seniors)): I thank the honourable senator for the question. I will take the question as notice and provide the honourable senator with the information.

UNITED STATES—RELEASE OF OMAR KHADR ACCORDING TO PROVISIONS OF UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION ON THE RIGHTS OF THE CHILD

Hon. Mobina S. B. Jaffer: Honourable senators, my question is to the Leader of the Government in the Senate in regard to the optional protocol of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. Canada has not secured the release from Guantanamo Bay of Omar Khadr. The United States returned nine British nationals in 2004 and 2005. Mr. Khadr is the last remaining westerner among some 300 detainees in Guantanamo Bay, where he has been held for the last five years. Serious questions exist about the legality of the military process under which he is to be tried by the United States.

My question is: Will the Canadian government bring Omar Khadr home, as other countries have been able to do for their citizens, so that he can be dealt with under our justice system?

Hon. Marjory LeBreton (Leader of the Government and Secretary of State (Seniors)): Honourable senators, I will take the question as notice.

Senator Jaffer: This U.S. military trial contravenes the optional protocol on the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. The U.S. and Canada are both signatories. The U.S. ratified the convention on January 23, 2003, and Canada on February 12, 2002.

As a signatory to the convention, Canada has an obligation to ensure that the protocol is being applied to all its citizens. The UN Special Representative on Children and Armed Conflict has raised concerns about the creation of an international precedent where an individual is being tried for war crimes with regard to alleged acts committed when he was a child. Omar Khadr was only 15 years old when he was captured by the U.S.

Can the honourable leader tell us what Canada's specific obligations are under the optional protocol of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, and on what grounds our government is denying these obligations to Omar Khadr?

Additionally, what is the Canadian government doing to get the United States to honour this protocol with regard to this child?

Senator LeBreton: I thank the honourable senator for her question. As is well known, Mr. Khadr faces some very serious charges, and any questions related to plans for his release are premature. The legal process is unfolding as we speak.

With regard to the United States and the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, I will take that question as notice.

Senator Jaffer: I ask the leader if she will brief us as to exactly what kind of help our government is giving to Omar Khadr to deal with these issues.

Senator LeBreton: I will take that question as notice as well.

JUSTICE

REVIEW OF FOREIGN CLEMENCY CASES

Hon. Claudette Tardif (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, the Minister of Justice recently stated that the Government of Canada would examine clemency cases for Canadian citizens imprisoned in foreign countries on a case-by-case basis. The Leader of the Government in the Senate proudly supported that statement in this chamber. It appears that the Government of Canada will now selectively determine which citizens it will protect abroad.

Will the Leader of the Government in the Senate explain the set of criteria by which the government will determine how far it will go in protecting the civil liberties and human rights of its own citizens in foreign countries?

Hon. Marjory LeBreton (Leader of the Government and Secretary of State (Seniors)): I thank the honourable senator for the question. I will be happy to make representations to the Minister of Justice in an attempt to provide her with an answer.

Although she did not mention the specific case of Mr. Smith in Montana, it will be impossible to discuss that case further, since he has embarked on a court action.

• (1405)

[Translation]

DECISION NOT TO APPEAL DEATH SENTENCE OF RONALD SMITH—GOVERNMENT STANCE ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

Hon. Claudette Tardif (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Leader of the Government in the Senate admit that by allowing Ronald Smith to be sentenced to death in the United States, the government is not respecting the will of Canadians with respect to capital punishment?

[English]

Hon. Marjory LeBreton (Leader of the Government and Secretary of State (Seniors)): I thank the honourable senator for her question. As I mentioned, because of the actions of Mr. Smith in taking this matter to court, it will be impossible to deal with that specific case.

The death penalty has been abolished in Canada. Other countries have other laws. When citizens from other countries are in our country, we expect them to obey the laws of our country, just as we should expect our citizens to obey the laws of other countries.

Senator Tardif: Canada abolished capital punishment and automatically sought clemency for Canadians on death row in countries beyond our borders. Has there been a change made to the consideration of the death penalty in Canada?

Senator LeBreton: I have made the position of the government very clear. The law in Canada is that the death penalty has been abolished. That will not change. That decision was made by Parliament and reiterated several times, the last time being in the late 1980s, I believe.

The fact is that our laws in regard to capital punishment can in no way go beyond our border. We cannot impose our laws on other countries, just as we would not want other countries to impose their laws on us.

Hon. Yoine Goldstein: Is the Leader of the Government in the Senate aware that Canada, as an observer of the Council of Europe, has an obligation not only to have abolished capital punishment within its jurisdiction but also to do anything and everything in its power to avoid the imposition of capital punishment in all other countries?

Is the honourable leader aware of the fact that Canada's inactivity with respect to what is happening in the United States at the moment with respect to a Canadian citizen may well jeopardize Canada's observer status at the Council of Europe?

Senator LeBreton: I thank the honourable senator for his question. In terms of our international obligations, on November 15, just a few weeks ago, Canada voted in favour of a draft resolution at the United Nations Social, Humanitarian and Cultural Committee. The resolution passed. It was, of course, the United Nations death penalty resolution, and Canada supported it.

THE SENATE

INTRODUCTION OF NEW PAGES

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, before proceeding to the next item, I am pleased to introduce new pages who will be working with us this year.

Bronwyn Guiton was born in British Columbia and calls North Vancouver home. She counts the Rotary Club's Adventures in Citizenship, Capilano College's Global Stewardship Program, and the Explore program among her formative experiences. Bronwyn is currently in her third year of studies in Social Sciences at the University of Ottawa.

Éric Beaudoin was born in Charlevoix and raised in Beauceville in the province of Quebec. Éric completed a Manitoba-Quebec francophone student exchange and studied in British Columbia at UWC Lester B. Pearson College. He is currently in his third year at the University of Ottawa, studying health sciences under the wing of a National Loran Award.

• (1410)

ORDERS OF THE DAY

HERITAGE LIGHTHOUSE PROTECTION BILL

SECOND READING—ORDER STANDS

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Carney, P.C., seconded by the Honourable Senator Nolin, for the second reading of Bill S-215, An Act to protect heritage lighthouses.—(*Honourable Senator Comeau*)

Hon. Lowell Murray: Honourable senators, I wish to ask the Deputy Leader of the Government a question on this order.

Your Honour quite properly intervened yesterday and cut our dialogue off, so I will come right to the point and ask the Deputy Leader of the Government whether he can, with more specificity, indicate when he might be intervening in this debate.

Hon. Gerald J. Comeau (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I received the minister's comments on this very important bill on Monday night. To illustrate how quickly I move on these matters, I will speak on the matter tomorrow, which is three days after receiving the minister's comments.

Order stands.

PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT ACT

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING— ORDER STANDS

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Ringuette, seconded by the Honourable Senator Smith, P.C., for the second reading of Bill S-219, An Act to amend the Public Service Employment Act (elimination of bureaucratic patronage and establishment of national area of selection).—(*Honourable Senator Stratton*)

Hon. Pierrette Ringuette: Honourable senators, I would like to ask the government representative in the Senate when they expect they will be speaking to this bill, which was already dealt with in this house and in committee and sent to the other place in the last session.

Hon. Terry Stratton: Honourable senators, unfortunately I do not have my speech quite finished, and I will not be in the chamber tomorrow, so I will speak on this item next week.

In order to encourage the honourable senator to assist us in getting out of here soon, I will speak to the matter before we leave for the Christmas break.

Senator Ringuette: Is that an indication that Senator Stratton will be the only person from his party speaking on this bill?

Some Hon. Senators: Oh, no!

Senator Stratton: That is a very good try. I do not know the answer, but if the honourable senator would like, I will survey my caucus on that in January.

Order stands.

CRIMINAL CODE

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING— ORDER STANDS

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Grafstein, seconded by the Honourable Senator Callbeck, for the second reading of Bill S-210, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (suicide bombings).—(*Honourable Senator Andreychuk*)

Hon. Jeremiah S. Grafstein: Honourable senators, I ask the Deputy Leader of the Government when he might deal with this measure. As he recalls, and as I mentioned earlier today, this bill previously received second reading and I would like it to go to committee before the end of this year.

Hon. Gerald J. Comeau (Deputy Leader of the Government): I thank the honourable senator for his question. We are not quite ready to proceed on the matter. I realize that this bill did progress quite a ways in the last session.

I will attempt to respond to the honourable senator tomorrow or by the middle of next week on when we might proceed to this order.

Order stands.

CANADA SECURITIES BILL

SECOND READING—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. Jeremiah S. Grafstein moved second reading of Bill S-211, An Act to regulate securities and to provide for a single securities commission for Canada.—(*Honourable Senator Grafstein*)

He said: Honourable senators, I rise to speak in support of Bill S-211. If adopted, this bill would create a single regulatory body for all of the country's 13 current securities markets, and it would be situated within the National Capital Region.

Honourable senators, we live in a complex world. Canada stands alone among all industrial nations in that we do not have a single national regulator for our security markets. Having one regulator would improve the efficiency and productivity of Canada's capital markets at a time when the cost of capital is a crucial issue not only within but also outside Canada. This bill would provide Canadian corporations and their investors with the certainty, consistency and protection afforded by a single national regulatory framework. Moreover, the cost of capital would go down for Canadian corporations, and the system would work faster and more productively, as the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce pointed out in previous reports. More foreign corporations would be enticed to enter Canada's capital market.

This proposed legislation would modernize Canada's capital markets and would pull us into the 21st century. This bill is long overdue. Around the world, developed and developing countries are quickly establishing single securities regulators in order to create economies that are competitive and efficient — Singapore, China, India and Poland, to name a few. Canada is behind all of our global competitors on securities regulation. Indeed, on a number of occasions the OECD has criticized Canada for its lack of a single regulator, which inhibits Canada's role in having a more effective say in international markets.

Last May, the *Financial Times* reported that New York Governor Eliot Spitzer, a staunch advocate of an effective and competitive securities regulator, called together a blue ribbon panel to modernize the American financial services regulation, replete with a powerful investor protection provision in order to compete better with European and Asian markets. The Americans are moving to improve their system, which has a single regulator.

Honourable senators will recall that the United States, during the Great Depression, established a single securities regulator located in Washington as part of the "New Deal". This revolutionary change marked the launch of America as the leading capital market in the world. Canada also took steps to modernize its economy at the time with the establishment of one central bank. Other steps in the securities area were not undertaken by the federal government, so a vacuum developed, and the vacuum was filled by a plethora of provincial and territorial regulators, now 13 in all, each with somewhat different rules, regulations and procedures.

Senator Baker called my attention to the tangled security case law. In case after case, Canadian courts, with the different tests and standards in provincial and territorial legislation, have made legal redress complicated, slow and ineffective. I will give honourable senators a more detailed report about that later.

The frustration of the courts is easy to discern in reading any of these cases. No single government seems to be able to take into account or to move or improve this hopeless legal situation or to rectify this morass. These different jurisdictions make it virtually impossible for shareholders to bring a successful action or for underwriters to bring a successful suit for offences such as misleading advertising in IPOs issued across Canada because of a hodgepodge of different legal tests imposed by various regulatory regimes in Canada. Read these cases and ask, "Where is responsible government that might redress these apparent flaws and gaps in the law?"

• (1420)

In response to my tabling this bill earlier in the spring, I received letters and emails from investors across the country. Virtually all of the correspondence was in agreement that there is a pressing need for a single federal regulator. I quote from an email I received from an investor securities lawyer and policy adviser responding to an appearance on the Business News Network concerning this measure when I first introduced the bill:

I watched your appearance on BNN concerning your private member's bill for a national securities regulator and I am responding to your request for feedback.

I wish to express my support for this type of federal legislation and congratulate you on its introduction. Rather than commenting from a transaction or compliance perspective, on which I expect you will receive considerable feedback and on which others have considerably more involvement than me, I will comment from the perspective of the policy-maker, in which I have experience in two different decades.

From 1990-92, I worked on policy matters at the OSC, having been hired in the International Markets Branch on its formation. My work included much of the drafting of multi-jurisdictional disclosure systems, the major policy initiative that came into effect during that period, and preparing the recommendations of the Canadian Securities Administrators for use by the Federal Department of Finance in negotiating a free trade agreement with the United States and in negotiating the agreement that led to the creation of the World Trade Organization.

As contract staff at the OSC from 1999 to 2000 and then as a consultant to the OSC from 2000-2004, I mostly worked on proposed changes in the regulation of the retail side of the securities industry. More recently I have done work consulting for the federal Department of Finance relating to the proposal for free trade in securities.

Based on my experience, I wish to make the following observations:

1. The securities rule-making process is excessively cumbersome and wasteful of government resources in attempting to achieve a consensus of 13 regulators. For those regulators who do not actively participate in a regulatory initiative, their involvement in the initiative is just a waste of their time in contributing nothing to the process, though they have a necessary involvement in approval of the initiative.

For those regulators who actively participate in a regulatory initiative, the process becomes even more cumbersome and drawn out, resulting in a greatly reduced ability for regulators to act in a timely manner and sometimes at a loss of momentum that can kill a useful initiative.

2. the attempt to achieve a consensus of 13 regulators opens the door for industry to attack or delay an initiative by successfully lobbying just one of the larger regulators, including taking advantage of disagreements between Ontario and British Columbia.

3. My experience is that the rule-making process has gotten more cumbersome between the two decades, not less.

4. Opponents of a national regulator cite the existence of state security regulators in the United States as justification for provincial securities regulation in Canada. However, the existence of state regulators in the United States does not impede the ability of the U.S. SEC to enact rules or the U.S. government's ability to enact legislation.

5. You noted that the opposition to a national securities regulator comes from those with a vested interest in the status quo. I strongly agree with that comment. Securities policy concerns and goals are fundamentally the same among the provinces, making the current system or provincial regulation highly artificial.

6. Notwithstanding the considerable abilities of staff of the federal Department of Finance, I would regard the Department to be inherently disadvantaged in negotiating securities matters with their counterparts in other countries as a result of the federal government's lack of involvement in regulating securities.

By the way, that was the same argument advanced by the managing director of the OECD when criticizing Canada's failure to have a single federal regulator.

7. I understand the Canadian government has significant involvement in the current initiative towards free trade in securities. However, this initiative is based on a system of substituted compliance based on a finding of equivalence between two regulatory systems. Even if this concept is accepted in the future by the United States and other G7 countries, it is quite possible that Canada could be left out of its implementation because of the need for other countries to make this determination of equivalence with 13 regulatory systems, unless they decide to limit free trade in securities to certain provinces, such as Ontario and possibly Quebec.

He concludes by saying:

It appears that the best that can be said for the current system of securities regulation in Canada by the provinces and territories, including the new passport initiative, is that the system could be even worse than it is. As an investor, securities lawyer and taxpayer, I don't think it's enough.

That is the end of the letter and I thought it was quite informed, fair, detailed thoughtful and balanced.

Finally, honourable senators, in an *International Herald Tribune* report last May, the headline read as follows: "IPO earnings in U.S. losing the lead to Europe." This article notes that, for the first time since World War II, bankers in New York are earning less from initial IPO offerings in Europe. The gap is closing, with more than \$1.1 billion in fees from European IPOs compared to \$1.4 billion from U.S. initial sales. Europe is about to overtake the United States because of its different and more coherent regulatory system. The article goes on to say that

the move towards favouring London is here to stay. The big headline is: "London is rapidly becoming a new Big Board."

Canada is falling behind the United States and even falling behind London as it regains its centre as the leading capital-making market in the world.

Honourable senators, 14 out of 15 of the world's biggest IPOs were listed in Europe this year because of lower fees and regulatory lag. As a result, the United States Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Henry Paulson, Jr., has called for streamlining rules and curbing shareholder lawsuits to increase competition with regulated overseas markets.

Unless such changes are made, it is predicted that the United States will lose its place as the world's leading financial centre and — as I said before, Canada lags far behind the United States.

Why is this important reform to our economy necessary? Why is time of the essence? It is because global capital — and we read this every day in our newspapers — does not sit still. It moves effectively, quickly and promptly to the most efficient venue.

Why is our capital market the essence and heart of Canada's growth and prosperity? Capital means jobs, growth and innovation. It drives our tax system and supports our social net. For scarce capital to be deployed directly and not frittered away in a costly and cumbersome regulatory system will simply create more jobs in industry and manufacturing and greater productivity, efficiency and prosperity for all of our citizens.

No reform is more immediate and vital to the vibrancy of our economy. Our global competitors are moving to modernize their regulatory system and their economies. It is with great modesty that I say I have studied this subject for over 40 years and this is the most important step to modernizing our economy since the creation of the Bank of Canada.

I do not intend to try the patience of honourable senators any longer. *Res ipsa loquitur*; this matter speaks for itself.

Honourable senators, I urge your support for this legislation and conclude with two comments, one from yesterday's newspapers. Every federal finance minister, including this one, in the last 50 years, at some time or another, has called for the creation of a single securities regulator. Yet no prime minister, nor minister of finance, has been prepared to invest the political capital necessary for this essential reform.

Honourable senators, the Senate can now lead the way.

There was a rather disturbing report in the newspapers yesterday. It was reported that the RCMP Integrated Market Enforcement Teams, IMETS, have been a disaster and a failure. Members of the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce will recall that all members of the committee have criticized or tried to urge the government and the RCMP to improve the prosecutions of white-collar crimes, especially from within the regulatory securities environment. There has been an acknowledged failure in this regard. Mr. Nick Le Pan, the former senior federal officer supervising banks, was retained by the RCMP themselves to make a report and he published his 77-page report less than a week ago. In it, he detailed a number of the

reasons why the RCMP — and this was their report which they called for themselves — had failed to successfully prosecute. The reasons indicated are the regulatory morass the difficulties of lack of singular control and the problems of responsible government if one looks between the lines. Although we live in a country with responsible government, no one is taking responsibility or accountability for cleaning up this morass. The resolution of this is a single federal regulator, with stronger investigatory and prosecutorial powers.

I assume, honourable senators, that you are as embarrassed as I am, when we see Canadians who have allegedly committed white-collar and regulatory crimes being prosecuted in the United States. We are told, and Mr. Le Pan tells us in his report, that it is not fair for us to compare the system of regulatory oversight in the United States with Canada. Such an expectation is too high. We should not expect to have the same system of governance and prosecution in Canada as they have in the United States. The rationale for that, which is not in the report, is clear: It is impossible for any prosecutor or any regulator, given the plethora of regulators, to bring criminals to account swiftly. We have a weak system that is giving Canada a bad name. We have to cleanse our system of the many bad guys by having a strong, enforceable, responsible and accountable regulatory system.

• (1430)

Honourable senators, this reform is long overdue. I became interested in this subject more than 40 years ago when I served as Chief of Staff to John Turner, then Minister without Portfolio, who became the first Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. We launched a study at that time to have a single federal regulator. Four decades have passed and we are no further ahead today. The reform is long overdue and I urge the Senate to give the matter consideration and report it to committee, where I will deal with all of the material objections. There are serious objections from British Columbia, Alberta and Quebec.

This past summer, I took it upon myself to visit privately with the ministers responsible in British Columbia, Alberta and Nova Scotia. I intend to do the same with the Minister of Finance in Quebec. I am satisfied because I hear two sides, the vested interests and the political classes saying they are against it, and the constitutionalists, saying there is a problem with it. At committee, I believe I can satisfy even the harshest critics and most pro-provincial senators in this place that there is a constitutional power within the federal government under the Criminal Code and the interprovincial trade power to do this. The opinions are clear, as given to the Allan commission. If the bill is referred to committee with the consent and consensus of this chamber, I would be prepared to address each and every one of those obstacles and hopefully convince honourable senators that this reform is worthwhile and necessary. Time is of the essence.

Hon. Lowell Murray: If the honourable senator would permit a question, I would take up the last point raised in respect of the constitutionality of Bill S-211. Although he clearly recommended in his speech that senators should read a number of legal cases to bone up on the jurisprudence, I do not promise to do so over the Christmas holidays but I will put it high on my list of New Year's resolutions. The honourable senator speaks to the frustration of the courts in many of these cases. Have any of the courts recommended or suggested that Parliament should act by

asserting what he claims is our jurisdiction and by passing a bill such as the one he has placed before the house?

Senator Grafstein: I do not think it is fair to look among those cases for that recommendation. One has only to read through the great pile of entangled cases. They all deal with differing onus, responsibilities and regulatory systems, so at times people pick and choose their venue of choice. In pursuit of a case, one can pick and choose the jurisdiction where the defence or the prosecution, as the case may be, will stand the best chance of meeting with success. It is a marketplace of ideas.

I urge the honourable senator to read the cases, and I will send him two or three. He will then be able to sense the frustration of the judges who wonder why the system cannot be made simpler. Judges have a duty to protect the public interest, so why is the public interest under responsible government not being protected by a clearer statement of onuses and responsibilities and why is the criminal power not clear? The argument in the Le Pan report is that the Americans have a better and tougher system because there is one jurisdiction. The Americans have a more complicated jurisdiction than we have because their criminal power is state-by-state. The Fathers of Confederation recognized the desire for one criminal law for Canada, and no province has ever challenged the criminal power. We already have the criminal power to do this, but the problem is the next step of coordinating the various regulatory commissions, the public and the marketplace, which creates an undue obstacle in the pursuit of justice in Canada.

The short answer to the honourable senator's question is, no, the courts have not made such a recommendation. I suggest to the honourable senator that he read two or three of these cases, of which Senator Baker has many. In each one, he will be able to sense the frustration of the judicial system and almost hear the judges imploring the legislators to get on with the business of responsible government.

Senator Murray: I appreciate the critique that the honourable senator has made of the status quo. I have followed him before on this subject.

Does the honourable senator disagree with me that if the Parliament of Canada was to pass Bill S-211, there would be a constitutional challenge to it from one or other of the provinces? He seems to be much more sanguine than I would be normally about what would happen in the event of such a challenge and whether ultimately the Supreme Court of Canada would find the bill ultra vires of Parliament and of the proper use of the criminal power. If not, then, as the scriptures say, our last state will be worse than our first.

I appreciate that the honourable senator belongs to the roll-of-the-dice school of politics, but does he not think we are taking a big chance?

Senator Grafstein: Let us see what would happen. Let us assume for a moment that the Senate is bold enough to pass this legislation and that the House of Commons is bold enough to pass the legislation. Immediately, there would be a challenge, and I accept that. The Provinces of Quebec, Alberta and British Columbia might challenge it and, if not the provinces, then some interested party within the provinces would challenge it. However, Parliament would win, and I will tell the honourable senator why we would win.

I will be accountable for this. Take a careful look at the law notes in Laskin's case book on constitutional law. I went to law school in the mid-1950s and I revisited those footnotes last night in preparation for my speech today because I assumed this question would be asked. Interestingly, it also relates to Senator Nolin's position on why, essentially, as a matter of balance in the Constitution, Supreme Court cases from 1960 to date indicate a visible shift in the courts. They look at provincial and federal powers to determine whether there is a new test, which is whether something that impinges on provincial jurisdiction is in the national interest. If the national interest is so high and so great as it relates to pollution, for example, which was not a big problem in 1950 but is a problem in Canada in 2007, then the courts have said that, unlike in the United States where they interpret the Constitution by looking at the intention of their founding fathers, we are to look at the situation as it applies today. It is a different test. The new test in the courts is such that if it can be demonstrated that the matter is in the national interest above and beyond the concerns of the provincial ideology, then the courts are prepared to support federal power. We do not need that test in this case, even though I tried to establish the national necessity today, because the federal government has always had the powers necessary. We have always had the criminal power and the interprovincial trade power. The federal government did not use their powers and thus a lacuna was left in the 1930s, and the provinces crept and seeped into federal jurisdiction. You now sell your securities in Ontario if you are a provincial regulator across Canada. That is contrary to the interprovincial trade laws, but because we left the lacuna, so it has been readily filled by provincial power. This bill would be rebalancing the constitution and rebalancing Confederation in the national interest.

• (1440)

Hon. Hugh Segal: Will the senator take another question?

I will leave the constitutional debate to senators who are far more informed in that area than I am. I am more troubled by the premise, which is explicit in the legislation and the honourable senator's defence thereof. It says: If we have a national problem, the response must be a bigger federal agency. I understand why on that side of the house a big, federal, bureaucratic response is a normative and comfortable proposition. On other sides of the house, however, there is a view that suggests that looking to big federal, administrative, commercial and other responses to problems in the marketplace may not be as fraught with a vast history of success as the honourable senator invests in the possibility of a national securities commission.

Can the honourable senator share his data set relative to the overweening success of large federal agencies on matters of commercial and related enforcement?

Senator Grafstein: Let us start with Mr. Le Pan's 77-page report. Start with that and read it. The current system is failing.

Senators who went with us to New York will recall this: When the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce went to New York, we met with a number of experts. One of them was Professor Coffee, a professor of law at Columbia University retained by the Ontario securities regulators, the Allan commission, to look at the securities situation in Canada. Mr. Coffee surprised us by telling us that more than 100 alleged securities violations had come to the attention of the authorities but that nothing was done. He could

not find out why none of those cases of alleged securities violations was pursued.

Then we have the affirmation — the answer is here now: One prosecution in Canada, one of the largest capital markets in the world. We are either the most honest capital market in the world or there is an inability of those responsible to bring people to justice and cleanse our system.

There are senators here who have been criticized for sitting on boards of public companies. I am not ashamed of being on a board of a private or public company.

An Hon. Senator: Shame!

Senator Grafstein: Honourable senators, the system is not working. Senator Segal is on a public board, or has been. The system is not working — and I am not the only one saying this. Mr. Le Pan, who is the expert and who was the senior federal regulator of banks, says that the system is not working.

Senator Segal, do not set up a straw man. The "straw man" is that we will have a bloated federal bureaucracy that will not be able to do its job. Frankly, the existing system is bloated, inefficient and unproductive. However, I believe the federal government can play an active role in this case; I believe we can have efficient agencies; and I believe the Bank of Canada is doing a great job at times.

Having said that, I am not ashamed to say that we should not be afraid to use federal power in the national interest of Canada. I am glad we have strong federal agencies that do their job. I do not want to get into an ideological battle; I would rather have a functional look at this question. I am prepared to rely on the functionality of my argumentation.

Senator Segal: I have two very brief supplementary questions. Would it be the honourable senator's expectation that a new national agency, as envisaged in his thoughtful and creative legislation, would embark upon and seek to impose U.S. prosecutorial standards in commercial matters in this country? Additionally, would that be seen as a step ahead in his perspective?

Second, is it Senator Grafstein's view that capital markets of a junior nature in places like Alberta or smaller provinces should have the same regulatory frame as capital markets in more senior and mature markets? If that is the honourable senator's view, why not adopt the jurisdiction of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission and do away with our own domestic regulation completely if one big regulator is the answer for North American efficiency, which I believe to be at least a part of the construct he is suggesting?

Senator Grafstein: That is about four questions.

First, I believe in Canada. I believe in sovereignty. I believe in accountable, responsible government. I do not believe that we should delegate our responsibilities to regulate our market to American colleagues, nor do I believe that our legal system cannot be renovated in a more sophisticated way than the American system. Sometimes, their system does provide overkill and does not protect the accused fairly — and we have seen that. Hence, I am not suggesting that.

[Senator Grafstein]

I am suggesting that we will do our business here to ensure that the criminal penalties attached to this legislation are appropriate to our jurisdiction, system and judicial courts, because we do have a different system. The existing system would not change. The provincial governments can continue to have a regulatory system for a junior market if they choose to do that in their own province. If they wish to sell securities or have a capital market in their own province, they can be free to do so.

However, they do not want to do that. Alberta does not want to limit itself to Alberta. It wants its IPOs, as well as British Columbia's IPOs to be purchased across the country. Our natural market is already too narrow. Why go into a marketplace and not at least get the entire Canadian marketplace? In this country, we do not have a national marketplace. We have obstacles and barriers to interprovincial trade, and the Senate Banking Committee continues to look at this. We do not have a national marketplace. We have free trade with the United States but not within our own jurisdiction in Canada.

I am not worried about overkill or Americanization of our criminal law system. There are checks and balances in place. The Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs, a thoughtful committee, would carefully vet legislation to ensure that the criminal power is appropriately applied, and applied differently than in the United States. I am not in favour of RICO — the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act — in the United States, because that legislation has been taken out of proportion. RICO was put in place to catch criminal gangs but it is now being applied to civil or criminal regulatory issues. It is not fair and we would not do that in Canada.

I have more confidence that our judicial system and legislators would be more careful, thoughtful and fair to both sides, especially in a criminal matter.

Hon. W. David Angus: Would the honourable senator take another question? In his bill, I believe Senator Grafstein is talking about a single national securities regulator under the federal law, as it has been described.

Is the honourable senator familiar with the concept of a common national securities regulator, whereby the federal government would work with the provinces and territories? If the honourable senator is familiar with that, why would he not prefer such a system?

Senator Grafstein: The answer is responsible government. Let me give the honourable senator the argument. This is not a new proposal. This proposal was made in the early 1960s, 1964-65, by the then chairman of the Ontario Securities Commission who proposed such a system. I was involved in those discussions at the time, and the federal mandarins and ministers turned it down because of the question of accountability. By separating the responsibility between the federal government and the 13 jurisdictions, there is no accountability. If something goes wrong, who is to blame? Who can be held accountable?

• (1450)

Our Fathers of Confederation believed, differently than the United States, in responsible government. That is the very essence of our constitutionality. How can responsible government exist when something goes wrong within the system, as it has now — only one successful prosecution — and no one takes account or responsibility? How does the voter of Canada decide that a

politician or a group of politicians is not doing his or her job? They cannot when the responsibility is divided among 13 jurisdictions.

Who do voters blame? Do they blame Nova Scotia? Do they blame Saskatchewan? No, let the federal government take responsibility and let it take the heat for that responsibility. That is the essence of responsible government to me, unless my mentors were wrong when they told me that the federal government could be a focused, effective tool in the national interest.

On motion of Senator Meighen, debate adjourned.

HUMAN RIGHTS

MOTION TO AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE TO STUDY ORGANIZATION FOR SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE 2007 DECLARATION ON ANTI-SEMITISM AND INTOLERANCE—ORDER STANDS

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Grafstein, seconded by the Honourable Senator Losier-Cool:

That the following Resolution on Combating Anti-Semitism and Other Forms of Intolerance, which was adopted at the 16th Annual Session of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, in which Canada participated in Kyiv, Ukraine on July 9, 2007, be referred to the Standing Senate Committee on Human Rights for consideration and that the Committee table its final report no later than March 31, 2008:

RESOLUTION ON COMBATING ANTI-SEMITISM, RACISM, XENOPHOBIA AND OTHER FORMS OF INTOLERANCE, INCLUDING AGAINST MUSLIMS AND ROMA

1. Recalling the Parliamentary Assembly's leadership in raising the focus and attention of the participating States since the 2002 Annual Session in Berlin on issues related to intolerance, discrimination, and hate crimes, including particular concern over manifestations of anti-Semitism, racism, xenophobia and other forms of intolerance,
2. Celebrating the richness of ethnic, cultural, racial, and religious diversity within the 56 OSCE participating States,
3. Emphasizing the need to ensure implementation of existing OSCE commitments on combating anti-Semitism, racism, xenophobia, and other forms of intolerance and discrimination, including against Christians, Muslims, and members of other religions, as well as against Roma,
4. Recalling other international commitments of the OSCE participating States, and urging immediate ratification and full implementation of the Convention on Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War

Crimes and Crimes against Humanity, and the Rome Statute,

5. Reminding participating States that hate crimes and discrimination are motivated not only by race, ethnicity, sex, and religion or belief, but also by political opinion, national or social origin, language, birth or other status,

The OSCE Parliamentary Assembly:

6. Welcomes the convening of the June 2007 OSCE High Level Conference on Combating Discrimination and Promoting Mutual Respect and Understanding, in Bucharest, Romania as a follow-up to the 2005 Cordoba Conference on Anti-Semitism and Other Forms of Intolerance;
7. Appreciates the ongoing work undertaken by the OSCE and the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (the OSCE/ODIHR) through its Programme on Tolerance and Non-discrimination, as well as its efforts to improve the situation of Roma and Sinti through its Contact Point for Roma and Sinti Issues, and supports the continued organization of expert meetings on anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance aimed at enhancing the implementation of relevant OSCE commitments;
8. Recognizes the importance of the OSCE/ODIHR Law Enforcement Officers Programme (LEOP) in helping police forces within the participating States better to identify and combat hate crimes, and recommends that other participating States make use of it;
9. Reiterates its full support for the political-level work undertaken by the three Personal Representatives of the Chair-in-Office and endorses the continuance of their efforts under their existing and distinct mandates;
10. Reminds participating States of the Holocaust, its impact, and the continued acts of anti-Semitism occurring throughout the 56-nation OSCE region that are not unique to any one country and necessitate unwavering steadfastness by all participating States to erase the black mark on human history;
11. Calls upon participating States to recall that atrocities within the OSCE region motivated by race, national origin, sex, religion or belief, disability or sexual orientation have contributed to the negative perceptions and treatment of persons in the region;
12. Further recalls the resolutions on anti-Semitism adopted unanimously by the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly at its Annual Sessions in Berlin in 2002, Rotterdam in 2003, Edinburgh in 2004, Washington in 2005 and Brussels in 2006;
13. Reaffirms especially the 2002 Porto Ministerial Decision condemning "anti-Semitic incidents in the OSCE area, recognizing the role that the existence of anti-Semitism has played throughout history as a major threat to freedom";
14. Recalls the agreement of the participating States, adopted in Cracow in 1991 to preserve and protect those monuments and sites of remembrance, including most notably extermination camps, and the related archives, which are themselves testimonials to tragic experiences in their common past;
15. Commends the 11 member states of the International Tracing Service for approving the immediate transfer of scanned Holocaust archives to receiving institutions and encourages all participating States to cooperate in opening, copying, and disseminating archival material from the Holocaust;
16. Commemorates the bicentennial of the 1807 Abolition of the Slave Trade Act which banned the slave trade in the British Empire, allowed for the search and seizure of ships suspected of transporting enslaved people, and provided compensation for the freedom of slaves;
17. Agrees that the transatlantic slave trade was a crime against humanity and urges participating states to develop educational tools, programmes, and activities to teach current and future generations about its significance
18. Acknowledges the horrible legacy that centuries of racism, slavery, colonialism discrimination, exploitation, violence, and extreme oppression have continued to have on the promulgation of stereotypes, prejudice, and hatred directed towards persons of African descent;
19. Reminds parliamentarians and participating States that Roma constitute the largest ethnic minority in the European Union and have suffered from slavery, genocide, mass expulsions and imprisonment, forced assimilations, and numerous other discriminatory practices in the OSCE region;
20. Reminds participating States of the role these histories and other events have played in the institutionalization of practices that limit members of minority groups from having equal access to and participation in state-sponsored institutions, resulting in gross disparities in health, wealth, education, housing, political participation, and access to legal redress through the courts;
21. Underscores the sentiments of earlier resolutions regarding the continuing threat that anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance pose to the underlying fundamental human rights and democratic values that serve as the underpinnings for security in the OSCE region;
22. Therefore urges participating States to increase efforts to work with their diverse communities to develop and implement practices to provide members of minority groups with equal access to and opportunities within social, political, legal, and economic spheres;

23. Notes the growing prevalence of anti-Semitism, racism, xenophobia, and other forms of intolerance being displayed within popular culture, including the Internet, computer games, and sports;
24. Deplores the growing prevalence of anti-Semitic materials and symbols of racist, xenophobic and anti-Semitic organizations in some OSCE participating States;
25. Reminds participating States of the 2004 OSCE meeting on the Relationship between Racist, Xenophobic and Anti-Semitic Propaganda on the Internet and Hate Crimes and suggested measures to combat the dissemination of racist and anti-Semitic material via the Internet as well as in printed or otherwise mediated form that could be utilized throughout the OSCE region;
26. Deplores the continuing intellectualization of anti-Semitism, racism and other forms of intolerance in academic spheres, particularly through publications and public events at universities;
27. Condemns the association of politicians and political parties with discriminatory platforms, and reaffirms that such actions violate human rights standards;
28. Notes the legislative efforts, public awareness campaigns, and other initiatives of some participating States to recognize the historical injustices of the transatlantic slave trade, study the enslavement of Roma, and commemorate the Holocaust;
29. Urges other states to take similar steps in recognizing the impact of past injustices on current day practices and beliefs as a means of providing a platform to address anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance;
30. Suggests guidelines on academic responsibility to ensure the protection of Jewish and other minority students from harassment, discrimination, and abuse in the academic environment;
31. Urges participating States to implement the commitments following the original 2003 Vienna Conferences on Anti-Semitism and on Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination and subsequent conferences that include calls to:
 - a. provide the proper legal framework and authority to combat anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance;
 - b. collect, analyse, publish, and promote hate crimes data;
 - c. protect religious facilities and communitarian institutions, including Jewish sites of worship;
 - d. promote national guidelines on educational work to promote tolerance and combat anti-Semitism, including Holocaust education;
 - e. train law enforcement officers and military personnel to interact with diverse communities and address hate crimes, including community policing efforts;
 - f. appoint ombudspersons or special commissioners with the necessary resources to adequately monitor and address anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance;
 - g. work with civil society to develop and implement tolerance initiatives;
32. Urges parliamentarians and the participating States to report their initiatives to combat anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance and publicly recognize the benefits of diversity at the 2008 Annual Session;
33. Commends all parliamentary efforts on combating all forms of intolerance, especially the British All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Anti-Semitism and its final report;
34. Emphasizes the key role of politicians and political parties in combating intolerance by raising awareness of the value of diversity as a source of mutual enrichment of societies, and calls attention to the importance of integration with respect for diversity as a key element in promoting mutual respect and understanding;
35. Calls upon OSCE PA delegates to encourage regular debates on the subjects of anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance in their national parliaments, following the example of the All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Anti-Semitism;
36. Calls upon journalists to develop a self-regulated code of ethics for addressing anti-Semitism, racism, discrimination against Muslims, and other forms of intolerance within the media;
37. Expresses its concern at all attempts to target Israeli institutions and individuals for boycotts, divestments and sanctions;
38. Urges implementation of the Resolution on Roma Education unanimously adopted at the OSCE PA 2002 Berlin Annual Session to “eradicate practices that segregate Roma in schooling” and provide equal access to education that includes intercultural education;
39. Calls upon parliamentarians and other elected officials to publicly speak out against discrimination, violence and other manifestations of intolerance against Roma, Sinti, Jews, and other ethnic or religious groups;

40. Urges the participating States to ensure the timely provision of resources and technical support and the establishment of an administrative support structure to assist the three Personal Representatives of the Chair-in-Office in their work to promote greater tolerance and combat racism, xenophobia and discrimination;
41. Encourages the three Personal Representatives of the Chair-in-Office to address the Assembly's Winter Meetings and Annual Sessions on their work to promote greater tolerance and combat racism, xenophobia, and discrimination throughout the OSCE region;
42. Recognizes the unique contribution that the Mediterranean Partners for Co-operation could make to OSCE efforts to promote greater tolerance and combat anti-Semitism, racism, xenophobia and discrimination, including by supporting the ongoing work of the three Personal Representatives of the Chair-in-Office;
43. Reminds participating States that respect for freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief should assist in combating all forms of intolerance with the ultimate goal of building positive relationships among all people, furthering social justice, and attaining world peace;
44. Reminds participating States that, historically, violations of freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief have, through direct or indirect means, led to war, human suffering, and divisions between and among nations and peoples;
45. Condemns the rising violence in the OSCE region against persons believed to be Muslim and welcomes the conference to be held in Cordoba in October 2007 on combating discrimination against Muslims;
46. Calls upon parliamentarians and the participating States to ensure and facilitate the freedom of the individual to profess and practice any religion or belief, alone or in community with others, through transparent and non-discriminatory laws, regulations, practices and policies, and to remove any registration or recognition policies that discriminate against any religious community and hinder its ability to operate freely and equally with other faiths;
47. Encourages an increased focus by participating States on the greater role teenagers and young adults can play in combating anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance and urges participating States to collect data and report on hate crimes committed by persons under the age of 24 and to promote tolerance initiatives through education, workforce training, youth organizations, sports clubs, and other organized activities;
48. Reminds participating States that this year marks the 59th Anniversary of the United Nations Human Rights Commission's adoption of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, which has served as the inspiration for numerous international treaties and declarations on tolerance issues;
49. Calls upon participating States to reaffirm and implement the sentiments expressed in the 2000 Bucharest Declaration and in this resolution as a testament to their commitment to "respect human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief, for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion", as enshrined in the Helsinki Final Act;
50. Expresses deep concern at the glorification of the Nazi movement, including the erection of monuments and memorials and the holding of public demonstrations glorifying the Nazi past, the Nazi movement and neo-Nazism;
51. Also stresses that such practices fuel contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance and contribute to the spread and multiplication of various extremist political parties, movements and groups, including neo-Nazis and skinhead groups;
52. Emphasizes the need to take the necessary measures to put an end to the practices described above, and calls upon participating States to take more effective measures to combat these phenomena and the extremist movements, which pose a real threat to democratic values.—(*Honourable Senator Di Nino*)

Hon. Consiglio Di Nino: Honourable senators, I am quite prepared to speak on this motion. I have been talking with the sponsor of this item, Senator Grafstein. Looking at the time that it has been sitting on the Order Paper, I wanted to assure everyone that, in consultation with Senator Grafstein, I will be speaking on the matter in the not-too-distant future. In the meantime, I will adjourn it for the remainder of my time.

Order stands.

THE SENATE

MOTION TO TELEVISION PROCEEDINGS— DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. Hugh Segal, pursuant to notice of November 13, 2007, moved:

That whenever the Senate is sitting, the proceedings of the upper chamber, like those of the lower one, be televised, or otherwise audio-visually recorded, so that those proceedings can be carried live or replayed on CPAC, or any other television station, at times that are convenient for Canadians.

The Hon. the Speaker: Are honourable senators ready for the question?

Hon. Gerald J. Comeau (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, given that the honourable mover of this motion has not made any comments in regard to this item, I wonder if he might entertain answering a few questions for me.

Senator Segal: I would be honoured to do so.

The Hon. the Speaker: The motion is Senator Segal's motion, so we are on Senator Segal's time, with 15 minutes for questions and comments.

Senator Comeau: Honourable senators, I have no problem with this motion, but I have a number of questions that I should like the honourable senator to entertain.

First, this motion gives an order to someone, but it does not say to whom. It says, let us start televising, but who will do the televising?

Are we to expect the table to set up cameras in the room? What about Senator Corbin, who usually has problems with the fact that he has cameras in back of him? He usually raises objections on this and I might raise objections if a camera is placed between the leader and me.

These are some of the questions that are not answered in the motion because no one takes responsibility. It is simply an order from the Senate to someone out there, but we do not identify that person.

Second, because there is no indication as to what would be the cost of all this, has any consideration been given to costing? If it has not, who will do the costing? Will it be the Speaker or the table officers? The motion does not say.

Third, the motion says we will start televising, but to whom? No one seems to be identified to pick up the feed from the Senate. Is somebody responsible for finding someone to pick up the feed from the Senate? After we spend money putting in cameras, we may not be sending the feed anywhere.

These are the kinds of questions I have. The honourable senator is not identifying who will set this up or to whom we are giving the order. Is this motion something that will stand out there and no one will pick up the ball and run with it after we, as a chamber, pass the motion?

Senator Segal: I thank my honourable colleague for those thoughtful and direct questions.

My intent with respect to this motion was to have an expression of will. Is it or is it not the will of this chamber that we find some way to televise our proceedings? If the will is expressed to do so, I understand that I do not have the authority as a private senator to make any proposal that would facilitate the expenditure of funds or would have any impact on the rules of this place.

Once that will was expressed, it would be my hope that one could then consider a motion that was a direction to the Rules Committee or to the Internal Economy Committee to consider the modalities, with the advice of the table and others, with respect to how the will of this place might go forward in a fashion that struck all colleagues as fair, reasonable and cost efficient.

My good friend Senator Banks commented the other day that there may be a way to provide an efficient feed that does not involve television, but that could be picked up by anyone who wishes to have access thereto in ways that respect the new technology.

The Deputy Leader of the Government is absolutely correct to ensure that I am not implying that this motion constitutes an underwriting of cost or an acceptance willy-nilly of particular procedures. I have not, in this motion, suggested to whom the management of this proposition should now go; that is beyond me.

It is my hope that if the will to proceed was enunciated by this place, then the two sides, the minority and the majority, could work together on what would be the best modalities for looking at the details, the cost, and to what committee that matter might be referred. I consider that to be well beyond my pay scale. All I can do as a member of the Senate is suggest that the will might be expressed in a constructive way. I mean no more than that.

I surely do not mean, in any way, to limit the options of the chamber or the table with respect to how we might proceed. However, it struck me that if the will was expressed, we would have ample time — perhaps between the Christmas break and the return, now scheduled for the end of January — to consider some of those issues on a consultative basis between colleagues on both sides.

Senator Comeau: I believe I have made my point; I do not think the honourable senator should underestimate his own sense of importance in the chamber. He has proposed a motion that basically does not say who will do what. He has suggested that both sides might meet and talk about it, but that motion does not say so.

• (1500)

In my view, the motion would be much more powerful had it included a reference to the Internal Economy Committee to get back to us as to whether the concept is doable and what it would cost, rather than leaving it in a limbo as to maybe we do it and maybe we do not. The motion does not authorize anyone whatsoever to do anything. It is a nice, collective sigh — "I wish this would happen." However, most likely we would all go back to our everyday jobs the following day and nothing would happen to it. Put some teeth into this motion and let us send it off somewhere, where it is of value.

Senator Segal: I am more than delighted to take advice from those more learned and more experienced in the matter than myself. It struck me that it would be a waste of time and money to have the Internal Economy or the Rules Committee consider the modalities prior to this chamber expressing its will to be televised. Why go through the exercise of determining how we might do this, if this chamber — and I understand there to be a series of very different views on the matter — is not of the will that we should go forward? If we are not of the will that we should go forward, then that is the end of the matter. I will have made a suggestion and I would be delighted to accept the will of the chamber, and I will defend the decision taken by the chamber, either way.

The notion that we would begin detailed committee discussion about how we might do it before we know whether members of the chamber wish it to be done struck me as, perhaps, the wrong way to proceed. However, if others would prefer to proceed in another fashion, I am pleased to be cooperative in every sense.

Hon. George J. Furey: The problem is that the honourable senator's motion is not worded as a consultation but, rather, as a directive and will have the effect of an order of this chamber if we pass it.

Senator Segal: Yes; that would be my hope. If the honourable senator has "outed" me on that hope, he has done so expertly and I defer to that. It is my hope that once the chamber, should it choose to do so, expresses the will that we should be televised, then, when the various committees — that is, Internal Economy, Rules, and others — consider the modalities, they would be considering them with the understanding that it is the will of this chamber that it transpire.

Honourable senators, it has been my experience that with the best of people, particularly when they look at issues of cost, inconvenience and change, one can often slow down the process just by doing one's homework and by applying due diligence. If the process begins without this place having expressed its will precisely, then we could find ourselves, in six months' time, with outstanding work having been done but no clarity as to whether this place wishes to proceed. My hope was that we could get some clarity in that respect and then the various groups could proceed on that basis.

Senator Furey: Again, would it not be better if the honourable senator's motion was worded as a consultation as opposed to a directive? If it comes as a directive and an order of this chamber, then all of the questions that were raised by our colleague Senator Comeau will not be answered. There will be a directive to start putting cameras in here immediately. What Senator Comeau raises is an excellent point, and we should consider his points before we get an order to start erecting cameras in this chamber. If we reworded the honourable senator's motion such that it was a consultative motion rather than a directive, would that not be better?

Senator Segal: I suspect it would be. This motion is on the Order Paper as we speak. It is the second time this motion has been on the Order Paper; we had a similar one in the last session. I am completely comfortable with the Senate pronouncing upon this motion, with its strengths and weaknesses, and/or someone deciding to adjourn it, which may be what transpires — it is beyond my control. I am hopeful that we can find a way to express our will to proceed in a fashion that allows the rest of the process to have some direction and clarity to it rather than not express the will before we ask that the details be addressed and then find out that when the details come back, the will never existed to begin with, which may in fact be the case. I do not want to prejudge that.

Hon. David P. Smith: Honourable senators, on page 8 of the Order Paper, Honourable Senator Segal also has another motion, namely, for a referendum on the abolition of the Senate. Would it not seem to be a little odd to spend all this money before the continued existence of the Senate has been determined? The honourable senator cannot have it both ways.

Some Hon. Senators: Oh, oh!

Senator Segal: I sense my honourable colleague's question has broad popular support on both sides of the chamber. The honourable senator will know that my motion on the other matter

relates to a broad public referendum on whether the Senate should be abolished. He will know from the public record that I have indicated that I would be opposed to that abolition.

It is my very strong view that if the proceedings of this place were televised, not just in committee but in a fashion that resembles the way in which the House of Lords is televised, the narrow numbers now as between maintenance and abolition would shift toward maintenance, and I would be a champion of that cause. Furthermore, televised debates in this place would help make the case for its continuation on a responsible and constructive basis.

Hon. Lowell Murray: I was going to ask the Honourable Senator Segal and, inferentially, others who have taken part in this discussion, whether a solution might be found by amending his motion by putting a comma after the word "Canadians" and add the words "and that the Committee on Rules, or Internal Economy Committee", or whatever, "be directed to recommend modalities within a certain time frame."

Senator Segal: I would not pretend to know how to do that, but I would certainly accept the proposition as a great idea, and one that is consistent with what my deputy leader has been suggesting. If someone more learned than myself would know how to make that motion, I would support it.

Hon. Bill Rompkey: Honourable senators, given Senator Segal's position on his motion to abolish the Senate, could I ask him whether he is for or against televising the Senate?

Senator Segal: Honourable senators, I have long learned, in debating anyone from Newfoundland and Labrador, that when there is one path that leads to ontology and another one that leads to teleology, I should skip both.

Senator Rompkey: What we do not want is "palaeontology".

Senator Segal: I am for the televising of the Senate. I am for doing it in a fashion that is practical, efficient and fair. I believe a televised Senate would allow those of us who want a public referendum on its future and who are opposed to its abolition to make our case even more eloquently in the future.

Hon. A. Raynell Andreychuk: I should like to adjourn this debate, honourable senators.

The Hon. the Speaker: We have a motion that is not metaphysical at all.

On motion of Senator Andreychuk, debate adjourned.

THE SENATE

MOTION TO URGE GOVERNMENT TO ESTABLISH NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY IN NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. Jerahmiel S. Grafstein, pursuant to notice of December 4, 2007, moved:

That the Senate urge the Government to establish a National Portrait Gallery in the National Capital Region without delay.

He said: Honourable senators, you have been very patient with me today. I am speaking in support of this resolution, namely, that the Senate urge the government to establish a National Portrait Gallery in the National Capital Region without delay. I raise this now because I think it is timely for the Senate to opine on this measure because of the current situation as it pertains to the government.

• (1510)

Honourable senators, I do not mean to try your patience today. You have been very kind. The reason for this motion is that the government has announced recently that it intends to have, in effect, a competition between cities, pitting one city against the others across Canada to receive applications for siting the National Portrait Gallery outside the National Capital Region. It is my hope that prior to adjourning for the Christmas break, the Senate would opine on this question.

Honourable senators, I shall try to be brief. Back in the spring of 1998, I returned from a trip to London, England, where once again I had visited, as I usually do, the National Portrait Gallery, which is a stunning, elegant gallery of portraits of the great personalities of Britain through the ages. Included in the collection on various floors are portraits of the royalty, the courts, politicians and prime ministers. There is a wonderful portrait of the first war cabinet where you see Winston Churchill and Mr. Borden in the same cabinet together. This was the first imperial cabinet. There are fabulous portraits of business leaders and barons of business, actors, artists and ordinary working people from every walk of life.

In effect, the impression in the gallery is a virtual pictorial panorama of British history as seen through the great portraits of England, not only from its elite leadership but also from the perspective of the ordinary man in the street, if you will.

Each time I visit the gallery, there is an additional portrait or two. I invite all senators who have not visited that gallery, which is located in the heart of London, to do so on their next visit.

That spring, when I came back from London and discovered that the United States Embassy, which was located right across from Parliament Hill — that wonderful art nouveau building — was going to be left vacant, as the American embassy was moving around the corner, I thought it would be an excellent venue for a National Portrait Gallery for Canada. I contacted National Archives of Canada.

Allow me to quote from their letter, dated July 8, 1998.

Dear Senator Grafstein,

Recently, in conversation with John Cipton of the National Arts Centre, I learned of your interest in exploring the potential of creating a National Portrait Gallery in Canada. Your interest in national portraiture is shared by the National Archives of Canada.

Virtually since our formation in 1872, we have acquired portraits as historical documents, and our portrait holdings now number over 4 million items, including works of art such as paintings, prints, and caricatures, as well as major collections of photographs. Among these unique materials

is, for example, the only known portrait of a Beothuk painted from life, a very early photographic portrait of Sir John A. Macdonald, held as an intimate keepsake in a locket, and the entire studio of Yousuf Karsh. Over the years, this unparalleled collection of portraits, together with manuscript and other relevant records on the lives of Canadians which we hold, has become a much used resource for historians, educators, other exhibiting institutions and the media.

We, too, have regularly exhibited selections of these portrait holdings, as is demonstrated by the enclosed sampling of catalogues.

They were kind enough to send me a catalogue, which is available to all senators.

The letter continues:

Unfortunately, while we are actively acquiring and preserving Canada's portrait heritage, we do not as yet have a permanent exhibition space to offer the public ready access to these national treasures. . . .

The National Archives is committed to pursuing the display of our national portrait collection, as the benefits it would offer Canadians are indisputable, both in terms of strengthening Canadian identity and in enhancing pride in our heritage. Given your own interest in this area, I would like to invite you, and anyone you might like to accompany you, to visit the National Archives to see for yourself the breadth and scope of the National Archives' impressive portrait holdings, and how they could form the foundation for a new focus on this nation's people and their stories.

I would also like to learn more of your own ideas about how to showcase this aspect of our Canadian heritage.

After receiving that letter, I spoke to my colleague, one of Canada's great art experts, Senator Joyal, and he as well was interested in this project. I asked him if the two of us could join forces to see if we could persuade the government of the day — Mr. Chrétien was then the prime minister — to bring this about.

Senator Joyal was kind enough to give me a letter addressed to him on October 18, 1998 from the National Archives of Canada. I shall not read the letter in its entirety — because some of it reflects what is in the letter to me. I am reading this letter with the permission of Senator Joyal. It says:

Dear Senator Joyal,

Recently, during an enjoyable telephone conversation with Senator Grafstein about his interest in a National Portrait Gallery for Canada, I learned of your own desire to see Canadian portraiture made more available to the public. The interest you and Senator Grafstein have on this front is shared by the National Archives of Canada.

Mr. Lee McDonald, Acting National Archivist, goes on in that letter to repeat the same subject matter I previously read.

Senator Joyal will speak later, I would hope, in this debate. He and I then decided to attend on Mr. Chrétien, who was then the prime minister. It was fortunate, as Senator Joyal brought to my attention, that towards the back of this collection catalogue there was a very good photograph of Mr. Chrétien, taken in 1985.

Senator Joyal convinced me that this would become a very impressive document with which to persuade the Prime Minister to institute the National Portrait Gallery. To be fair to then Prime Minister Chrétien, he was immediately taken by the idea. He said he would pursue it, and indeed he did. He established a budget, with \$45 million to \$50 million as a target, I believe. A group of bureaucrats were put into place; plans were set afoot. Senator Joyal and I attended regularly at meetings to see if we could help them along the way.

Honourable senators will know that on the outside of that building — located across the street from Parliament Hill — there are a number of poster displays demonstrating the beginnings of the National Portrait Gallery, which was to be created thereafter, with some renovation.

The rationale for creating the portrait gallery was simple. Somewhere between 750,000 and 1.2 million Canadians from all walks of life visit Parliament Hill each year. When they are finished their magnificent tour of this building, and the adjacent buildings on the Hill, there is no place to go. This venue across from Parliament Hill would allow hundreds of thousands of Canadians to walk across the street and immediately enter into and gain easy access to an historic and fascinating collection of Canadiana, portraits of great Canadians, stretching back before Confederation — our undiscovered national treasure.

Senator Joyal and I thought this would be an appropriate and cost-effective way to display the National Archives collection, which I have visited. I urge each and every senator to cross the river and visit the National Archives and taste and sample some of these portraits. I am sure honourable senators will find them astounding and compelling. It would be very easy and cost-effective to bring them from that central point, which is in Gatineau, across the river, and rotate them across the street from Parliament on a regular basis so, in time, the entire collection would be seen by the public.

• (1520)

That building, in my view, and I think this is view shared by Senator Joyal but he will speak for himself, would become the second most famous building in Canada after the Parliament Buildings themselves. Each night, when the national news media focused on Parliament Hill, from time to time they would turn the cameras and we would see this splendid building in the background. We would be promoting a national institution of great interest, freely and easily, without a huge promotion budget. This would not be, in the words of Senator Segal, bloated economy. This would be a cost-effective way of promoting our national heritage.

To be fair, the government has not dismissed the idea of a National Portrait Gallery. My only quarrel with the government is that they intend to place it outside the capital region. Each and

every study indicates that the cost of transportation of rare collections over the years would be more than the cost of renovating a building in Ottawa. If you are looking for cost effectiveness, it is better to have the gallery here than outside the National Capital Region.

There is not a capital in the world — and all of us have visited capitals around the world — where there is not a fine collection of portraits of the national identity of the country. England has one, the United States has one. They are all located in the national capital. Moscow has one, Senator Fairbairn says, and Austria the same, so says Senator Joyal. When you travel the world, most of us who are interested in paintings visit these galleries. There is no reason why we cannot enhance our national identity and national history here in the capital region at the same time.

Let us look at the public polls. There is no question that Parliament and politicians are held in very low esteem in the polls. As a matter of fact, I remember when I first became a senator, I belled up my marks. Lawyers were ranked at 2 per cent in popularity in the poll, and politicians were 4 per cent. I rose from 2 per cent to 3 per cent on the average. Honourable senators, we have a responsibility to elevate the profile of both Ottawa and Parliament. This is an easy, cost-effective way to do it in this case.

I hope that honourable senators will agree to pass this resolution and to convince the government that we could move to establish the National Portrait Gallery cost effectively and quickly. The plans are afoot, and money has already been spent. This project could be implemented within a year and very cost effectively. I hope honourable senators will support this modest resolution to retain the National Portrait Gallery where it rightfully belongs, here in the National Capital Region.

Hon. Terry Stratton: Honourable senators, being from Winnipeg, which is one of the cities named on the list of possibilities to locate the gallery, I wish to adjourn the debate so that I may speak on behalf of the City of Winnipeg.

On motion of Senator Stratton, debate adjourned.

THE SENATE

INTRODUCTION OF NEW PAGE

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, before proceeding to the next item, I would like to introduce another page who is working with us this year.

Hannah Wyile was born in Fredericton New Brunswick; grew up in Edmonton, Alberta; and now hails from Wolfville, Nova Scotia. She is an ardent lover of music, literature and history. She recently completed her International Baccalaureate Diploma and is now in her first year at Carleton University, studying human rights and political science, with a concentration in international relations.

The Senate adjourned until Thursday, December 6, 2007, at 1:30 p.m.

APPENDIX

Officers of the Senate

The Ministry

Senators

(Listed according to seniority, alphabetically and by provinces)

Committees of the Senate

THE SPEAKER

The Honourable Noël A Kinsella

THE LEADER OF THE GOVERNMENT

The Honourable Marjory LeBreton, P.C.

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

The Honourable Céline Hervieux-Payette, P.C.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE**CLERK OF THE SENATE AND CLERK OF THE PARLIAMENTS**

Paul Bélisle

LAW CLERK AND PARLIAMENTARY COUNSEL

Mark Audcent

USHER OF THE BLACK ROD

Terrance J. Christopher

THE MINISTRY

(In order of precedence)

(December 5, 2007)

The Right Hon. Stephen Joseph Harper	Prime Minister
The Hon. Robert Douglas Nicholson	Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
The Hon. David Emerson	Minister of International Trade and Minister for the Pacific Gateway and the Vancouver-Whistler Olympics
The Hon. Jean-Pierre Blackburn	Minister of Labour and Minister of the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec
The Hon. Gregory Francis Thompson	Minister of Veterans Affairs
The Hon. Marjory LeBreton	Leader of the Government in the Senate and Secretary of State (Seniors)
The Hon. Monte Solberg	Minister of Human Resources and Social Development
The Hon. Chuck Strahl	Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians
The Hon. Gary Lunn	Minister of Natural Resources
The Hon. Peter Gordon MacKay	Minister of National Defence and Minister of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency
The Hon. Loyola Hearn	Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
The Hon. Stockwell Day	Minister of Public Safety
The Hon. Vic Toews	President of the Treasury Board
The Hon. Rona Ambrose	President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister of Western Economic Diversification
The Hon. Diane Finley	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
The Hon. Gordon O'Connor	Minister of National Revenue
The Hon. Beverley J. Oda	Minister of International Cooperation
The Hon. Jim Prentice	Minister of Industry
The Hon. John Baird	Minister of the Environment
The Hon. Maxime Bernier	Minister of Foreign Affairs
The Hon. Lawrence Cannon	Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities
The Hon. Tony Clement	Minister of Health and Minister for the Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario
The Hon. James Michael Flaherty	Minister of Finance
The Hon. Josée Verner	Minister of Canadian Heritage, Status of Women and Official Languages
The Hon. Michael Fortier	Minister of Public Works and Government Services
The Hon. Peter Van Loan	Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform
The Hon. Gerry Ritz	Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food and Minister for the Canadian Wheat Board
The Hon. Jay D. Hill	Secretary of State and Chief Government Whip
The Hon. Jason Kenney	Secretary of State (Multiculturalism and Canadian Identity)
The Hon. Helena Guergis	Secretary of State (Foreign Affairs and International Trade) (Sport)
The Hon. Christian Paradis	Secretary of State (Agriculture)
The Hon. Diane Ablonczy	Secretary of State (Small Business and Tourism)

SENATORS OF CANADA

ACCORDING TO SENIORITY

(December 5, 2007)

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
Willie Adams	Nunavut	Rankin Inlet, Nunavut
Lowell Murray, P.C.	Pakenham	Ottawa, Ont.
Peter Alan Stollery	Bloor and Yonge	Toronto, Ont.
Peter Michael Pitfield, P.C.	Ottawa-Vanier	Ottawa, Ont.
Jerahmiel S. Grafstein	Metro Toronto	Toronto, Ont.
Anne C. Cools	Toronto Centre-York	Toronto, Ont.
Charlie Watt	Inkerman	Kuujuuaq, Que.
Joyce Fairbairn, P.C.	Lethbridge	Lethbridge, Alta.
Colin Kenny	Rideau	Ottawa, Ont.
Pierre De Bané, P.C.	De la Vallière	Montreal, Que.
Eymard Georges Corbin	Grand-Sault	Grand-Sault, N.B.
Norman K. Atkins	Markham	Toronto, Ont.
Ethel Cochrane	Newfoundland and Labrador	Port-au-Port, Nfld. & Lab.
Mira Spivak	Manitoba	Winnipeg, Man.
Pat Carney, P.C.	British Columbia	Vancouver, B.C.
Gerald J. Comeau	Nova Scotia	Saulnierville, N.S.
Consiglio Di Nino	Ontario	Downsview, Ont.
Donald H. Oliver	South Shore	Halifax, N.S.
Noël A. Kinsella, <i>Speaker</i>	Fredericton-York-Sunbury	Fredericton, N.B.
J. Trevor Eytton	Ontario	Caledon, Ont.
Wilbert Joseph Keon	Ottawa	Ottawa, Ont.
Michael Arthur Meighen	St. Marys	Toronto, Ont.
Janis G. Johnson	Winnipeg-Interlake	Gimli, Man.
A. Raynell Andreychuk	Saskatchewan	Regina, Sask.
Jean-Claude Rivest	Stadacona	Quebec, Que.
Terrance R. Stratton	Red River	St. Norbert, Man.
Marcel Prud'homme, P.C.	La Salle	Montreal, Que.
Leonard J. Gustafson	Saskatchewan	Macoun, Sask.
David Tkachuk	Saskatchewan	Saskatoon, Sask.
W. David Angus	Alma	Montreal, Que.
Pierre Claude Nolin	De Salaberry	Quebec, Que.
Marjory LeBreton, P.C.	Ontario	Manotick, Ont.
Gerry St. Germain, P.C.	Langley-Pemberton-Whistler	Maple Ridge, B.C.
Lise Bacon	De la Durantaye	Laval, Que.
Sharon Carstairs, P.C.	Manitoba	Winnipeg, Man.
John G. Bryden	New Brunswick	Bayfield, N.B.
Rose-Marie Losier-Cool	Tracadie	Bathurst, N.B.
Céline Hervieux-Payette, P.C.	Bedford	Montreal, Que.
William H. Rompkey, P.C.	North West River, Labrador	North West River, Labrador, Nfld. & Lab.
Lorna Milne	Peel County	Brampton, Ont.
Marie-P. Poulin	Nord de l'Ontario/Northern Ontario	Ottawa, Ont.

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
Wilfred P. Moore	Stanhope St./South Shore	Chester, N.S.
Lucie Pépin	Shawinigan	Montreal, Que.
Fernand Robichaud, P.C.	New Brunswick	Saint-Louis-de-Kent, N.B.
Catherine S. Callbeck	Prince Edward Island	Central Bedeque, P.E.I.
Serge Joyal, P.C.	Kennebec	Montreal, Que.
Joan Cook	Newfoundland and Labrador	St. John's, Nfld. & Lab.
Ross Fitzpatrick	Okanagan-Similkameen	Kelowna, B.C.
Francis William Mahovlich	Toronto	Toronto, Ont.
Joan Thorne Fraser	De Lorimier	Montreal, Que.
Aurélien Gill	Wellington	Mashteuiatsh, Pointe-Bleue, Que.
Vivienne Poy	Toronto	Toronto, Ont.
George Furey	Newfoundland and Labrador	St. John's, Nfld. & Lab.
Nick G. Sibbeston	Northwest Territories	Fort Simpson, N.W.T.
Tommy Banks	Alberta	Edmonton, Alta.
Jane Cordy	Nova Scotia	Dartmouth, N.S.
Elizabeth M. Hubley	Prince Edward Island	Kensington, P.E.I.
Mobina S.B. Jaffer	British Columbia	North Vancouver, B.C.
Jean Lapointe	Saurel	Magog, Que.
Gerard A. Phalen	Nova Scotia	Glace Bay, N.S.
Joseph A. Day	Saint John-Kennebecasis	Hampton, N.B.
Michel Biron	Mille Isles	Nicolet, Que.
George S. Baker, P.C.	Newfoundland and Labrador	Gander, Nfld. & Lab.
Raymond Lavigne	Montarville	Verdun, Que.
David P. Smith, P.C.	Cobourg	Toronto, Ont.
Maria Chaput	Manitoba	Sainte-Anne, Man.
Pana Merchant	Saskatchewan	Regina, Sask.
Pierrette Ringuette	New Brunswick	Edmundston, N.B.
Percy Downe	Charlottetown	Charlottetown, P.E.I.
Paul J. Massicotte	De Lanaudière	Mont-Saint-Hilaire, Que.
Mac Harb	Ontario	Ottawa, Ont.
Marilyn Trenholme Counsell	New Brunswick	Sackville, N.B.
Terry M. Mercer	Northend Halifax	Caribou River, N.S.
Jim Munson	Ottawa/Rideau Canal	Ottawa, Ont.
Claudette Tardif	Alberta	Edmonton, Alta.
Grant Mitchell	Alberta	Edmonton, Alta.
Elaine McCoy	Alberta	Calgary, Alta.
Robert W. Peterson	Saskatchewan	Regina, Sask.
Lillian Eva Dyck	Saskatchewan	Saskatoon, Sask.
Art Eggleton, P.C.	Ontario	Toronto, Ont.
Nancy Ruth	Cluny	Toronto, Ont.
Roméo Antonius Dallaire	Gulf	Sainte-Foy, Que.
James S. Cowan	Nova Scotia	Halifax, N.S.
Andrée Champagne, P.C.	Grandville	Saint-Hyacinthe, Que.
Hugh Segal	Kingston-Frontenac-Leeds	Kingston, Ont.
Larry W. Campbell	British Columbia	Vancouver, B.C.
Rod A.A. Zimmer	Manitoba	Winnipeg, Man.
Dennis Dawson	Lauzon	Sainte-Foy, Que.
Yoine Goldstein	Rigaud	Montreal, Que.
Francis Fox, P.C.	Victoria	Montreal, Que.
Sandra Lovelace Nicholas	New Brunswick	Tobique First Nations, N.B.
Michael Fortier, P.C.	Rougemont	Town of Mount Royal, Que.
Bert Brown	Alberta	Kathryn, Alta.

SENATORS OF CANADA

ALPHABETICAL LIST

(December 5, 2007)

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address	Political Affiliation
THE HONOURABLE			
Adams, Willie	Nunavut	Rankin Inlet, Nunavut	Liberal
Andreychuk, A. Raynell	Saskatchewan	Regina, Sask.	Conservative
Angus, W. David	Alma	Montreal, Que.	Conservative
Atkins, Norman K.	Markham	Toronto, Ont.	Progressive Conservative
Bacon, Lise	De la Durantaye	Laval, Que.	Liberal
Baker, George S., P.C.	Newfoundland and Labrador	Gander, Nfld. & Lab.	Liberal
Banks, Tommy	Alberta	Edmonton, Alta.	Liberal
Biron, Michel	Mille Isles	Nicolet, Que.	Liberal
Brown, Bert	Alberta	Kathyrn, Alta.	Conservative
Bryden, John G.	New Brunswick	Bayfield, N.B.	Liberal
Callbeck, Catherine S.	Prince Edward Island	Central Bedeque, P.E.I.	Liberal
Campbell, Larry W.	British Columbia	Vancouver, B.C.	Liberal
Carney, Pat, P.C.	British Columbia	Vancouver, B.C.	Conservative
Carstairs, Sharon, P.C.	Manitoba	Winnipeg, Man.	Liberal
Champagne, Andrée, P.C.	Grandville	Saint-Hyacinthe, Que.	Conservative
Chaput, Maria	Manitoba	Sainte-Anne, Man.	Liberal
Cochrane, Ethel	Newfoundland and Labrador	Port-au-Port, Nfld. & Lab.	Conservative
Comeau, Gerald J.	Nova Scotia	Saulnierville, N.S.	Conservative
Cook, Joan	Newfoundland and Labrador	St. John's, Nfld. & Lab.	Liberal
Cools, Anne C.	Toronto Centre-York	Toronto, Ont.	Conservative
Corbin, Eymard Georges	Grand-Sault	Grand-Sault, N.B.	Liberal
Cordy, Jane	Nova Scotia	Dartmouth, N.S.	Liberal
Cowan, James S.	Nova Scotia	Halifax, N.S.	Liberal
Dallaire, Roméo Antonius	Gulf	Sainte-Foy, Que.	Liberal
Dawson, Dennis	Lauson	Ste-Foy, Que.	Liberal
Day, Joseph A.	Saint John-Kennebecasis	Hampton, N.B.	Liberal
De Bané, Pierre, P.C.	De la Vallière	Montreal, Que.	Liberal
Di Nino, Consiglio	Ontario	Downsview, Ont.	Conservative
Downe, Percy	Charlottetown	Charlottetown, P.E.I.	Liberal
Dyck, Lillian Eva	Saskatchewan	Saskatoon, Sask.	Ind. New Democrat
Eggleton, Art, P.C.	Ontario	Toronto, Ont.	Liberal
Eyton, J. Trevor	Ontario	Caledon, Ont.	Conservative
Fairbairn, Joyce, P.C.	Lethbridge	Lethbridge, Alta.	Liberal
Fitzpatrick, Ross	Okanagan-Similkameen	Kelowna, B.C.	Liberal
Fortier, Michael, P.C.	Rougemont	Town of Mount Royal, Que.	Conservative
Fox, Francis, P.C.	Victoria	Montreal, Que.	Liberal
Fraser, Joan Thorne	De Lorimier	Montreal, Que.	Liberal
Furey, George	Newfoundland and Labrador	St. John's, Nfld. & Lab.	Liberal
Gill, Aurélien	Wellington	Mashteuiatsh, Pointe-Bleue, Que.	Liberal
Goldstein, Yoine	Rigaud	Montreal, Que.	Liberal
Grafstein, Jeremiah S.	Metro Toronto	Toronto, Ont.	Liberal
Gustafson Leonard J.	Saskatchewan	Macoun, Sask.	Conservative
Harb, Mac	Ontario	Ottawa, Ont.	Liberal
Hervieux-Payette, Céline, P.C.	Bedford	Montreal, Que.	Liberal
Hubley, Elizabeth M.	Prince Edward Island	Kensington, P.E.I.	Liberal
Jaffer, Mobina S. B.	British Columbia	North Vancouver, B.C.	Liberal

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address	Political Affiliation
Johnson, Janis G.	Winnipeg-Interlake	Gimli, Man.	Conservative
Joyal, Serge, P.C.	Kennebec	Montreal, Que.	Liberal
Kenny, Colin	Rideau	Ottawa, Ont.	Liberal
Keon, Wilbert Joseph	Ottawa	Ottawa, Ont.	Conservative
Kinsella, Noël A., <i>Speaker</i>	Fredericton-York-Sunbury	Fredericton, N.B.	Conservative
Lapointe, Jean	Saurel	Magog, Que.	Liberal
Lavigne, Raymond	Montarville	Verdun, Que.	Liberal
LeBreton, Marjory, P.C.	Ontario	Manotick, Ont.	Conservative
Losier-Cool, Rose-Marie	Tracadie	Bathurst, N.B.	Liberal
Lovelace Nicholas, Sandra	New Brunswick	Tobique First Nations, N.B.	Liberal
Mahovlich, Francis William	Toronto	Toronto, Ont.	Liberal
Massicotte, Paul J.	De Lanaudière	Mont-Saint-Hilaire, Que.	Liberal
McCoy, Elaine	Alberta	Calgary, Alta.	Progressive Conservative
Meighen, Michael Arthur	St. Marys	Toronto, Ont.	Conservative
Mercer, Terry M.	Northend Halifax	Caribou River, N.S.	Liberal
Merchant, Pana	Saskatchewan	Regina, Sask.	Liberal
Milne, Lorna	Peel County	Brampton, Ont.	Liberal
Mitchell, Grant	Alberta	Edmonton, Alta.	Liberal
Moore, Wilfred P.	Stanhope St./South Shore	Chester, N.S.	Liberal
Munson, Jim	Ottawa/Rideau Canal	Ottawa, Ont.	Liberal
Murray, Lowell, P.C.	Pakenham	Ottawa, Ont.	Progressive Conservative
Nancy Ruth	Cluny	Toronto, Ont.	Conservative
Nolin, Pierre Claude	De Salaberry	Quebec, Que.	Conservative
Oliver, Donald H.	South Shore	Halifax, N.S.	Conservative
Pépin, Lucie	Shawinigan	Montreal, Que.	Liberal
Peterson, Robert W.	Saskatchewan	Regina, Sask.	Liberal
Phalen, Gerard A.	Nova Scotia	Glace Bay, N.S.	Liberal
Pitfield, Peter Michael, P.C.	Ottawa-Vanier	Ottawa, Ont.	Independent
Poulin, Marie-P.	Nord de l'Ontario/Northern Ontario	Ottawa, Ont.	Liberal
Poy, Vivienne	Toronto	Toronto, Ont.	Liberal
Prud'homme, Marcel, P.C.	La Salle	Montreal, Que.	Independent
Ringuette, Pierrette	New Brunswick	Edmundston, N.B.	Liberal
Rivest, Jean-Claude	Stadacona	Quebec, Que.	Independent
Robichaud, Fernand, P.C.	New Brunswick	Saint-Louis-de-Kent, N.B.	Liberal
Rompkey, William H., P.C.	North West River, Labrador	North West River, Labrador, Nfld. & Lab.	Liberal
St. Germain, Gerry, P.C.	Langley-Pemberton-Whistler	Maple Ridge, B.C.	Conservative
Segal, Hugh	Kingston-Frontenac-Leeds	Kingston, Ont.	Conservative
Sibbeston, Nick G.	Northwest Territories	Fort Simpson, N.W.T.	Liberal
Smith, David P., P.C.	Cobourg	Toronto, Ont.	Liberal
Spivak, Mira	Manitoba	Winnipeg, Man.	Independent
Stollery, Peter Alan	Bloor and Yonge	Toronto, Ont.	Liberal
Stratton, Terrance R.	Red River	St. Norbert, Man.	Conservative
Tardif, Claudette	Alberta	Edmonton, Alta.	Liberal
Tkachuk, David	Saskatchewan	Saskatoon, Sask.	Conservative
Trenholme Counsell, Marilyn	New Brunswick	Sackville, N.B.	Liberal
Watt, Charlie	Inkerman	Kuujuuaq, Que.	Liberal
Zimmer, Rod A.A.	Manitoba	Winnipeg, Man.	Liberal

SENATORS OF CANADA
BY PROVINCE AND TERRITORY
(December 5, 2007)

ONTARIO—24

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
1 Lowell Murray, P.C.	Pakenham	Ottawa
2 Peter Alan Stollery	Bloor and Yonge	Toronto
3 Peter Michael Pitfield, P.C.	Ottawa-Vanier	Ottawa
4 Jeremiah S. Grafstein	Metro Toronto	Toronto
5 Anne C. Cools	Toronto Centre-York	Toronto
6 Colin Kenny	Rideau	Ottawa
7 Norman K. Atkins	Markham	Toronto
8 Consiglio Di Nino	Ontario	Downsview
9 John Trevor Eyton	Ontario	Caledon
10 Wilbert Joseph Keon	Ottawa	Ottawa
11 Michael Arthur Meighen	St. Marys	Toronto
12 Marjory LeBreton, P.C.	Ontario	Manotick
13 Lorna Milne	Peel County	Brampton
14 Marie-P. Poulin	Northern Ontario	Ottawa
15 Francis William Mahovlich	Toronto	Toronto
16 Vivienne Poy	Toronto	Toronto
17 David P. Smith, P.C.	Cobourg	Toronto
18 Mac Harb	Ontario	Ottawa
19 Jim Munson	Ottawa/Rideau Canal	Ottawa
20 Art Eggleton, P.C.	Ontario	Toronto
21 Nancy Ruth	Cluny	Toronto
22 Hugh Segal	Kingston-Frontenac-Leeds	Kingston
23	
24	

SENATORS BY PROVINCE AND TERRITORY

QUEBEC—24

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
1 Charlie Watt	Inkerman	Kuujuaq
2 Pierre De Bané, P.C.	De la Vallière	Montreal
3 Jean-Claude Rivest	Stadacona	Quebec
4 Marcel Prud'homme, P.C.	La Salle	Montreal
5 W. David Angus	Alma	Montreal
6 Pierre Claude Nolin	De Salaberry	Quebec
7 Lise Bacon	De la Durantaye	Laval
8 Céline Hervieux-Payette, P.C.	Bedford	Montreal
9 Lucie Pépin	Shawinigan	Montreal
10 Serge Joyal, P.C.	Kennebec	Montreal
11 Joan Thorne Fraser	De Lorimier	Montreal
12 Aurélien Gill	Wellington	Mashteuiatsh, Pointe-Bleue
13 Jean Lapointe	Saurel	Magog
14 Michel Biron	Milles Isles	Nicolet
15 Raymond Lavigne	Montarville	Verdun
16 Paul J. Massicotte	De Lanaudière	Mont-Saint-Hilaire
17 Roméo Antonius Dallaire	Gulf	Sainte-Foy
18 Andrée Champagne, P.C.	Grandville	Saint-Hyacinthe
19 Dennis Dawson	Lauzon	Ste-Foy
20 Yoine Goldstein	Rigaud	Montreal
21 Francis Fox, P.C.	Victoria	Montreal
22 Michael Fortier, P.C.	Rougemont	Town of Mount Royal
23		
24		

SENATORS BY PROVINCE-MARITIME DIVISION

NOVA SCOTIA—10

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
1 Gerald J. Comeau	Nova Scotia	Saulnierville
2 Donald H. Oliver	South Shore	Halifax
3 Wilfred P. Moore	Stanhope St./South Shore	Chester
4 Jane Cordy	Nova Scotia	Dartmouth
5 Gerard A. Phalen	Nova Scotia	Glace Bay
6 Terry M. Mercer	Northend Halifax	Caribou River
7 James S. Cowan	Nova Scotia	Halifax
8		
9		
10		

NEW BRUNSWICK—10

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
1 Eymard Georges Corbin	Grand-Sault	Grand-Sault
2 Noël A. Kinsella, <i>Speaker</i>	Fredericton-York-Sunbury	Fredericton
3 John G. Bryden	New Brunswick	Bayfield
4 Rose-Marie Losier-Cool	Tracadie	Bathurst
5 Fernand Robichaud, P.C.	Saint-Louis-de-Kent	Saint-Louis-de-Kent
6 Joseph A. Day	Saint John-Kennebecasis, New Brunswick	Hampton
7 Pierrette Ringuette	New Brunswick	Edmundston
8 Marilyn Trenholme Counsell	New Brunswick	Sackville
9 Sandra Lovelace Nicholas	New Brunswick	Tobique First Nations
10		

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—4

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
1 Catherine S. Callbeck	Prince Edward Island	Central Bedeque
2 Elizabeth M. Hubley	Prince Edward Island	Kensington
3 Percy Downe	Charlottetown	Charlottetown
4		

SENATORS BY PROVINCE-WESTERN DIVISION

MANITOBA—6

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
1 Mira Spivak	Manitoba	Winnipeg
2 Janis G. Johnson	Winnipeg-Interlake	Gimli
3 Terrance R. Stratton	Red River	St. Norbert
4 Sharon Carstairs, P.C.	Manitoba	Winnipeg
5 Maria Chaput	Manitoba	Sainte-Anne
6 Rod A.A. Zimmer	Manitoba	Winnipeg

BRITISH COLUMBIA—6

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
1 Pat Carney, P.C.	British Columbia	Vancouver
2 Gerry St. Germain, P.C.	Langley-Pemberton-Whistler	Maple Ridge
3 Ross Fitzpatrick	Okanagan-Similkameen	Kelowna
4 Mobina S.B. Jaffer	British Columbia	North Vancouver
5 Larry W. Campbell	British Columbia	Vancouver
6

SASKATCHEWAN—6

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
1 A. Raynell Andreychuk	Saskatchewan	Regina
2 Leonard J. Gustafson	Saskatchewan	Macoun
3 David Tkachuk	Saskatchewan	Saskatoon
4 Pana Merchant	Saskatchewan	Regina
5 Robert W. Peterson	Saskatchewan	Regina
6 Lillian Eva Dyck	Saskatchewan	Saskatoon

ALBERTA—6

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
1 Joyce Fairbairn, P.C.	Lethbridge	Lethbridge
2 Tommy Banks	Alberta	Edmonton
3 Claudette Tardif	Alberta	Edmonton
4 Grant Mitchell	Alberta	Edmonton
5 Elaine McCoy	Alberta	Calgary
6 Bert Brown	Alberta	Kathryn

SENATORS BY PROVINCE AND TERRITORY

NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR—6

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
1 Ethel Cochrane	Newfoundland and Labrador	Port-au-Port
2 William H. Rompkey, P.C.	North West River, Labrador	North West River, Labrador
3 Joan Cook	Newfoundland and Labrador	St. John's
4 George Furey	Newfoundland and Labrador	St. John's
5 George S. Baker, P.C.	Newfoundland and Labrador	Gander
6		

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES—1

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
1 Nick G. Sibbeston	Northwest Territories	Fort Simpson

NUNAVUT—1

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
1 Willie Adams	Nunavut	Rankin Inlet

YUKON—1

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
1		

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF STANDING, SPECIAL AND JOINT COMMITTEES

(As of December 5, 2007)

*Ex Officio Member

ABORIGINAL PEOPLES

Chair: Honourable Senator St. Germain, P.C.

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Sibbeston

Honourable Senators:

Campbell,	Gill,	* LeBreton, P.C. (or Comeau),	St. Germain, P.C.
Carney, P.C.	Gustafson,	Lovelace Nicholas,	Segal,
Dallaire,	* Hervieux-Payette, P.C. (or Tardif),	Peterson,	Sibbeston.
Dyck,	Hubley,		

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Campbell, Carney, P.C., Dallaire, Dyck, Gill, Gustafson, *Hervieux-Payette, P.C. (or Tardif), Hubley, *LeBreton, P.C. (or Comeau), Lovelace Nicholas, Peterson, St. Germain, P.C., Segal, Sibbeston.*

AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

Chair: Honourable Senator Fairbairn, P.C.

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Gustafson

Honourable Senators:

Baker, P.C.,	Fairbairn, P.C.,	* LeBreton, P.C. (or Comeau),	Peterson,
Callbeck,	Gustafson,	Mahovlich,	St. Germain, P.C.,
Carney, P.C.,	* Hervieux-Payette, P.C. (or Tardif),	Mercer,	Segal.

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Bacon, Baker, P.C., Callbeck, , P.C. Carney, Cowan, Fairbairn, P.C., Gustafson, *Hervieux-Payette, P.C. (or Tardif), *LeBreton, P.C. (or Comeau), Mahovlich, Mercer, Peterson, Segal, St. Germain, P.C.*

BANKING, TRADE AND COMMERCE

Chair: Honourable Senator Angus

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Goldstein

Honourable Senators:

Angus,	Goldstein,	* LeBreton, P.C. (or Comeau),	Moore,
Biron,	Harb,	Massicotte,	Ringuette,
Eyton,	* Hervieux-Payette, P.C. (or Tardif),	Meighen,	Tkachuk.
Fitzpatrick,			

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Angus, Biron, Cowan, Eyton, Fitzpatrick, Goldstein, Grafstein, Harb, *Hervieux-Payette, P.C. (or Tardif), *LeBreton, P.C. (or Comeau), Massicotte, Meighen, Ringuette, Tkachuk.*

ENERGY, THE ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Chair: Honourable Senator Banks

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Nolin

Honourable Senators:

Adams,	Cochrane,	Milne,	Sibbeston,
Banks,	* Hervieux-Payette, P.C. (or Tardif),	Mitchell,	Spivak,
Brown,	Kenny,	Nolin,	Trenholme Counsell.
Campbell,	* LeBreton, P.C. (or Comeau),		

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Adams, Banks, Brown, Campbell, Cochrane, *Hervieux-Payette, P.C. (or Tardif), Kenny, *LeBreton, P.C. (or Comeau), Milne, Mitchell, Nolin, Sibbeston, Spivak, Trenholme Counsell.*

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Chair: Honourable Senator Rompkey, P.C.

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Cochrane

Honourable Senators:

Adams,	Cowan,	* LeBreton, P.C. (or Comeau),	Robichaud, P.C.,
Campbell,	Gill,	Meighen,	Rompkey, P.C.,
Cochrane,	* Hervieux-Payette, P.C. (or Tardif),	Peterson,	Watt.
Comeau,	Johnson,		

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Adams, Campbell, Cochrane, Comeau, Cowan, Gill, *Hervieux-Payette, P.C. (or Tardif), Hubley, Johnson, *LeBreton, P.C. (or Comeau), Meighen, Robichaud, P.C., Rompkey, P.C., Watt.*

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Chair: Honourable Senator Di Nino

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Stollery

Honourable Senators:

Corbin,	Downe,	* LeBreton, P.C. (or Comeau),	Rivest,
Dawson,	Grafstein,	Mahovlich,	Smith, P.C.,
De Bané, P.C.,	* Hervieux-Payette, P.C. (or Tardif),	Nolin,	Stollery.
Di Nino,	Johnson,		

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Corbin, Dawson, De Bané, P.C., Di Nino, Downe, *Hervieux-Payette, P.C. (or Tardif), Jaffer, Johnson, *LeBreton, P.C. (or Comeau), Mahovlich, Nolin, Rivest, Smith, P.C., Stollery.*

HUMAN RIGHTS

Chair: Honourable Senator Andreychuk

Deputy Chair:

Honourable Senators:

Andreychuk,	Jaffer,	Lovelace Nicholas,	Pépin,
Dallaire,	Kinsella,	Munson,	Poy.
* Hervieux-Payette, P.C. (or Tardif),	* LeBreton, P.C. (or Comeau),	Oliver,	

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Andreychuk, Dallaire, *Hervieux-Payette, P.C. (or Tardif), Jaffer, Kinsella, *LeBreton, P.C. (or Comeau), Lovelace Nicholas, Munson, Oliver, Pépin, Poy.*

INTERNAL ECONOMY, BUDGETS AND ADMINISTRATION

Chair: Honourable Senator Furey

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Stratton

Honourable Senators:

Comeau,	Goldstein,	Massicotte,	Robichaud, P.C.,
Cook,	* Hervieux-Payette, P.C. (or Tardif),	Nancy Ruth,	Stollery,
Cowan,	Jaffer,	Phalen,	Stratton.
Downe,	Kinsella,	Prud'homme, P.C.,	
Furey,	* LeBreton, P.C. (or Comeau),		

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Comeau, Cook, Cowan, Downe, Furey, Goldstein, *Hervieux-Payette, P.C. (or Tardif), Jaffer, Kinsella, *LeBreton, P.C. (or Comeau), Massicotte, Nancy Ruth, Phalen, Prud'homme, P.C., Robichaud, P.C., Stollery, Stratton.*

LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS

Chair: Honourable Senator Fraser

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Andreychuk

Honourable Senators:

Andreychuk,	Fraser,	* LeBreton, P.C. (or Comeau),	Oliver,
Baker, P.C.,	* Hervieux-Payette, P.C. (or Tardif),	Merchant,	Stratton
Bryden,	Jaffer,	Milne,	Watt.
Di Nino,	Joyal, P.C.,		

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Andreychuk, Baker, P.C., Bryden, Carstairs, P.C., Di Nino, Fraser, Furey, *Hervieux-Payette, P.C. (or Tardif), Joyal, P.C., *LeBreton, P.C. (or Comeau), Milne, Oliver, Stratton, Watt.*

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT (Joint)

Joint Chair: Honourable Senator Trenholme Counsell

Honourable Senators:

Lapointe, Murray, P.C.,	Oliver,	Rompkey, P.C.,	Trenholme Counsell.
----------------------------	---------	----------------	---------------------

Original Members agreed to by Motion of the Senate
Lapointe, Murray, P.C., Oliver, Rompkey, P.C., Trenholme Counsell.

NATIONAL FINANCE

Chair: Honourable Senator Day

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Stratton

Honourable Senators:

Biron, Chaput, Cowan, Day,	De Bané, P.C., Di Nino, Eggleton, P.C., * Hervieux-Payette, P.C. (or Tardif),	* LeBreton, P.C. (or Comeau), Mitchell, Murray, P.C.	Nancy Ruth, Ringuette, Stratton.
-------------------------------------	--	--	--

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection
*Biron, Cowan, Day, De Bané, P.C., Di Nino, Eggleton, P.C., *Hervieux-Payette, P.C. (or Tardif),*
**LeBreton, P.C. (or Comeau), Mitchell, Moore, Murray, P.C., Nancy Ruth, Ringuette, Stratton.*

NATIONAL SECURITY AND DEFENCE

Chair: Honourable Senator Kenny

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Tkachuk

Honourable Senators:

Banks, Day, * Hervieux-Payette, P.C. (or Tardif),	Kenny, * LeBreton, P.C. (or Comeau), Meighen,	Mitchell, Moore, Nancy Ruth,	Tkachuk, Zimmer.
---	---	------------------------------------	---------------------

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection
*Atkins, Banks, Day, *Hervieux-Payette, P.C. (or Tardif), Kenny, *LeBreton, P.C. (or Comeau),*
Meighen, Moore, Nancy Ruth, Tkachuk, Zimmer.

SUBCOMMITTEE VETERANS AFFAIRS

Chair: Honourable Senator Meighen

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Day

Honourable Senators:

Banks,	* Hervieux-Payette, P.C. (or Tardif),	* LeBreton, P.C. (or Comeau),	Nancy Ruth.
Day,	Kenny,	Meighen,	

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Chair: Honourable Senator Chaput

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Champagne, P.C.

Honourable Senators:

Champagne, P.C.,	De Bané, P.C.,	* LeBreton, P.C. (or Comeau),	Poulin,
Chaput,	Goldstein,	Losier-Cool,	Tardif.
Comeau,	* Hervieux-Payette, P.C. (or Tardif),	Murray, P.C.,	

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Champagne, P.C., Chaput, Comeau, De Bané, P.C., Goldstein, Harb,
*Hervieux-Payette, P.C. (or Tardif), *LeBreton, P.C. (or Comeau), Losier-Cool, Murray, P.C., Tardif.*

RULES, PROCEDURES AND THE RIGHTS OF PARLIAMENT

Chair: Honourable Senator Keon

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Smith, P.C.

Honourable Senators:

Andreychuk,	Corbin,	* Hervieux-Payette, P.C. (or Tardif),	Losier-Cool,
Angus,	Cordy,	Joyal, P.C.,	McCoy,
Brown,	Fraser,	Keon,	Robichaud, P.C.,
Champagne, P.C.,	Furey,	* LeBreton, P.C. (or Comeau),	Smith, P.C.
Cools,			

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Andreychuk, Angus, Brown, Champagne, P.C., Corbin, Cordy, Fraser, Furey, Grafstein,
*Hervieux-Payette, P.C. (or Tardif), Joyal, P.C., Keon, *LeBreton, P.C. (or Comeau),
Losier-Cool, McCoy, Robichaud, P.C., Smith, P.C.*

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS (Joint)

Joint Chair: Honourable Senator Eyton

Honourable Senators:

Bacon,	Bryden,	Harb,	Nolin,
Biron,	Eyton,	Moore,	St. Germain, P.C.

Original Members as agreed to by Motion of the Senate

Biron, Bryden, Cook, Eyton, Harb, Moore, Nolin, St. Germain, P.C.

SELECTION

Chair: Honourable Senator Segal

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Cowan

Honourable Senators:

Bacon,	Fraser,	Nancy Ruth,	Stratton,
Cowan,	* Hervieux-Payette, P.C. (or Tardif),	Robichaud, P.C.,	Tkachuk.
Fairbairn, P.C.,	* LeBreton, P.C. (or Comeau),	Segal,	

Original Members agreed to by Motion of the Senate

*Bacon, Cowan, Fairbairn, P.C., Fraser, *Hervieux-Payette, P.C. (or Tardif),
LeBreton, P.C. (or Comeau), Nancy Ruth, Robichaud, P.C., Segal, Stratton, Tkachuk.

SOCIAL AFFAIRS, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Chair: Honourable Senator Eggleton, P.C.

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Keon

Honourable Senators:

Brown,	Cook,	* Hervieux-Payette, P.C. (or Tardif),	Munson,
Callbeck,	Cordy,	Keon,	Pépin,
Champagne, P.C.,	Eggleton, P.C.,	* LeBreton, P.C. (or Comeau),	Trenholme Counsell.
Cochrane,	Fairbairn, P.C.,		

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Brown, Callbeck, Champagne, P.C., Cochrane, Cook, Cordy, Eggleton, P.C., Fairbairn, P.C.,
*Hervieux-Payette, P.C. (or Tardif), Keon, *LeBreton, P.C. (or Comeau),
Munson, Pépin, Trenholme Counsell.*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CITIES

Chair: Honourable Senator Eggleton, P.C.

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Champagne, P.C.

Honourable Senators:

Champagne, P.C.,	Eggleton, P.C.,	Keon,	Munson,
Cordy,	* Hervieux-Payette, P.C. (or Tardif),	* LeBreton, P.C. (or Comeau),	Trenholme Counsell.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON POPULATION HEALTH

Chair: Honourable Senator Keon

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Pépin

Honourable Senators:

Brown,	Cook,	* Hervieux-Payette, P.C. (or Tardif),	* LeBreton, P.C. (or Comeau),
Callbeck,	Fairbairn, P.C.,	Keon,	Pépin.
Cochrane,			

TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

Chair: Honourable Senator Bacon

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Oliver

Honourable Senators:

Adams,	Fox, P.C.,	Mercer,	Phalen,
Bacon,	* Hervieux-Payette, P.C. (or Tardif),	Merchant,	Tkachuk,
Dawson,	Johnson,	Oliver,	Zimmer.
Eyton,	* LeBreton, P.C. (or Comeau),		

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Adams, Bacon, Dawson, Eyton, Fox, P.C., *Hervieux-Payette, P.C. (or Tardif), Johnson, *LeBreton, P.C. (or Comeau), Mercer, Merchant, Oliver, Phalen, Tkachuk, Zimmer.*

AGING (SPECIAL)

Chair: Honourable Senator Carstairs, P.C.

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Keon

Carstairs, P.C.,	Cordy,	Keon,	Mercer,
Chaput,	* Hervieux-Payette, P.C. (or Tardif),	* LeBreton, P.C. (or Comeau),	Stratton.
Cools,			

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Carstairs, P.C., Chaput, Cools, Cordy, *Hervieux-Payette, P.C. (or Tardif), Johnson, *LeBreton, P.C. (or Comeau), Mercer, Nolin.*

ANTI-TERRORISM (SPECIAL)**Chair: Honourable Senator Smith, P.C.****Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Nolin**

Andreychuk,
Baker, P.C.,
Day,

Fairbairn, P.C.,
* Hervieux-Payette, P.C. (or Tardif),
Jaffer,

Joyal, P.C.,
* LeBreton, P.C. (or Comeau),
Nolin,

Segal,
Smith, P.C.

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Andreychuk, Day, Fairbairn, P.C., Fraser, *Hervieux-Payette, P.C. (or Tardif), Jaffer,
Joyal, P.C., Kinsella, *LeBreton, P.C. (or Comeau), Nolin, Smith, P.C.*

CONTENTS

Wednesday, December 5, 2007

	PAGE	PAGE
SENATORS' STATEMENTS		
National Security and Defence		
<i>Ottawa Citizen</i> Article on National Defence Spending by Governments.		
Hon. David Tkachuk	396	
Infrastructure Deficit in Cities		
Hon. Art Eggleton	396	
Concert on the Hill		
Hon. Leonard J. Gustafson	397	
National Day of Remembrance and Action on Violence Against Women		
Eighteenth Anniversary of Tragedy at L'École Polytechnique.		
Hon. Lucie Pépin	397	
The Honourable Marcel Prud'homme, P.C.		
Congratulations on Receiving Order of Friendship of Russia.		
Hon. Anne C. Cools	397	
Kyoto Protocol		
Commitment of Manitoba.		
Hon. Mira Spivak	398	
<hr/>		
ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS		
Tsawwassen First Nation Agreement		
Documents Tabled.		
Hon. Gerald J. Comeau	398	
Canada-United States Inter-Parliamentary Group		
National Governors Association Annual Meeting, July 20-23, 2007—Report Tabled.		
Hon. Jeremiah S. Grafstein	398	
Pacific Northwest Economic Region Legislative Leadership Academy, September 28-October 1, 2007—Report Tabled.		
Hon. Jeremiah S. Grafstein	398	
<hr/>		
QUESTION PERIOD		
Public Works and Government Services		
Possible Moratorium on Government Polling.		
Hon. Céline Hervieux-Payette	398	
Hon. Michael Fortier	399	
Report on Review of Government Polling.		
Hon. Céline Hervieux-Payette	399	
Hon. Michael Fortier	399	
Hon. Yoine Goldstein	399	
Review of Government Polling—Independence.		
Hon. Yoine Goldstein	399	
Hon. Michael Fortier	400	
Report on Review of Government Polling.		
Hon. James S. Cowan	400	
Hon. Michael Fortier	400	
Foreign Affairs		
United States and Russia—Memorandum of Understanding on Interoperability of Defence Forces.		
Hon. Hugh Segal	400	
Hon. Marjory LeBreton	400	
United States—Release of Omar Khadr According to Provisions of United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child.		
Hon. Mobina S. B. Jaffer	400	
Hon. Marjory LeBreton	400	
Justice		
Review of Foreign Clemency Cases.		
Hon. Claudette Tardif	401	
Hon. Marjory LeBreton	401	
Decision Not to Appeal Death Sentence of Ronald Smith—Government Stance on Capital Punishment.		
Hon. Claudette Tardif	401	
Hon. Marjory LeBreton	401	
Hon. Yoine Goldstein	401	
The Senate		
Introduction of New Pages.		
The Hon. the Speaker	401	
<hr/>		
ORDERS OF THE DAY		
Heritage Lighthouse Protection Bill (Bill S-215)		
Second Reading—Order Stands.		
Hon. Lowell Murray	402	
Hon. Gerald J. Comeau	402	
Public Service Employment Act (Bill S-219)		
Bill to Amend—Second Reading—Order Stands.		
Hon. Pierrette Ringuette	402	
Hon. Terry Stratton	402	
Criminal Code (Bill S-210)		
Bill to Amend—Second Reading—Order Stands.		
Hon. Jeremiah S. Grafstein	402	
Hon. Gerald J. Comeau	402	
Canada Securities Bill (Bill S-211)		
Second Reading—Debate Adjourned.		
Hon. Jeremiah S. Grafstein	402	
Hon. Lowell Murray	405	
Hon. Hugh Segal	406	
Hon. W. David Angus	407	
Human Rights		
Motion to Authorize Committee to Study Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe 2007 Declaration on Anti-Semitism and Intolerance—Order Stands.		
Hon. Consiglio Di Nino	410	
The Senate		
Motion to Televisе Proceedings—Debate Adjourned.		
Hon. Hugh Segal	410	
Hon. Gerald J. Comeau	410	
Hon. George J. Furey	412	
Hon. David P. Smith	412	
Hon. Lowell Murray	412	
Hon. Bill Rompkey	412	
Hon. A. Raynell Andreychuk	412	
The Senate		
Motion to Urge Government to Establish National Portrait Gallery in National Capital Region—Debate Adjourned.		
Hon. Jeremiah S. Grafstein	412	
Hon. Terry Stratton	414	
The Senate		
Introduction of New Page.		
The Hon. the Speaker	414	
Appendix	i	



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