



CANADA

Debates of the Senate

3rd SESSION

•

40th PARLIAMENT

•

VOLUME 147

•

NUMBER 24

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Tuesday, May 4, 2010



THE HONOURABLE NOËL A. KINSELLA
SPEAKER

This issue contains the latest listing of Senators,
Officers of the Senate and the Ministry.

CONTENTS

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

Debates Services: D'Arcy McPherson, National Press Building, Room 906, Tel. 613-995-5756
Publications Centre: David Reeves, National Press Building, Room 926, Tel. 613-947-0609

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

Tuesday, May 4, 2010

The Senate met at 2 p.m., the Speaker in the chair.

Prayers.

VISITOR IN THE GALLERY

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I draw your attention to the presence in the gallery of His Excellency Arturo Guillermo Bothamley, Ambassador of the Argentine Republic.

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

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

AFGHANISTAN—FALLEN SAILOR

SILENT TRIBUTE

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, before we proceed, I ask all honourable senators to rise and observe one minute of silence in memory of Petty Officer Second Class Craig Blake whose tragic death occurred yesterday while serving his country in Afghanistan.

Petty Officer Second Class Craig Blake was a member of Fleet Diving Unit (Atlantic), based in Shearwater, Nova Scotia.

Honourable senators then stood in silent tribute.

SENATORS' STATEMENTS

CHILD AND YOUTH MENTAL HEALTH

Hon. Judith Seidman: Honourable senators, mental health challenges affect one out of every five of Canada's children and youth. This amounts to more than two million young people. Another way of looking at it is that, in every Canadian classroom, four to five students have mental health challenges.

However, only one in six children and youth ever receive treatment or services. This lack of treatment is due both to a lack of mental health services as well as the stigma associated with mental illness.

Honourable senators, mental illness and physical illness are not perceived in the same way. When a parent has a child with cancer or a heart condition, they are met with support and resources. However, when a son or daughter is suffering from depression there is often a fear or shame associated with reaching out for help.

There are walkathons and telethons in support of cancer and heart disease, but not yet for suicide prevention, mental health promotion or mental illness prevention. Why is that?

More than 70 per cent of adults living with mental health challenges developed their symptoms in childhood or early adolescence. It is important that supports and services are in place to provide the help needed, especially for youth early in their lives, to prevent or reduce the likelihood of more serious problems as individuals grow older. We should not forget mental health promotion programs, which help to sensitize and educate youth, their families, teachers and friends.

No one is immune — no matter where they live, what their age is, or what they do in life. Good health is not possible without good mental health.

Do honourable senators know that in the 1800s, the colour green was used to identify people labelled "insane"? The children's mental health community is now using the colour green, but with a completely different focus. Green signifies new life, new growth and new beginnings.

Honourable senators, please join me in showing your support of child and youth mental health by wearing a green ribbon this week.

NATIONAL HOSPICE PALLIATIVE CARE WEEK

Hon. Elizabeth Hubley: Honourable senators, this week, people across Canada are celebrating National Hospice Palliative Care Week. Hike for Hospice Palliative Care, a national fundraising and awareness event held in approximately 100 communities across the country, kicked off the week on Sunday.

National Hospice Palliative Care Week is a time to share the achievements of hospice palliative care, to honour the commitment and caring of those who work in the field and to raise awareness for the need for palliative care.

This year's theme is "Discovering Your Voice." It encourages people with a life-limiting illness, their caregivers and family members to share what hospice and palliative care means to them to help others understand the importance of palliative care.

The motto of the Hospice Palliative Care Association of Prince Edward Island is "Make Each Day Count." This motto is particularly appropriate as hospice palliative care is not about dying as much as it is about living well until the end. It focuses on persons living with a life-limiting illness and their families to address not only physical needs but also social, emotional and spiritual needs. Palliative care seeks to bring care, compassion, comfort and hope for a peaceful and pain-free death as well as bereavement support and "aftercare" services to loved ones left behind.

Dying is a natural process. It is an experience we will all share. It is beyond time for us to accept the need for improved palliative care and to work toward providing it for all Canadians.

CANADIAN NAVY

CONGRATULATIONS ON ONE HUNDREDTH
ANNIVERSARY

Hon. Terry M. Mercer: Honourable senators, this year we mark the centennial of the Canadian Navy. Canada, as a maritime nation, came into its own through its actions during conflicts over the past 100 years, in large part due to our navy.

Many events and activities are taking place throughout Canada this year to mark the impact of Canada's navy. Indeed, many Canadians celebrated the Battle of the Atlantic this past Sunday.

• (1410)

Additionally, His Honour was one of the hosts of a ceremony held in this chamber just hours ago. The ceremony was held to mark the centennial with the dedication of the Canadian Naval Centennial Bell, since today marks the one hundredth anniversary of the Naval Service Act, which was given Royal Assent in this chamber 100 years ago today.

This truly moving ceremony was to rededicate the navy to the next 100 years of service to Canada. The bell was christened with the combined waters of Canada's oceans and seaways, as well as the oceans of the world. Honourable senators would have been so proud of all of our Senate pages, some of whom read poems while others in the gallery sang music and did a moving rendition of "Hallelujah." We should be very proud of the young people working with us in this chamber.

Honourable senators, the theme of the Canadian Naval Centennial is to "bring the navy to Canadians." My family is no stranger to service in the Royal Canadian Navy. My sister-in-law's father, Petty Officer Laurent Bertrand, went down with the HMCS *Athabaskan* in the English Channel in 1944. My own father, Chief Petty Officer Bob Mercer, and his shipmates captured an enemy U-boat off the coast of Nova Scotia as the Second World War was coming to an end.

As a proud son of a sailor and the proud father of a son who today wears a naval officer's uniform in the reserves, teaching young cadets, I encourage all honourable senators to take part in other events to commemorate the impact the navy has and will continue to have in Canada. I congratulate the Canadian Navy and all the men and women who do so much to protect Canada's way of life. I offer this to all of them and to all of those we have lost:

Eternal Father, strong to save,
Whose arm hath bound the restless wave,
Who bids the mighty ocean deep
Its own appointed limits keep;
Oh, hear us when we cry to Thee
For those in peril on the sea!

[Translation]

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

HUMAN RESOURCES AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

AGREEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY BETWEEN
GOVERNMENT OF CANADA AND REPUBLIC
OF MACEDONIA—DOCUMENT TABLED

Hon. Gerald J. Comeau (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, pursuant to the Social Security Act, subsection 42(1), Order in Council P.C. 2010-556, regarding the Agreement on Social Security between Canada and the Republic of Macedonia.

INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

STATE OF INUIT CULTURE AND SOCIETY
IN THE NUNAVUT SETTLEMENT AREA—
2007-08 ANNUAL REPORT TABLED

Hon. Gerald J. Comeau (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the Report on the State of Inuit Culture and Society for the 2007-08 fiscal year.

NISGA'A FINAL AGREEMENT—2006-07 AND 2007-08
ANNUAL REPORTS TABLED

Hon. Gerald J. Comeau (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the 2006-07 and 2007-08 annual reports of the Nisga'a Final Agreement.

CRIMINAL CODE

BILL TO AMEND—FIRST READING

Hon. Gerald J. Comeau (Deputy Leader of the Government) presented Bill S-9, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (auto theft and trafficking in property obtained by crime).

(Bill read first time.)

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, when shall this bill be read the second time?

(On motion of Senator Comeau, bills placed on Orders of the Day for second reading two days hence.)

[English]

CANADIAN NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

2009 ANNUAL SESSION—NOVEMBER 13-17, 2009—
REPORT TABLED

Hon. Jane Cordy: Honourable senators, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the report of the Canadian NATO Parliamentary Association, the NATO PA, respecting its participation at the 2009 annual session held in Edinburgh, Scotland, U.K., from November 13 to 17, 2009.

THE SENATE

NOTICE OF MOTION TO ENCOURAGE THE MINISTER OF NATIONAL DEFENCE TO CHANGE THE OFFICIAL STRUCTURAL NAME OF THE CANADIAN NAVY

Hon. Bill Rompkey: Honourable senators, I give notice that, at the next sitting of the Senate, I will move:

That the Senate of Canada encourage the Minister of National Defence, in view of the long service, sacrifice and courage of Canadian Naval forces and personnel, to change the official structural name of the Canadian Navy from “Maritime Command” to “Canadian Navy” effective from this year, as part of the celebration of the Canadian Navy Centennial, with that title being used in all official and operational materials, in both official languages, as soon as possible.

I might say, honourable senators, that it gives me great honour to give notice on the very day that the Naval Service Act received Royal Assent in this chamber.

QUESTION PERIOD

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

MATERNAL HEALTH CONFERENCE

Hon. Grant Mitchell: Honourable senators, in a few short weeks, a major international conference on maternal health, sponsored by the group Women Deliver, will be held in Washington, D.C., which is not too far from Ottawa. Yet, while 3,500 leaders, practitioners and special policy-makers from around the world will attend that conference, it appears that Canada will not send a representative of the Government of Canada. That is odd, honourable senators, since the Government of Canada is making such a big deal out of its maternal health aid program. This makes one wonder if the Conservative view of foreign aid might not simply be foreign aid for domestic consumption.

Can the Leader of the Government in the Senate tell us why Canada has no official or ministerial representation at this extremely important conference? This conference is significant to Canada, since the government seems to have little, if any, understanding of the standard accepted protocols for maternal health aid in the world.

Hon. Marjory LeBreton (Leader of the Government): I thank the honourable senator for the question. With regard to the conference and Canadian representation, if any, I will take that question as notice.

However, honourable senators, I do not need to repeat to Senator Mitchell that the initiative undertaken by the Government of Canada as host of the G20, and particularly the G8, in the field of maternal and child health is an endeavour

that has been widely applauded. Despite the efforts of some to make this an internal domestic political story, as I quoted the other day, many aid organizations are applauding Canada's efforts. Our mission is to promote health and wellness for mothers and children, and nothing will steer us away from our intentions in that regard.

Senator Mitchell: Honourable senators, I will accept the leader's reply at face value; however, I will tell the leader something that will inhibit her from properly achieving the government's often-stated lofty goals, which are most often used for political consumption. One must build consensus with people around the world. Thirty-five hundred representatives will be in Washington. Why would the leader not know, absolutely, that we have a minister or two, such as Ministers Oda and Cannon, going to that conference so they could begin to build consensus with the people who will help to deliver the government's program around the world?

• (1420)

Senator LeBreton: As I have already said to the honourable senator, I will take his question on that conference as notice. I did not have a chance this morning. It was probably because I was at the navy celebration and that one little drink of rum got in the way of my thought process. I will blame the rum.

Senator Mercer: I tried that before and it does not work.

Senator LeBreton: I can tell the honourable senator has tried it many times before. He does not need to convince me.

Honourable senators, I saw that article and I made a mental note to myself; I was sure if Senator Mitchell did not ask about it, someone else would.

Now the lights are dimming. Is it me or the rum?

In any event, I intended to find out what the story was before Question Period. Perhaps someone will hear my pleas and send me the answer so I can give it to the honourable senator.

Senator Mitchell: I wondered why the leader's answers seemed so much more forthcoming. Then I thought that maybe the rum was making it seem like the lights had gone down.

President Obama has stated that he will likely go to this conference. Given our experience with Copenhagen, where the Prime Minister did not go until Mr. Obama decided to go, is this another one of those cases where Mr. Obama says “jump” and Mr. Harper says “how high?”

Senator LeBreton: The honourable senator is misinformed. President Obama was going to stop on his way to receiving the Nobel Peace Prize, and the Prime Minister had committed to attend Copenhagen. As a result, Minister Prentice and the Canadian delegation were successful in Copenhagen, and an agreement came out of Copenhagen that all of us can work toward.

Obviously, we do not follow President Obama's schedule on a daily basis. If he has indicated that he is attending, that is something I was not aware of. However, the conference is being held in Washington, as Senator Mitchell pointed out.

The end result of all of this in terms of maternal health is that we are hosting the meeting this year and, together with our G8 partners, we will come up with a plan. We will concentrate on our efforts for third world countries, and do everything we can to increase the services — facilities, nutrition, good medicines and hygiene — to ensure that mothers and children have long, healthy lives.

[Later]

Honourable senators, someone heard my plea, and I was given notice that Minister Oda will attend the conference in Washington on behalf of the Government of Canada.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Senator Mitchell: Does that mean that the government makes its decisions after it reads reports in *The Globe and Mail*?

Senator LeBreton: Senator Mitchell has trouble understanding the meaning of the word “yes.”

[Translation]

STATUS OF WOMEN

NEW BRUNSWICK COALITION FOR PAY EQUITY

Hon. Rose-Marie Losier-Cool: Honourable senators, my question is for the Leader of the Government in the Senate. In early April, the New Brunswick Coalition for Pay Equity found out that Status of Women Canada had turned down its application for funding. This is the first time that Status of Women Canada has denied the coalition funding since it was founded in 1998.

The Coalition for Pay Equity receives no core funding and works exclusively on a project-by-project basis. The organization's mission is to actively and realistically advocate for pay equity to enable women in New Brunswick to contribute to the provincial economy.

This particular project targets New Brunswick women and focuses on media relations and networking. The project is perfectly in line with the government's public position. After its funding application was turned down, the coalition found out that a new minister had been put in charge of Status of Women Canada.

I know that the minister cannot tell us why the former minister decided to turn down the funding application, but has the government's position changed since the new minister was appointed?

[English]

Hon. Marjory LeBreton (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I am not familiar with each and every application made for funds from Status of Women Canada. I do not imagine that a ministerial change would affect the policy. These decisions are made by not only one minister, but on the advice of bureaucrats and other cabinet colleagues.

[Senator LeBreton]

I cannot answer specifically for that one project, except to say that we increased the budget of the Women's Program at Status of Women Canada to the highest level ever. Obviously, many organizations apply for funding and some of them are not successful. The number of individual projects funded has increased by 69 per cent, and 47 per cent of the groups are receiving funding for the first time.

This one particular project, unfortunately, did not benefit from their application. For some reason, it was not encapsulated in the 69 per cent. However, 47 per cent of the funding has gone to new organizations and groups, and I think that is the way it should be.

As I have said before, because programs were in place year after year, it does not mean that they have a lock on that program forever and no one else can access the program. We have increased funding for Status of Women Canada, and I am sure that the 47 per cent of the new programs that have received money are grateful that they were able to receive funds this year.

[Translation]

Senator Losier-Cool: The coalition submitted a very specific project. In fact, the coalition has been recognized as one of Canada's 10 best organizations in the field of managing status of women programs.

We asked the new minister, Rona Ambrose, to take another look at how the funding application was dealt with. Can the government leader at least ask the minister to check whether she received the application?

[English]

Senator LeBreton: I will be happy to pass along the comments of the honourable senator to Minister Ambrose. Again, we have significantly increased the funding of Status of Women Canada. We have increased the number of community-based projects that receive money.

As honourable senators know, despite the allegations that we had cut funding, that was not the case. We took the money and put it into programs that help women more at the community level.

Obviously, when this application came in, it was considered. I do not have any knowledge as to what happened to that exact project. However, with all the applications — and 47 per cent are new applicants — that to me is good news. It means that the government and Status of Women Canada are reaching out and including women's groups that had been overlooked for many years in the past.

[Translation]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Hon. Maria Chaput: Honourable senators, my question is for the Leader of the Government in the Senate and concerns Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada and its communication practices.

If Canada really wants to project its linguistic duality, as enshrined in the Official Languages Act, in its dealings with other countries, does the leader not believe that any public document from Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada should be issued in both official languages, with the English and French text in a single document?

Does she not agree that this new communication practice would be a perfect example of a positive measure to promote the equal use of Canada's two official languages? Lastly, could the leader discuss this with the minister responsible?

Some Hon. Senators: Bravo!

• (1430)

[English]

Hon. Marjory LeBreton (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I do not have the exact details of the issue raised by the honourable senator. Canada is an officially bilingual country and all publications sent out on behalf of the Government of Canada must be in Canada's two official languages.

[Translation]

Hon. Pierre De Bané: Honourable senators, I would like to point out to the leader that there is a big difference between issuing one document in both languages, as Senator Chaput is suggesting, and issuing two separate documents, each in a single language. Two documents, one in French and one in English, would be like the old expression once used in the United States: separate but equal. The philosophy here must reflect Canada's linguistic duality and, obviously, the way to do that is to have both reports, one in each language, in a single publication.

On the Internet, all a user has to do is click "French" or "English" for the desired version.

If there are separate printed publications in each language, then, inevitably, there will be few documents in French.

Let us take the example of the Department of Justice. Every law is published in a single document, in French and English. Anglophone and francophone legislative drafters work together, and both languages are included in the same document.

Honourable senators, I would very much like Senator Chaput's recommendation to be taken into consideration.

I remember that when I became a parliamentarian, all Government of Canada publications were issued in a single volume, in French and English. The French and English versions were together in a single document.

[English]

Senator LeBreton: I thank Senator De Bané for the question. The practices of various departments have not changed, as far as I know, since Canada's Official Languages Act was first enshrined. The other day, an invitation was brought to the attention of honourable senators by Senator De Bané, which was

a worthy thing to do. I will read the honourable senator's suggestion carefully, but I do not believe there is or was any act by this government or a previous government to do anything other than respect Canada's Official Languages Act. I do not have a definitive answer for the honourable senator.

This government, led by the Prime Minister, is absolutely committed to ensuring that both of Canada's official languages are respected fully and implemented in government publications.

I am proud to be part of the party that brought simultaneous translation into the House of Commons under the Right Honourable John George Diefenbaker. Certainly, revisionist historians would not want me to point that out.

Other than being sympathetic to the honourable senator's comments, I have not seen any change in policy by this government or any previous government that has not been committed fully to the implementation of Canada's Official Languages Act.

ATLANTIC CANADA OPPORTUNITIES AGENCY

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Hon. Fabian Manning: Honourable senators, my question is for the Leader of the Government in the Senate. Government agencies across the country have provided an essential mechanism for businesses and communities to provide an avenue for assistance in rural and regional economic development. Following four years of continuous cuts to the budgets to many of these agencies by the former Liberal government, our government not only maintained existing budgets but also created two new agencies in our country.

Coming from Newfoundland and Labrador, and having worked with many communities and regions on economic development in my years at the municipal, provincial and federal levels, I realize the important role that the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, ACOA, plays in our part of the country. As always, we need to be mindful of how government spends Canadians' hard-earned tax dollars.

My question for the Leader of the Government in the Senate is this: As our government looks at expenditures across the board, what role does it see for ACOA and the other regional government agencies across the country?

Hon. Marjory LeBreton (Leader of the Government): I thank Senator Manning for his excellent question. There has been a considerable amount of fear-mongering across the country about the efforts of the President of Treasury Board, the Honourable Stockwell Day, in terms of strategic review of all government departments to try to find savings.

The government made a commitment in the Speech from the Throne to take a serious look at all government expenditures with a view to deficit reduction. There is never any harm, honourable senators, in exploring ways to improve programming and make it more efficient in achieving real results for Canadians.

ACOA is an outstanding organization with a proven track record of creating jobs and building economic growth in the region. This government has demonstrated its support for ACOA and the Atlantic region. For example, as the honourable senator knows, Budget 2010 provides \$19 million per year to extend the Atlantic Innovation Fund. Although the government is looking for savings within departments, it is committed to regional development.

The honourable senator is quite right: Before the Conservative Party won the 2006 election, there was fear-mongering that it would get rid of all regional development agencies. However, this government created two more agencies. The government's commitment to regional development, in particular to ACOA, remains strong and firm.

[Translation]

PUBLIC SAFETY

QUALITY OF TRANSLATION

Hon. Céline Hervieux-Payette: Honourable senators, my question is for the Leader of the Government in the Senate. Along the same lines, but regarding matters not nearly as serious as the publication of official reports, on April 22, 2010, you said you would make inquiries regarding the translation errors that abounded in an invitation from your colleague Gary Lunn that was sent to all parliamentarians, the French version of which was positively appalling.

Today's *Le Devoir* published — on the front page no less — this invitation addressed to all parliamentarians, including everyone here today, in French that was so terrible that the journalist summed it up as follows:

How could anyone possibly understand the French version of the invitation?

The title of the invitation read as follows:

“Pour la Libération Immédiate” . . .

I do not know if that means the liberation of the government, but really!

. . . the press release proclaims, instead of the usual “Pour diffusion immédiate.”

It really takes some imagination to understand. Perhaps if you understand it, you could explain it to me.

The text reads as follows:

Le Ministre de Défense Peter MacKay, le Ministre de Sécurité Publique Vic Toews et M.P.s de tous les partis politiques tiendra un événement sur la Colline de Parlement dans le soutien de troupes canadiennes servant en Afghanistan.

An MP or “member of Parliament” should be rendered as “un député” in French. The text continues:

[Senator LeBreton]

L'événement doit lever de l'argent pour acheter des cartes de cadeau pour le retour à la maison de membres CAF de l'Afghanistan. Pour l'instant, \$45,000 a été levé. Le sénateur Pamela Wallin exercera les fonctions du maître du soir de cérémonies.

• (1440)

Based on the distribution list, the message was sent to at least 1,100 people. Messages that contain a typographical error are sometimes recalled by the sender, usually minutes after the message is sent. Five hours after the message was received, the invitation had not yet been recalled.

It was sent at noon yesterday. Today, it was on the front page of *Le Devoir* and, so far, no changes have been made. The journalist concluded that Vic Toews must be blushing from embarrassment or perhaps he was not informed by his assistants that a French message, obviously translated using software, was unintelligible.

Does the Leader of the Government in the Senate know when her government will truly value the francophones of this country and send invitations in correct French?

[English]

Hon. Marjory LeBreton (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I saw the report in *Le Devoir* by Hélène Buzzetti with regard to this particular invitation.

When I first heard about this event, I thought, what a wonderful idea, what a terrific cause and what a great location. I then read the comments of Hélène Buzzetti.

I think it is a stretch for Senator Hervieux-Payette to try to impugn motives of the government; that somehow the government is being disrespectful to one of our official languages.

When Senator De Bané raised the issue of the invitation sent from the office of Minister Lunn, the minister was apologetic and embarrassed by the incident and indicated he had taken steps to ensure that when invitations are sent from his office, careful measures will be taken to ensure they are properly communicated.

In this particular case, I cannot answer for the people responsible for sending invitations like this out, but I believe, honourable senators, that no one, whether anglophone or francophone, whether bilingual or not, would see any ulterior motives in mistakes made by various officials, whether the mistakes are made in English or in French. It is regrettable, but it is hardly an indication that the government is somehow, as the honourable senator seems to indicate, not being respectful of Canada's official languages, in particular the French language, when we have a Prime Minister who always goes out of his way to demonstrate the importance of both official languages in this country, French and English.

[Translation]

Senator Hervieux-Payette: Honourable senators, first, I would like the minister to confirm that this message will be corrected and sent to francophone guests in a language they can understand. Second, would she please indicate what steps have been taken by

her government to ensure that representatives of all departments have sufficient knowledge of French to draft messages? Given that we still have the impression that these messages go through the Prime Minister's office, who in that office is responsible for verifying language quality? Who allowed such an unintelligible message to be sent?

[English]

Senator LeBreton: We do not have language police in some jurisdictions in this country.

Senator Mercer: No, they police everything else.

Senator Ringuette: Is there a mandatory sentence in here?

Senator LeBreton: Honourable senators, this invitation was sent out by a minister, as was the case with Minister Lunn. To suggest that, for some reason, this was indicative of a lack of respect is troubling. It is beneath any of us to impugn motives that are not intended.

Honourable senators, obviously, a staffer in this particular minister's office sent this invitation, but I do not know the exact process that they followed. As with all areas of government, with respect to anything sent out from the government or from ministers' offices, we urge senders to be careful to use the proper language, whether it is French or English. As I mentioned to the Honourable Senator De Bané, I see errors in English on almost a daily basis.

Having said that, in this case, let us take the matter for what it is. It was a well-intended invitation that, in the view of some, was not properly communicated. I take that criticism as genuine, and, as I did with Minister Lunn, I will refer the matter to Minister Toews and ask him to ensure that these things do not happen again.

With regard to the Prime Minister's Office, we were accused enough and unfairly so. Honourable senators can imagine what the media and the opposition would say if we went around checking everyone's invitations. There would be no end to criticism over that.

[Translation]

DELAYED ANSWERS TO ORAL QUESTIONS

Hon. Gerald J. Comeau (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I have the honour to present delayed answers to oral questions raised by Senator Poulin on March 18, 2010, concerning Heritage, foreign ownership; and by Senator Fox on April 15, 2010, concerning Infrastructure, broadband access to remote areas.

HERITAGE

TELECOMMUNICATIONS—FOREIGN OWNERSHIP

(Response to question raised by Hon. Marie-P. Poulin on March 18, 2010)

As announced in Budget 2010, the government is acting to remove the existing restrictions on foreign ownership of

Canadian satellites. This will allow firms to access foreign capital and know-how and to invest in new and advanced technologies. The removal of restrictions will also allow Canadian firms to develop strategic global relationships that will enable them to participate fully in foreign markets.

The removal of existing restrictions on foreign ownership of Canadian satellites will be carried out by way of amendment to the *Telecommunications Act*. The appropriate amendment is contained in Bill C-9, *The Budget Implementation Act*. Bill C-9 passed second reading in the House of Commons and is now before the Standing Committee on Finance.

Only an Amendment to the *Telecommunications Act* is being made. No change is being made to the *Broadcasting Act*.

INFRASTRUCTURE

BROADBAND ACCESS TO REMOTE AREAS

(Response to question raised by Hon. Francis Fox on April 15, 2010)

Broadband Canada received 570 applications, requesting close to \$1B in funding.

Due to the high response to the program, the application assessment phase took slightly longer than anticipated and many of the projects had partial or full overlaps with each other in terms of area to be served with broadband connectivity.

The Broadband Canada program has now completed its assessment of applications and has begun contacting applicants to notify them of their status and, where appropriate, request additional information regarding their applications. This information is required to assist the Broadband Canada office in determining which of the applications will maximize available funding to bring broadband connectivity to as many unserved and underserved households as possible.

All applicants will be notified within the coming weeks as to the status of their applications.

The goal of the program is to bring broadband connectivity to as many unserved and underserved households across the country as possible. Therefore applications were assessed on that basis, with no regional allocations.

No recommendations for project approval have been made at this time. All inquiries from applicants should be addressed to the Broadband Canada program and its staff.

[English]

ORDERS OF THE DAY

TAX CONVENTIONS IMPLEMENTATION BILL, 2010

THIRD READING

Hon. Stephen Greene moved third reading of Bill S-3, An Act to implement conventions and protocols concluded between Canada and Colombia, Greece and Turkey for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income.

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

(Motion agreed to and bill read third time and passed.)

[Translation]

THE SENATE

MOTION TO STRIKE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON ANTI-TERRORISM ADOPTED

Hon. Gerald J. Comeau (Deputy Leader of the Government), pursuant to notice of April 29, 2010, moved:

That a Special Committee of the Senate be appointed to consider any matters relating to anti-terrorism that may be referred to it by the Senate from time to time;

That, notwithstanding rule 85(1)(b), the special committee comprise nine members namely the Honourable Senators Furey, Joyal, P.C., Jaffer, Marshall, Nolin, Segal, Smith, P.C., Tkachuk, and Wallin, and that four members constitute a quorum;

That the committee have power to send for persons, papers and records; to examine witnesses; to report from time to time; and to print such papers and evidence from day to day as may be ordered by the committee;

That, notwithstanding rule 92(1), the committee be empowered to hold occasional meetings in camera for the purpose of hearing witnesses and gathering specialized or sensitive information;

That the papers and evidence received and taken and work accomplished by the Special Senate Committee on the Antiterrorism Act and the Special Senate Committee on Antiterrorism since the First Session of the Thirty-Eighth Parliament be referred to the committee for the purposes of its work; and

That, pursuant to rule 95(3), the committee be authorized to meet on any Monday that immediately precedes a Tuesday when the Senate is scheduled to sit, even though the Senate may then be adjourned for a period exceeding a week.

(Motion agreed to.)

• (1450)

[English]

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO RULE 104 ADOPTED

The Senate proceeded to consideration of the first report of the Standing Joint Committee on the Library of Parliament (*mandate of the committee and quorum*), presented in the Senate on April 28, 2010.

Hon. Percy E. Downe moved the adoption of the report.

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

(Motion agreed to and report adopted.)

EROSION OF FREEDOM OF SPEECH

INQUIRY—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the inquiry of the Honourable Senator Finley calling the attention of the Senate to the issue of the erosion of Freedom of Speech in our country.

Hon. James S. Cowan (Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, I am pleased to join in the debate initiated by Senator Finley on the issue of freedom of speech in our country.

The concept of freedom of speech or freedom of expression comes to us from the very earliest times. Moses had the temerity to argue with God in the Old Testament. Far from being struck down for such audacity, he is revered by adherents of different faiths as one of the great leaders in history.

From the ancient Athenian democracy, we read in Plato's Socratic dialogues that freedom of discussion among citizens is an absolutely essential component of a great democracy.

In our country, the concept of freedom of speech can be traced back directly to the British Bill of Rights of 1689. Interestingly, that Bill of Rights enshrined freedom of speech in Parliament. It stated, in relevant part:

That the freedom of speech and debates or proceedings in Parliament ought not to be impeached or questioned in any court or place out of Parliament;

A century later, the French National Assembly's Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen in 1789 took the leap of characterizing this right of free speech as a right for all times and for all nations. Article 11 reads:

The free communication of ideas and of opinions is one of the most precious of the rights of man. Every citizen may, accordingly, speak, write, and print with freedom, but shall be responsible for such abuses of this freedom as shall be defined by law."

This declaration was, of course, not without controversy. Indeed it was truly revolutionary. Senator Finley and other colleagues opposite are no doubt very familiar with Edmund Burke, the so-called father of modern conservatism, who railed against these “metaphysical rights,” as he dismissively called them. In retrospect, he was not on the right side of history because this was an idea and an ideal which spread throughout the world.

Twenty-eight years ago, building on what Prime Minister John Diefenbaker started with the Bill of Rights in 1960, Canada enshrined in its Constitution its own declaration concerning freedom of speech. Section 2 of our Charter of Rights and Freedoms states:

Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms:

- (a) freedom of conscience and religion;
- (b) freedom of thought, belief, opinion and expression, including freedom of the press and other media of communication;
- (c) freedom of peaceful assembly; and
- (d) freedom of association.

The Charter, of course, emerged from Prime Minister Trudeau’s vision of a “just society” for Canadians.

What is the Harper government’s vision of Canada as a just society? A criminal code filled with ever-longer prison sentences, and Canadians kept busy building and paying for more and bigger prisons to hold all these convicted under those laws. It is a small wonder that Prime Minister Harper has little appetite to draw attention to the contrast his approach provides with the principles and vision reflected in our Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

I was pleased to hear Senator Finley initiate this inquiry. As he stated in his motion, his purpose was to call the attention of this chamber to the erosion of freedom of speech in our country.

First and foremost, freedom of speech relates to government action. Our Charter is a statement of Canadians’ fundamental rights and freedoms vis-à-vis their government — not vis-à-vis their neighbours, family members or employers. To properly examine whether our freedom of speech is being eroded, we must look first and most critically at the actions of our government. Honourable senators, I agree with the premise of Senator Finley’s inquiry: The actions of the Harper government indeed are seriously eroding freedom of speech in this country.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Senator Cowan: Senator Finley apparently was prompted in part to initiate this inquiry because of the incident when Ann Coulter was supposed to speak at the University of Ottawa. I do not propose to address this at length. I do not agree with much of what I have read or heard of Ms. Coulter’s views, but I have no difficulty with her being free to express those views in Canada.

The actions in question were actions of the university or of Ms. Coulter’s organizers, not the government. Of far greater

concern to me are the actions taken directly by the Government of Canada that have the effect of preventing or impeding individuals from expressing their views.

Ms. Coulter, an American citizen, had no difficulty entering Canada to speak at the University of Ottawa and subsequently did speak at the Universities of Calgary and Western Ontario. Others whose views may not meet with the same support and approval by members of this government have not been so fortunate.

Senator Downe asked Senator Finley whether he believed the government had made a mistake by restricting people who want to come to Canada to speak by not allowing them entrance to the country. Senator Finley replied that he assumed Senator Downe was referring to George Galloway and that he, Senator Finley, was disappointed that Mr. Galloway was not given an opportunity to express himself here in Canada.

In recent days, we have read in the press that, while at the time the Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and Multiculturalism, the Honourable Jason Kenney, stated that neither he nor his staff had been in direct contact with Canadian Border Services Agency officials over Mr. Galloway’s status, in fact, documents released since suggest that there was, as one report described it, “a short but intense campaign on the parts of Kenney’s office and government officials to keep Galloway out of Canada.”

Indeed, this campaign proceeded notwithstanding strenuous objection by the Canadian High Commissioner in Britain, who wrote to senior officials in both the Prime Minister’s Office and the Privy Council Office, saying, among other things:

... my suspicion is that the Brits will be somewhat taken aback by such a Canadian decision, and some (possibly including the UK Government) will feel compelled to defend his freedom of speech, especially as he is a sitting MP.

In the end, of course, our government did not take the advice of our high commissioner and refused to give Mr. Galloway, a duly elected member of the British Parliament, permission to enter Canada.

Unfortunately, honourable senators, the Galloway incident is but one incident in what appears to be a pattern of conduct by this government.

On February 6, an American journalist was denied entry into Canada. Martin Macias, Jr. was reportedly detained by border officials at the Vancouver International Airport, questioned for several hours, and then denied entry and put back on a plane to Seattle. Mr. Macias is a reporter for, amongst other bodies, the online and news media outlet for Chicago Public Radio. He is also a member of No Games Chicago, an organization that opposed Chicago’s bid for the 2016 Olympic Games. According to a CBC news report, he was travelling to Vancouver to attend various political events, including a two-day conference organized by the Olympic Resistance Network. He was to leave Vancouver on February 11, before the start of the Olympics. There was no suggestion that he was planning anything nefarious to interfere with the Games.

According to Mr. Macias, he was questioned aggressively for two hours about what he was going to do in Vancouver, who he was meeting with, who organized the conference, and even what they looked like. They took all his contact information, as well as the business cards of journalists and others he planned to connect with in Vancouver.

Amy Goodman is another American journalist. She is known as the principal host of “Democracy Now!,” a U.S. syndicated radio program. She encountered problems when she sought to enter Canada. She was coming here as part of a book tour to promote her new book *Breaking the Sound Barrier*.

• (1500)

I will read to you from the CBC News story of November 26:

Goodman, 52, known for her views opposing the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, told CBC News on Thursday that Canadian border agents asked her repeatedly what subjects she would cover at scheduled speaking engagements in Vancouver and Victoria. . . .

Goodman said her car was searched and officials demanded to look at her notes and her computer. . . .

“I am deeply concerned that as a journalist I would be flagged and that the concern — the major concern — was the content of my speech,” said Goodman.

I guess the border officials were satisfied with what they heard of Ms. Goodman’s planned content of her speech. They allowed her to enter Canada but returned her passport with a document demanding she leave the country within 48 hours. So much for her freedom of expression.

As I say, honourable senators, these incidents cause me even greater concern than the one at the University of Ottawa. Unlike the Ann Coulter case, these incidents involve actions by the Government of Canada to prevent expression in Canada of views that the government, for whatever reason, does not want expressed. Government officials are demanding to know what someone — journalists in both cases — will say, before deciding whether to allow them to enter and speak, as with Ms. Goodman, or deny them entry and put them on a plane back out of Canada, as happened to Mr. Macias. Interestingly, there is no suggestion that Ms. Coulter, whose views are often aligned with those of the Harper government, was even questioned at the border.

I hoped that when Senator Wallin and Senator Duffy, who both have impressive journalistic pedigrees, participated in this inquiry, they would have said something about their fellow journalists, Mr. Macias and Ms. Goodman. Both Senator Duffy and Senator Wallin travelled to the farthest corners of the globe during their journalistic careers, but now sit in this chamber supporting a government that denies other journalists entry into their own country.

Yes, honourable senators, we indeed have a serious problem with the erosion of freedom of speech by the Harper government and it is not confined to selective harassment of individuals at the border.

Frankly, I was somewhat surprised that it was Senator Finley who initiated this inquiry. Perhaps these months of serving in the Senate have opened his mind on some issues.

Judging from a report in the *Toronto Star* in 2008, freedom of speech was not particularly high on Senator Finley’s priority list while he was national campaign director for the Conservative Party.

The story describes how, in 2007, Mark Warner, an international trade lawyer who had been chosen as the Conservative Party candidate in the riding of Toronto Centre and had already been actively campaigning, received a letter informing him that he would not be allowed to run as the Conservative candidate. Honourable senators, guess who signed that dismissal letter. It was our good friend Senator Plett.

The 2008 *Toronto Star* article went into some detail about what reportedly happened:

“I wasn’t supposed to talk to the media,” says Warner. “I told them I couldn’t have a non-existent media campaign when I was running against Bob Rae because I’d get killed.”

He was told he could go to a Star forum on poverty where Rae spoke, but “not to say anything.”

Warner says Finley’s office summoned him to Ottawa, where he met with Finley on the 12th floor of Tory headquarters at 130 Albert Street. Finley apparently yelled at Warner several times during the five-hour session, including over his edict Warner couldn’t fill out a questionnaire about equality from a gay-lesbian alliance. “He said if I answered it, I would be denounced by the Prime Minister and everybody else in caucus.”

Warner, according to the news report, called the session a “Star Chamber.” The article notes:

Warner was officially fired by senior official Don Plett, in a hotel room near the Toronto airport.

Honourable senators will understand why I found myself scratching my head listening to Senator Finley extol his heartfelt commitment to free speech. If duly nominated candidates for election are not allowed to exercise free speech — if Canadians are not allowed to learn where a particular candidate or his or her party stands on an issue — then what role is there for free speech?

Of course, we know this incident was not an isolated one. Candidates refuse to attend all-candidate meetings. Cabinet ministers apparently are kept on a short leash, if indeed they are allowed out at all. God forbid that Canadians should actually hear what a cabinet minister thinks about a particular issue within his or her portfolio.

How many times have Canadians listened to news reports that conclude with the words, “The minister responsible declined our invitation to appear” or “declined to comment”? “The Current,” a CBC Radio current affairs show, ran a segment entitled “Request Count,” in which they tallied the number of requests made to members of the Harper government and tracked how many were accepted and how many refused. They finally stopped

the on-air component — there were so few requests that were accepted. As of a few days ago, so far there have been 46 requests; 6 accepted and a full 40 declined — in this season alone.

Last week's issue of *The Hill Times* had a front-page article about the “unprecedented” control being exerted by the Prime Minister's Office and the Privy Council Office, the arm of the bureaucracy that serves the Prime Minister. It described how “Tory political staff have seized almost total control of routine government communications.”

Diplomats are notoriously muzzled — one diplomat said that the Harper government's approach has “killed public diplomacy, outreach and media relations.” Jeff Davis, the author of the piece, writes, “the Tories have wrapped all government communications up in political red tape, radically reducing the amount of information disclosed to the public.” He quotes a diplomat who questions the government approach, noting that “public servants have not given up their freedom of expression.”

David Akin, the respected Canwest reporter, wrote in his blog on January 29 about the continued limitations imposed on the Parliamentary Press Gallery by the Prime Minister's Office under Mr. Harper. He described the trip with the Prime Minister to the World Economic Forum in Switzerland, where members of the press galley were collectively afforded only two questions — one in English, one in French. One reporter who dared to ask a question at a photo op was warned immediately that if she continued, reporters would no longer be allowed to attend such photo ops — access would be denied. PMO staff also made veiled threats that the individual's organization might suffer further sanction — all because of the impertinence of asking a question.

Honourable senators, as is explicit in the language of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, freedom of expression and freedom of the press go hand in hand. As Senator Fraser, Senator Munson, Senator Wallin and Senator Duffy in particular know, to choke a free press is to kill free speech. Yet this is business as usual for the Harper government.

In view of all I have described, I was not surprised to hear that yesterday, which was World Press Freedom Day, the Canadian Journalists for Free Expression awarded this government an “F” — a failing grade — for “the countless delays and roadblocks” put in the way of access to information. Several colleagues opposite used the term “Orwellian” in speaking to this inquiry. The phrase is more appropriate than perhaps they intended.

I mentioned the marketplace of ideas — a concept I thought would be understood by a Conservative government, which presents itself as committed to the principle of free markets. The fundamental premise of freedom of speech is to allow wide, open discussion — a busy, free marketplace of competing ideas from which citizens may choose, bringing to bear their own ideas, knowledge and critical, thoughtful analysis. However, the free market of information under the Harper government more closely resembles a store under the old Soviet regime: sparsely stocked — empty shelves with only a few closely controlled, government-approved goods — and long lines of hungry citizens waiting outside in the cold.

Honourable senators, there can be no meaningful freedom of speech if the government refuses to provide information to its citizens about the government's actions and activities.

Guy Giorno, Chief of Staff to the Prime Minister, told a committee in the other place that freedom of information is “the oxygen of democracy.” This government's actions repeatedly belie that statement.

Robert Marleau, the former clerk of the other place, who was appointed Information Commissioner of Canada in 2007, reported in 2008 that, contrary to Mr. Harper's election pledge to make transparency a hallmark of his administration, a “fog over information” had crept across the government's activities. He said that restrictions on the access to information process effectively put a stranglehold on communications.

• (1510)

Mr. Marleau's successor, Suzanne Legault, Interim Information Commissioner of Canada, recently issued a special report to Parliament containing the 2008-09 report cards on systemic issues affecting access to information in Canada. Ms. Legault entitled the report *Out of Time*. She did not mince her words. She said that Canadians' right to timely access to information “is at risk of being totally obliterated.”

Honourable senators, my friends opposite would like Canadians to believe that the threat to free speech is some university students behaving badly towards an American political pundit. Imagine, university students behaving badly. How unprecedented. How shocking. Meanwhile, the Interim Information Commissioner reports that the right of Canadians to timely information from their own government is being “totally obliterated” — not just restricted, but “totally obliterated.”

There is no story here for my friends opposite. Let us get our attention back to the real threat — to university students behaving badly. Talk about being both Orwellian and, in the words of Neil Postman, amusing ourselves to death.

We have repeatedly seen this government trying to prevent Canadians from being in a position to exercise their freedom of speech, by denying them the necessary building blocks of accurate information. The Director of Communications for the Honourable Diane Finley, Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development, was reported to have recently intervened to try to suppress the release of information under the Access to Information Act that would have revealed that Ottawa spent \$5 million on a television advertising blitz surrounding the Vancouver Olympics.

Those stories followed a February 7 report of a Conservative political staffer who, when working for then Public Works Minister Christian Paradis, had apparently ordered the “unrelease” of a sensitive report on the government's real estate portfolio last July. According to the news reports, public servants, Department of Justice lawyers and consultants had agreed that there was no legal basis to withhold any of the 137-page document; yet this staffer reportedly ran — yes, ran — to the mail room to prevent a package of documents from being sent out in response to the access request. He subsequently pressured officials to release only 30 pages of that 137-page document.

The Hill Times then ran a story with the headline, “Cabinet ministers’ offices regularly interfere in ATI requests, says Tory staffer.” They quoted a Conservative political staffer who, understandably, did not want to be identified, as saying that Sebastian, the staffer who was running around trying to get things “unreleased” . . .

. . . has not, from my experience, done anything that is significantly different than what ministers’ offices are expected to do by the PMO.

According to *The Hill Times*, the staffer said that the Prime Minister’s Office has pressured ministerial staffers to head off the release of explosive information.

That article appeared on February 22. The next week, March 1, *The Hill Times* ran another story, which reported the following:

Early last week, a Tory staffer who asked not to be identified, encouraged *The Hill Times* to “keep going on this story about the ATIPs.”

The staffer said despite PMO statements that all staffers have been directed to abide and uphold the Access to Information Act, the PMO interference continues.

“This still continues and staff are told publicly to ‘respect the process’ but are expected to find ways to thwart the process,” the staffer wrote. “Trust me — despite the public musings — political staff were told ‘not to interfere,’ nudge nudge, wink wink.”

The Harper government’s wall of secrecy and muzzle on freedom of expression extends throughout the halls of government. I spoke earlier of the collective vow of silence that appears to have been adopted by all cabinet ministers, but this government muzzles even its scientists. Just last month, on March 15, the *National Post*, usually a determined cheerleader for the Harper Conservatives, ran an article headed “Scientists ‘muzzled’ by Tories’ media policy.” This was too much even for the *National Post*.

Just 10 days later, Lawrence Martin, the columnist for *The Globe and Mail*, could not hold back any longer. He wrote an article entitled “A capital where freedom’s in short supply.” I will quote just a few of the passages.

Silencing orders were going out all over Ottawa — to caucus members, civil servants, agency heads and military brass. They may have been able to state their view in the past. But not in the new Harperized capital. Not without prior approval from the Prime Minister’s Office or the Privy Council Office.

The scope of the clampdown was unprecedented. The government tried censoring coverage of dead bodies returning from Afghanistan. It tried to curtail freedom of the press like never before, at one point having the police move out journalists from a Charlottetown hotel lobby. Restrictions on the access-to-information process effectively put a “stranglehold” on communications, information commissioner Robert Marleau reported.

The long arm of the Prime Minister’s Office has not stopped at the walls of its own public servants. According to a CBC report last year, a series of government emails showed that the Harper PMO directed the contents of news releases issued by the Transportation Safety Board of Canada, a supposedly arm’s-length advisory body and, more than that, told the board to hold off on the release of the safety report into the high-seas death of Laura Gaine until after the October 14 general election. Indeed, the report, which was ready for release on September 24, was not released until October 30, two weeks after the election.

Perhaps it is no surprise that the safety board acceded to the Prime Minister’s request. We have all seen what happens to independent watchdogs who fall out of favour with this government. It is the same old stuff; it is a story that bears repeating.

Linda Keen was fired from her position as chair of the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission. This firing came the night before she was to testify before a parliamentary committee in the other place.

Peter Tinsley was chair of the Military Police Complaints Commission. In that capacity, he was attempting to conduct an investigation into the allegations around the Afghan detainee issue, an investigation that the Harper government was working to thwart and impede in every possible way it could imagine. In the middle of this investigation, Mr. Tinsley sent what I would have thought would have been a pro forma request for an extension of his term to complete his work. Instead, he received a letter from Defence Minister Peter MacKay, which said: “I encourage you to begin arranging your personal and professional affairs and start your career planning as soon as possible.”

Mr. Tinsley told reporters at the time, last December, that it was unprecedented for the Harper government not to reappoint someone in the middle of a significant inquiry. He was quoted as saying:

Lack of cooperation by the government, or resistance [to] the roles of administrative tribunals, and the effect on the [cabinet] appointees, can have nothing but a . . . chilling effect across the field.

The article continues:

He said the fear is that watchdog chairs could be cowed by “an environment where the government of the day sends signals that if you don’t guess right what the government of the day wants” there will be consequences.

Linda Keen spoke in January about the attitude of the Harper government to independent watchdogs like herself and Peter Tinsley. She did not mince her words. She said:

Administrative tribunal heads and, by extension, their tribunals and administrative law are under attack today in the federal government.

Honourable senators, under the Harper government, even independent watchdogs have lost their right to freedom of expression. They have lost their right precisely where it is

needed most, on the issues where Canadians depend on their ability to speak openly and freely, without fear of reprisal, guided only by the Canadian public interest as they see it.

Mr. Tinsley's successor at the Military Police Complaints Commission, hand-picked by the Harper government, has not fared any better in prying open the clamp of secrecy, and the government has not hesitated to let the commission know just exactly who tells who what will happen and when. Just last week the new chair, Mr. Glenn Stannard, asked the government's representative, Justice Department lawyer Alain Préfontaine, for a date when the commission could expect to receive certain requested government documents. Mr. Préfontaine replied: "This is not something I am at liberty to discuss with you."

• (1520)

Mr. Stannard, understandably dumbfounded, asked the question again. Mr. Préfontaine replied: "The documents will be given to your counsel when they are good and ready."

Mr. Stannard later told *The Globe and Mail* that since mid-February disclosure to the commission has nearly dried up. Thousands of documents have yet to be released and those documents that have been released have been heavily censored. Indeed, of even greater concern is that there appears to be a "weeding out of material" even before packages are handed over to the censors for scrutiny. Journalists are managing to obtain documents that it now turns out were never even given to the commission.

This government claims to be the government of transparency and accountability — the government committed to justice, and law and order. What sort of justice can result when documents are hidden from the commission? There is no transparency; there is only delay, censorship and arrogance. Instead of accountability to Canadians, there is disdain and contempt.

Honourable senators will understand why I find it difficult to take seriously this government's pious assertions of its devotion to the cause of freedom of speech, or the direction in which my friends opposite want to take this inquiry. They would rather not talk about Richard Colvin, who found himself in Afghanistan waging a different war from the one he accepted. His was a personal battle against the very government he was representing, as he tried to tell them his concerns about Afghan detainees.

Of course, honourable senators, as we all know too well, the Harper government's attempts to prevent Mr. Colvin from speaking out did not end in Afghanistan. Invoking national security yet again, the government tried repeatedly to prevent him from appearing before the Military Police Complaints Commission. Finally, after members of the other place stepped in so Mr. Colvin could speak here on Parliament Hill, the government resorted to that last refuge of scoundrels and shamefully tried to discredit Mr. Colvin's testimony. That is the true face of this government's commitment to freedom of speech.

Honourable senators, speak to people who work for non-governmental organizations across the country. Too many are afraid to speak out on various issues for fear of incurring the wrath of the Harper government and losing their critically needed funding.

Senator LeBreton finds this situation amusing, but I do not think the NGOs who are affected by this fear on a day-to-day basis find it nearly as amusing.

This past weekend, *The Globe and Mail* published an interview with Joanna Kerr, Chief Executive Officer of ActionAid International. She told the *Globe*:

It's so hard for NGOs to speak out, because they get their funding cut. That's what's been going on. If your mandate is to help people around the world, you're not going to rock the boat. It's a very, very unusual time in Ottawa, the kind of censorship that is happening.

Before I conclude, I want to speak briefly about section 13 of the Canadian Human Rights Act, which several senators have focused on in their remarks in this inquiry. I appreciate that there have been some real concerns about some cases that have been initiated under this section of the Canadian Human Rights Act. We should, of course, always be looking for ways to improve the laws of Canada. I was impressed with the arguments presented by several senators in this debate, in particular Senator Nancy Ruth and Senator Fraser, explaining the value served by having the provisions of that act in addition to those in the Criminal Code; the fact, for example, as pointed out by Senator Nancy Ruth, that the Canadian Human Rights Act covers hate propaganda based on sex, while this would not be covered by hate crimes under the Criminal Code. As Senator Fraser pointed out, the remedies available under the two acts are distinct and are intended for different purposes.

I also believe that we should not lose sight of the reasons for particular laws. It is often said that bad facts make bad law — something this government should do well to remember when it jumps to introduce certain of its so-called law-and-order bills. The same logic applies when looking at certain questionable or even wrong decisions. The fact that one investigator, or even one adjudicator, has made a statement or decision we may disagree with cannot be sufficient cause to have us throw out the whole process. There have been many decisions over the years that I have disagreed with, even some by the Supreme Court of Canada, but that is surely not grounds for dismantling the court system.

Honourable senators, racism and hate propaganda are not issues for another time or another place. Sadly, they continue to have relevance here today, here in Canada, as well as around the world. As Senator Nancy Ruth eloquently reminded us, words are often not "only words." Words can be powerful and, indeed, sometimes dangerous.

Scholars have observed that every modern case of genocide has been preceded by a propaganda campaign. Some go so far as to suggest that such a campaign may, in fact, be indispensable to genocide — a prerequisite, if you will. As Senator Dallaire could tell us, in Rwanda the genocide was preceded by several years of hate propaganda. The same was true in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the same was true in Hitler's Germany.

Before genocide can occur, large numbers of people must be brought around to condone mass killing of the group in question. That is not to suggest that all expressions of racism or hatred are

to be censored as necessarily leading to genocide — by no means. However, it does suggest that Canada is right to take hate propaganda seriously and we are right to struggle to find the line between free speech and inflammatory speech that requires action.

The issue, as is often the case, is one of balance; in this case, between speech that is and must be fully protected under our fundamental, critical right of freedom of expression and those communications that would constitute hate messages and run afoul of Canadian law.

Are there adjustments that can be made, such as procedural safeguards, to guard against abuses of the law and to underscore the importance we place on freedom of speech? Perhaps, but, again, bad facts inevitably make bad law. We should always be open to considering proposed improvements, but the law as it stands now has proven effective in addressing serious cases of hate propaganda.

In conclusion, I want to thank Senator Finley for launching this inquiry. I agree with him: We indeed face a serious erosion of freedom of speech in this country, which is being affected as we speak by the Harper government. I look to Senator Finley and other colleagues who have risen to defend freedom of speech with such eloquence. I look to these honourable senators to join with us on this side and call the Harper government to account for its numerous actions that undermine free speech in this country. I am confident the honourable senators will join us and publicly denounce those actions by their government and work to uphold real freedom of speech in Canada.

Hon. Marjory LeBreton (Leader of the Government): Will Senator Cowan take a question?

Senator Cowan: I will be delighted to.

Senator LeBreton: I could not help but notice Senator Cowan's reference to bad facts make bad laws. I can up him one better. Bad facts make bad speeches, and also inflammatory speeches.

Honourable senators, Senator Cowan represents the epitome of what my colleague Senator Finley supports. Senator Cowan exercised his right to free speech, which all of us support. Senator Cowan missed the point completely in Senator Finley's speech. Senator Cowan seems to be fixated on Ann Coulter. I am no particular fan of Ann Coulter, but the honourable senator missed the point.

I cannot, as a member of the government of Prime Minister Harper, sit here and listen to unfounded allegations, using unnamed sources, outlining a litany of activities that claim to have been done, and that somehow members of our government are all complicit in a system whereby none of us are allowed to speak, which is absolutely false.

Since the honourable senator talked about his great hero Mr. Trudeau and the Charter, what about the rights of those hundreds of Quebecers who were thrown in jail during the time of the War Measures Act? I will go to the next Prime Minister of the

honourable senator's party, Prime Minister Chrétien. What about the rights of the protester in Hull, when he dared to protest and was strangled for his trouble?

• (1530)

What about the rights of Mr. Beaudoin, the former head of the Business Development Bank of Canada, when he stood up against Prime Minister Chrétien and refused to give money to one of Mr. Chrétien's friends for a golf course in which they had an interest? Mr Beaudoin was subjected to an unbelievable abuse of power, a witchhunt and a raid by the RCMP where he had to spend a great deal of time defending his name.

Those are actual facts, whereas the honourable senator cites *The Hill Times* and the CBC. As a long-standing member of the Conservative Party, I can tell the honourable senator that I have never been part of a government that has worked so hard to gain the trust of the Canadian public as this government has. We know what we are up against. We are up against these anonymous, faceless people around the city of Ottawa who are so used to their Liberal connections that they feed this information, *The Hill Times* prints it and, all of a sudden, it becomes fact.

I must say, honourable senators, that I was quite offended by Honourable Senator Cowan's speech. It is an insult to parliamentarians and to the government of the Prime Minister, Stephen Harper. It is an insult to all of us who serve in cabinet and, by the way, it is an insult to the Canadian public, who continuously indicate their support.

Senator Dawson: Question.

Senator Fraser: Is this a speech or question?

Senator LeBreton: I guess the old saying of Confucius — he who throws dirt loses ground — is exactly what happened.

My question is this: How does the honourable senator explain the actions of Mr. Trudeau and Mr. Chrétien where there was real, tangible evidence of abuse of power?

Senator Cowan: I am sure neither Mr. Trudeau nor Mr. Chrétien would need my assistance in trying to explain their actions. They do that very well.

I encourage Senator LeBreton to expand her thoughts here into a speech and to participate in this debate. I will try not to be as insulted by her speech as she claims to be my mine.

Obviously, there is a little bit of paranoia not far below the surface. I must have scratched that surface a little too much, but I encourage the leader to put her thoughts down, to expand on them and to participate in this debate.

Senator Mercer: Do not hurt her feelings.

Senator Cowan: Again, I congratulate Senator Finley for initiating this inquiry, and I encourage all honourable senators on both sides of the chamber to express their views. Surely, if we cannot express our views in this chamber, then there are not many places in the world where we can do so.

Senator LeBreton: “Paranoia” is a word that the honourable senator used. There is a difference between paranoia and having someone say something that is blatantly false. I will go through Senator Cowan’s speech. Many of the statements are blatantly false and protected by the privileges of Parliament, no doubt.

Again, when the honourable senator is talking about freedom of speech, he is like his leader, Mr. Ignatieff.

Senator Cowan: I think that is a compliment.

Senator LeBreton: The honourable senator shows no respect for the Prime Minister. He calls him “Harper” all the time.

Senator Rompkey: You say “Iggy.”

Senator LeBreton: Iggy is not the Prime Minister and never will be.

Again, I would ask Honourable Senator Cowan this: If he is to make a speech that he thinks is based on fact, should he quote unnamed sources in Parliament? It is a terrible affront to everyone, because an unnamed source is a person against whom one has no defence.

Senator Mockler: Unbelievable!

Senator Mercer: Read your talking points, Percy.

Senator LeBreton: I am not reading talking points.

Does the honourable senator not believe that when people have something to say and speak out in the name of freedom of speech that, at least, they should have the courage to say who they are before they make such statements? Does he not think that one should rely only on real people who speak?

Senator Cowan: I wish to thank the Honourable Senator LeBreton for that. I encourage her to read my speech. If there is something in there which is incorrect, I am sure she will draw that to my attention.

On every occasion, where these were not my own views, I have given the source of that view. It is entirely appropriate to quote from commentators who have their own sources.

Senator Hubley: Like Mike Duffy.

Senator Cowan: Senator LeBreton might laugh at that, but I have heard her day after day stand up and say, “Here is an article from a newspaper.” She quotes that as a perfectly valid backup and support for her position.

Senator LeBreton: I use the name.

Senator Cowan: I have said that those were the views of the journalists. I did not take them to be my own views. I put those views before the house and, in every case, to the extent that I had a source, I gave the source. If the leader can find that I have made an error of fact, I ask her to draw that to my attention.

Hon. Joan Fraser: Would Senator Cowan take another question?

Senator Cowan: Yes.

Senator Fraser: Honourable senators, dealing with the matter of unidentified sources, that is, unidentified in the public report of their comments, would the honourable senator agree that there are occasions when it is not possible to get information to the public unless one gives a guarantee of anonymity to the source? Thinking back in our time, probably the most famous example was the gentleman who for many years was identified only as “Deep Throat,” but who provided to journalists, on the guarantee of confidentiality, vitally important information for the health of democracy in the United States of America. I would argue there have been other comparable examples.

Are the examples the honourable senator cited perhaps illustrative of a climate of fear in which people are afraid to say in public what they know to be true?

Senator Cowan: I am sure that Senators Fraser, Duffy, Wallin and Munson, and others, perhaps, whom I do not need to name, who have far more experience than I in journalism and reporting, have had information given to them on condition that they not disclose the source. As I understand it, responsible journalists would try to check that information with another source. If it turned out that they had the appropriate level of verification, then they would print it, even though they were not able to identify publicly the source of that information. I understand this would meet the accepted standards of responsible journalism.

I can speak only from my own experience, not so much in preparation of this speech, but a year or so ago when I spoke on scientific research in Canada. At that time, I spoke to many scientists across the country, in universities and health institutes, about their funding, the prospects for scientific research and development in Canada, and how we would stack up against other countries.

I was told repeatedly that they would give me the information, but that I could not publicly identify them. They feared — and I cannot say whether their fear was justifiable or not — that there would be retribution on them as individuals or against the institution they represented.

I cannot say that was true. I can say that is what I was told. I suspect that my journalistic friends here have had experience with that. I am sure Senator Mockler, who is an experienced provincial politician, has had people come to him and give him information, which, after appropriate verification, he would have used in the practice of his craft, but was not able to identify the individual involved.

All of us have a responsibility, when we speak to issues like this, to verify the information as best we can and to identify the source of it, even if the source is only a report from a newspaper. The journals that I quoted and that other senators have quoted are well-known, respected journals in this country. I think we can assume that the journalists who write for those periodicals by and large respect those standards of journalistic verification, which we all think is entirely appropriate.

• (1540)

Senator Fraser referred to the American experience. Had people not been able to report on that experience, one wonders where democracy would be today.

(On motion of Senator Andreychuk, debate adjourned.)

IMPACT OF DEMENTIA ON SOCIETY

INQUIRY—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the inquiry of the Honourable Senator Carstairs, P.C., calling the attention of the Senate to the Impact of Dementia on the Canadian Society.

Hon. Wilbert J. Keon: Honourable senators, I want to comment briefly on this inquiry of Senator Carstairs calling the attention of the Senate to the impact of dementia on Canadian society. As Senator Carstairs pointed out, dementia is rapidly becoming a huge problem, especially as it relates to Alzheimer's disease. Alzheimer's disease is expected to increase from 500,000 cases to 1.1 million cases within a generation, and the cost of caring for dementia patients will increase from \$15 billion to \$153 billion a year. While these numbers are estimates, they are truly alarming.

Senator Carstairs' call to action, especially for people over 65, includes a dedicated program under ParticipACTION, a healthy diet and lifestyles program, and a skill-building support program for informal caregivers such as spouses and children of dementia sufferers. These measures can reduce the cost of caring for patients with dementia by about 50 per cent.

Senator Carstairs also pointed out that Canada does not have a strategy to deal with this situation, despite the existence of one in several other developed countries. She emphasized the importance of doing something as opposed to doing nothing, since 40 per cent of people will suffer from Alzheimer's disease at age 85.

Senator Hubley addressed the fact that we know little about, and do not understand, dementia and Alzheimer's disease in our native peoples. There is a real need to study this area in detail until the problems are fully understood.

I want to emphasize the need for research on this subject. Most important is that new imaging techniques and methods are now accurately finding the presence of Alzheimer's disease and other dementias. Although the so-called white spots are still not fully understood, they are opening a door to a whole new understanding of the phenomenon. Perhaps more important than anything else we can do at this time is to be supportive of our outstanding researchers in the field and to encourage the development of young scientists to pursue their studies in this direction.

Progress is being made by combining drug therapy with healthy lifestyle initiatives. For example, the careful control of blood pressure throughout the life course has a dramatic effect in delaying the onset of, or indeed preventing, the disease altogether.

[Senator Cowan]

No one knows how long it will take to fully understand this terrible disease, but we have made tremendous strides in the last decade. Tremendous strides are possible in the next decade, and hopefully the horrible projections that we have heard about the numbers of cases and the burden on society will not apply because Alzheimer's disease will be prevented in large numbers.

(On motion of Senator Tardif, debate adjourned.)

ENVIRONMENT AND HUMAN RIGHTS

INQUIRY—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. Grant Mitchell rose pursuant to notice of April 27, 2010:

That he will call the attention of the Senate to the relationship between the environment and human rights.

He said: Honourable senators, I am pleased to have the opportunity to talk about something that was brought to my attention by Senator Carstairs. Senator Carstairs has a way of seeing things that others do not see and clarifying things for those people. She is perceptive and insightful.

About a month ago, she invited me to speak with her and Senator Jaffer on a panel on human rights at a conference in Manitoba. I had not spoken on human rights before, so I asked her why she asked me to speak and what she wanted me to focus on. She suggested I talk about the relationship of human rights and the environment. I took that to mean climate change because, as honourable senators may be aware, I am interested in climate change.

The moment Senator Carstairs said that, it seemed so obvious, and I wondered why I had not recognized the relationship between the environment and human rights before. As I began to look into the subject, it became clear there might be a couple of reasons for that lack of recognition, which relate to the literature on human rights and the literature and arguments on climate change. Both contain almost no mention of the relationship between human rights and climate change. Two or three years ago, some of the literature coming out of the United Nations began to address the relationship, but the philosophical human rights literature has argued against it, although it is beginning to migrate to what should be obvious.

In one column, I listed what we can all presume to be, and in some cases must acknowledge are, the effects of climate change, and in another column, I listed the classic human rights that we all understand and most of us accept. When we put the two together, we see not that they mesh but that they collide head on. There is little doubt that climate change profoundly affects generally accepted human rights.

The major impacts of climate change include drought from less water, which is obvious in the case of drought; drought from more water, which seems to be counterintuitive, but we can have more rain in certain places, and we probably are, but, because these places are warmer, the water evaporates faster and, still leaves the region affected in greater drought; and glacier melt, which will lead to drought and the inability to find water.

• (1550)

There are also violent storms, which I argue are already occurring because of climate change. Science supports that view. Some might argue against it, but arguing against something that obvious is like denying gravity.

The sea level is rising. People will say, "so what?" Many people live in communities at the edge of bodies of water that will or are beginning to rise because of climate change. Sceptics say there is not enough ice to melt and, if ice already in the water melts, it will not raise the water level appreciably. The melted ice water will not account for the bulk of the rise in sea levels. Sea levels will rise because the water will heat and things that heat expand, and the water will rise. This phenomenon is already occurring.

We have only to look around the world. I was in Tuktoyaktuk a couple of years ago with the Standing Senate Committee on Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources. That community is losing its shore line and many houses are threatened by rising sea levels.

The world will experience many other impacts. There will be floods, higher temperatures and forest fires. These events are already occurring.

Honourable senators can take any one of those impacts and relate it to human rights that result in serious problems. These human rights, for example, include the right to health, food, safe water, secure access to water, subsistence, housing, security and culture.

Consider drought. It will clearly affect the food supply. Drought will affect the water supply and it will likely affect housing when people cannot live in a location any longer.

Consider violent storms. Honourable senators have already seen their impact. Perhaps we take such violent storms for granted because of the powerful image left in our minds. For example, if honourable senators were to go to New Orleans or other communities now following Hurricane Katrina, they will see houses that are still uninhabitable and communities that have been destroyed. People living in those communities had to leave, perhaps, losing their means to economic sustenance. The economy in many communities has been dramatically altered or destroyed.

I do not want to belabour the Hurricane Katrina crisis, but honourable senators can pick an impact of climate change and its effect on human rights. There is a direct relationship. They do not mesh; they collide.

All such impacts are compounded because wars and mass migration will result from climate change. In the Sudan, Darfur is a climate change war. The land utilized by two cultures with different modes of subsistence has been reduced in area by virtue of desertification in the region. There is less arable land. Those who previously grew crops and those who grazed animals both had plenty of land. There is not now enough land for both groups. Therefore, Darfur has become a climate change war.

It is interesting to note what will happen to certain other regions. If climate change affects the Middle East, as it is likely to do, by increasing temperature to levels hotter than they are currently, it might have a profound impact on what is already a highly sensitive region of the world with significant security implications for our allies in the region as well as for Canada and our global allies.

It is unfortunate that the poor will inevitably be most disadvantaged by climate change because they have the fewest resources with which to respond. The largest portion of the poor is women and, therefore, women will bear the disproportionate burden of climate change. Is it not almost inevitable that women seem to bear the burden in such unfortunate circumstances?

Canada is by no means exempt from the impact of climate change. The massive annual forest fires in British Columbia occur, in large part, because the warmer weather has not killed the pine beetle, which, in turn, has killed the trees that provide kindling for the fires.

Fisheries on the East Coast and the West Coast have been fundamentally disrupted. Some of the disruption may be because of the way the industry was fished and managed, but it is unlikely that accounts for the entire situation. Why did the salmon not appear on the West Coast a year or two ago? It is probably because changing temperatures have moved their food source elsewhere and disrupted their traditional feeding grounds.

Drought is causing problems for farmers in northern Alberta. Edmonton is losing a large number of trees in our beautiful river valley. The climate has been dry for 10 years and the trees cannot be sustained.

Our committee saw significant climate change impacts during our trip to the North. Permafrost is melting, roads are warping and buildings are beginning to sink. The patterns of animal migration upon which Aboriginal people depend greatly are being altered. People told the committee that they had gone out at the normal time of the year to hunt certain birds and the birds had migrated through the area two or three weeks earlier because of warmer weather. I indicated that Tuktoyaktuk is in danger of losing much of its shoreline and could lose many homes located on the shore.

It is particularly unfortunate that Aboriginal people will be impacted the most because they often make up a large portion of the poor. Aboriginal people also often depend on the land and wildlife for their livelihood, which are particularly affected by climate change.

In Canada, the effects of climate change probably will not relate generally to a human rights problem with the exception of Aboriginal peoples who tend not to receive the necessary support for, or resolution of, their problems.

A *prima facie* case can be made that climate change impacts affect and create human rights problems. A few steps must be put in place to ensure the link between climate change and human rights is clear so that no one can deny it.

The idea that society has an obligation to someone not yet alive is new to human rights thinking. Many of the people who will be affected by climate change are not alive today. Two arguments highlight that for me. First, many people affected by climate change are alive today and are affected now or their children will be affected in the future. Every honourable senator feels a profound obligation, if not to everyone, certainly to our children. They will be affected by climate change in the future.

Second, the argument is strengthened by an analogy provided by the Honourable Senator Banks who said that climate change impacts on subsequent generations is like someone waking up 50 years from now to find that they had had a \$50,000 debt irrevocably imposed on them that they must pay. That debt was incurred by someone who lived 50 years before. If they do not pay it today, they lose their house.

That is exactly the kind of obligation that climate change involves — we create climate change today to impact someone who may not even be born yet. That concept makes the precise link to climate change being a human rights issue.

I know all honourable senators in this house agree with the assertion that we are causing climate change. Is there any honourable senator who would raise his or her hand to tell us people are not causing climate change?

An Hon. Senator: Oh. Oh.

Senator Mitchell: All scientific evidence suggests that people are causing climate change. To those who say climate change is occurring but people are not causing it, I repeat that we had better hope people are causing climate change because if we are not, we cannot fix it. We will have no chance to do so. We are not capable of moving sun spots to keep the temperature right. Some will then say that it has been happening for a million years. I will say it has been happening for a billion years, but the world has been uninhabitable for most of that time.

• (1600)

If honourable senators do not think we are causing climate change, they should drop to their knees and pray we are so we have a chance to fix it. The science is powerful; there is a great deal of scientific consensus. All those skeptics who argue against climate change can never demonstrate science that defends what they say. They can pick something apart from a room full of scientific data and taint it, and say that, because that piece is tainted, it is all wrong. That is like saying one line of the *National Post* is wrong; *ergo* every *National Post* article ever published is without credibility.

My point is that there is irrevocable science. We are causing global warming. It is within our grasp to fix it and that finishes the link for me. Human rights are affected by climate change today. Human rights will continue to be affected, unfortunately, with greater intensity in the future and with even greater intensity

still if we do not start to act in a way that we should, and provide leadership in a way that a country like Canada can provide.

[Translation]

Hon. Suzanne Fortin-Duplessis (The Hon. the Acting Speaker): Honourable senators, do you wish to grant the Honourable Senator Mitchell five more minutes?

Some Hon. Senators: Yes.

Senator Mitchell: Thank you very much. I appreciate it.

[English]

It helps us to make the case. I have often said that we do not need more technology to reduce greenhouse gases; we need a new technology to help us convince the government and people to reduce greenhouse gases. Part of that case comes from the focus: The debate has been on what happens to economies, states and countries. With human rights, we begin to focus on what happens to people and the suffering they will experience because of climate change. That realization leads to a greater sense of obligation.

We, in Canada, have benefited from all those industrial processes that have created climate change to give us a standard of living beyond the imagination of people in most parts of this world — beyond the imagination of hundreds of millions of people — and that sense of obligation underlines human rights. It also underlines that sense of obligation internationally, not only to people we live with and amongst in our own country, but also to people around the world because our pollution contributes to this problem elsewhere and around the world.

I think the lens of human rights helps in developing public policy, prioritizing where that public policy needs to be applied and what it needs to be applied to. It gives one an understandable frame of reference about how we should cut through all the various possibilities and begin to focus on what, where to deal with climate change and to mitigate climate change for those people now suffering so profoundly by it.

It also raises the possibility of a discussion and of an implementation of a right to information. People have a right to information on things like climate change and climate change science, a right that could be defended by this government and has not been. In fact, it is quite the contrary. The government has stopped their climate change scientists from talking about what they know, which only exacerbates the problem.

Honourable senators, I appreciate the time to talk about this subject. I conclude by saying, yes, there are climate change effects. There will be more in the future. These effects relate to human rights. What that says to me, and what it should say to all of us, is that climate change does not relate to human rights only in some abstract way. It relates to people — people in our country, in our North, Aboriginal people and people all around the world — who could use our leadership to mitigate, offset and prevent the kinds of effects they surely will experience if this government does not start doing what it should on climate change.

(On motion of Senator Tardif, debate adjourned.)

[Senator Mitchell]

THE SENATE

MOTION TO ESTABLISH NATIONAL DAY OF REMEMBRANCE AND ACTION— DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. Roméo Antonius Dallaire, pursuant to notice of April 21, 2010, moved:

That in the opinion of the Senate, the government should establish a National Day of Remembrance and Action on Mass Atrocities on April 23 annually, the birthday of former Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson's, in recognition of his commitment to peace and international cooperation to end crimes against humanity.

He said: Honourable senators, I rise today because a motion similar to this one was presented in the other place and was passed unanimously. I hope to influence honourable senators in a similar fashion today.

Also, we received today the visit of the Under-Secretary-General of the United Nations in Genocide Prevention who spoke to the Canada-United States Inter-Parliamentary Group on genocide prevention this morning and was also a witness before the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development in the other place today. He will speak again tomorrow at other venues, in addition to staff.

I would like to speak on this motion this afternoon.

[*Translation*]

Honourable senators, I would like to take advantage of a rare opportunity we have to remember the victims of mass atrocities and honour their memory through concerted action.

[*English*]

I will also indicate that 16 years ago today, the Security Council finally commenced the debate on whether the slaughter in Rwanda was a genocide.

[*Translation*]

As you know, I have moved a motion to establish a National Day of Remembrance and Action on Mass Atrocities on April 23 annually. This motion is very similar to a motion put forward in the other place. April 23 is the birthday of our fourteenth Prime Minister, the distinguished Lester B. Pearson, and was chosen in recognition of his commitment to peace and international cooperation to end crimes against humanity.

As Canada's foremost statesman, Mr. Pearson ensured that the nation's opinion was not only heard but also taken into account. His career showed that a middle power such as Canada can carry a great deal of weight on the international scene when talk is combined with action.

For more than 20 years at the Department of External Affairs, Mr. Pearson played a key role in building Canada's international image. From his visionary strategy for keeping the peace during the Suez crisis in 1956 — which saw the establishment of

peacekeeping, that much-vaunted Canadian institution — to his involvement in defending our neighbours, friends and allies through the creation of NATO, Mr. Pearson became the best-known Canadian in diplomatic circles.

When he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1957 in recognition of his efforts during the Suez crisis, the Nobel Committee said that he had, and I quote, "saved the world." Thanks to Mr. Pearson's leadership in Canada and elsewhere in the world, that time became a turning point in the promotion and defence of the core values Canadians hold dear.

Although Mr. Pearson is known mainly as the father of peacekeeping, history shows that this dynamic, pragmatic man was a sportsman and even a soldier, an intellectual and a statesman, a politician and a prime minister. His outstanding achievements are proof of his determined pursuit of idealism in action — achievements that Canada badly needs to repeat.

• (1610)

He believed in a dynamic and tough diplomatic corps, and in a large military force that could be deployed to help maintain peace and security beyond our borders.

However, before Mr. Pearson became involved in politics in Canada and had the opportunity to develop our international conscience, our community of nations witnessed a terrible, heinous and avoidable tragedy, on a very disturbing scale, but this was not the first, and would certainly not be the last.

[*English*]

Our own nation's early relationship with the Holocaust is not a particularly proud chapter in Canadian history. At the 1938 Evian Conference, held to discuss the "problem" of Jewish refugees fleeing Nazi Germany, Canada steadfastly refused to increase its quota and accept more Jewish immigrants.

More disturbing was the decision in 1939, when the *SS St. Louis*, a passenger ship carrying 907 German Jews, was turned away from Canadian shores. Upon receiving its docking refusal, the *SS St. Louis* was forced to return to Europe, where most of its passengers were condemned to perish in Hitler's death camps.

In the aftermath of the Holocaust, Canada and the international community recognized the horrific consequences of their indifference and vowed never again to allow systematic killings on the basis of nationality, ethnicity, race or religion.

[*Translation*]

It was a pivotal moment when, in 1948, the new United Nations General Assembly — an organization that Mr. Pearson presided over — adopted the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, declaring that genocide, whether committed in time of peace or in time of war, was a crime under international law, which the parties undertook to prevent and to punish.

In 1946, the General Assembly defined genocide as:

... a denial of existence of entire human groups, as homicide is the denial of the right to live of individual human beings.

It went on to say:

... such denial of the right shocks the conscience of mankind ... the punishment of the crime of genocide is a matter of international concern.

[English]

Lofty rhetoric, indeed; but far from heeding this international call to action — one expressly demanded as an obligation under international law, a legal obligation Canada acknowledged when it ratified the Genocide Convention in September 1952. How have the nations like Canada, which ostensibly stand as beacons of equality, justice, and fairness, responded to atrocities in places like Cambodia, Bosnia and Rwanda?

There have been some successes, but there have also been too many failures, cases where empty rhetoric is the only response. The platitudes are used to appease the international community's collective moral conscience in the face of inaction. Ongoing atrocities in places like the Democratic Republic of Congo and Sudan continue to test our resolve and our willingness to robustly defend those at risk of becoming victims of mass atrocities.

[Translation]

The perpetrators and victims of mass atrocities know all too well what this lack of concern means. Perpetrators believe that they have carte blanche to continue carrying out their reprehensible crimes, and victims realize that powerful nations, those that claim to be defenders of decency and the supposedly unshakeable and inalienable rights of individuals, consider their lives to be of little value.

Recognizing genocide is just the first step. Unless we take appropriate action, we are just playing political semantics when we use the term "genocide." I have experienced this personally, and I have felt the consequences ever since.

I once asked whether we are all human or whether some of us are more human than others. If we believe that all human beings are human, how do we prove it? We can only prove it by our actions. That is the only way we can do our part to help humanity evolve and to stop crimes against humanity. There are many ways to bridge the gap between good intentions and concerted efforts on local, national and international levels.

However, for the transformation to take place, we have to introduce conceptual and normative changes. We have to understand that taking action to curb mass atrocities is in Canada's best interest.

There is no doubt that saving the lives of innocent people in the next Rwanda, or Kosovo will also save lives in Canada. Our safety is increasingly threatened by crises that we allow to persist in faraway places.

[Senator Dallaire]

Because more and more business people, tourists and humanitarian workers are travelling abroad, epidemics and infectious diseases that erupt in countries we once ignored, such as the Democratic Republic of Congo, Sudan and Zimbabwe, now pose a greater risk to our public health.

Moreover, mass atrocities undermine political stability in entire regions. In a global economy, that threatens our economic prosperity.

Our international security interests now intersect with our humanitarian interests more than ever before. We have to create a broader definition of our national interests not only to help at-risk states but also to help ourselves and protect ourselves so that we can do more to rid the world of mass atrocities.

The key to mobilizing the international community in order to prevent mass atrocities is to secure national support. It has to start at home. Prevention and the fight must start here: Canadians definitely need leaders who are determined to push this crucial issue. Solid and convincing leadership from our political and legislative authorities will strengthen the public's will to intervene. May God send us these leaders, and soon.

The leader of our country, Prime Minister Stephen Harper, has a unique opportunity to make the prevention of mass atrocities a priority for Canada. In addition, Mr. Harper has an unmatched opportunity to align himself strategically with the Obama administration, which took concrete measures to make genocide prevention a "national security priority." I was with his team at the White House two weeks ago mapping out our positions.

During the Holocaust remembrance ceremony in April 2009, President Barack Obama declared:

Today, and every day, we have an opportunity, as well as an obligation, to confront these scourges ... to commit ourselves to resisting injustice and intolerance and indifference in whatever forms they may take — whether confronting those who tell lies about history, or doing everything we can to prevent and end atrocities like those that took place in Rwanda, those taking place in Darfur. That is my commitment as President ...

He does not beat around the bush. He is a very determined man.

In his annual threat assessment presented to the United States Congress in February 2010, America's Director of National Intelligence, Admiral Dennis Blair, said:

... within the past three years, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Sudan all suffered mass killing episodes through violence, starvation, or deaths in prison camps. ... as well as inexcusably high rape statistics. ... Looking ahead over the next five years, a number of countries in Africa and Asia are at significant risk for a new outbreak of mass killing.

• (1620)

Furthermore, recognizing the national security problems presented by genocides and mass atrocities, the U.S. Quadrennial Defence Review, published in February 2010, stated that the United States Department of Defence should

be prepared to provide the president with options for “preventing human suffering due to mass atrocities or large-scale natural disasters abroad.”

President Obama is building upon Albright-Cohen Genocide Prevention Task Force and a special recommendation by the Will to Intervene project to prevent mass atrocities. In passing, I would like to salute Doctor Shaw, with whom I had the pleasure of working at Concordia University and who is present in the gallery today. The U.S. President has created a new, inter-institutional policy group on reconstruction and stabilization within the National Security Committee, which will help ensure that the prevention of mass atrocities receives greater attention from the American government as a whole.

Honourable senators, I wonder if I could have another five minutes to conclude my speech.

The Hon. the Acting Speaker: Is it your pleasure, honourable senators, to grant Senator Dallaire five more minutes?

Hon. Senators: Yes.

Senator Dallaire: Despite these efforts, no one country can single-handedly resolve the problem of mass atrocities. The credibility of our country and its ability to cooperate with our allies are on the line. To be effective and responsible leaders, Canada and its politicians must be at the forefront and create our own policies and programs for preventing mass atrocities.

How can we prevent genocide and other crimes against humanity? That is a good question. Once again, we must transform our commitment to abstract principles into concrete action. We must insist that our laws and national policies reflect and support our international political and legal obligations. It takes more than just signing conventions in Geneva. We must also pass laws in Ottawa. We must provide our citizens and organizations with more powerful tools in order to exert pressure on future governments, given that moral pressure is often not enough to ensure that politicians respect our international obligations.

We cannot be proud of that.

[English]

These are not high-minded pleas rooted in fanciful idealism. They are echoed by our strongest allies. They are based on scholarly research. They are supported across party lines.

In the 2010 Speech from the Throne, Mr. Harper committed his government to standing up for what is right in the world, including global security, human rights, maternal and child health care, financial market regulation, and international climate change. In many ways, I found this to be very encouraging; but, as always, it is the leap from words to action that really matters.

As the Prime Minister is no doubt aware, standing up for what is right depends on leadership, and it involves standing up for those whose voices have been silenced by the din of hatred, ignorance and intolerance. As empowered leaders, committed

humanitarians and concerned citizens, we must give the marginalized and the disempowered reason to hope. Hope will come from adopting a new approach and from recognizing that the prevention of mass atrocities should be a national priority of the Government of Canada.

Resources must be assigned to construct appropriate long-term strategies to prevent mass atrocities by using Canada's foreign aid; our diplomatic experience, if we ever plan to rebuild our diplomatic corps; and our military capabilities. These resources can be realigned in such incredible missions that go beyond the use of force to the educated use of force in restraint in advancing human rights and the protection of the innocent.

Our government must recognize the nexus between Canada's national interest and the prevention of mass atrocities, and pledge to work with our allies to protect the voiceless and powerless from massive human rights violations.

Time is limited, so I will close with the following: In recognizing April 23 as an annual national day of remembrance and action on mass atrocities, it is my hope that all Canadians will be provided with a regular opportunity to remember victims of mass atrocities; to remember the lessons learned after the Holocaust, after Bosnia, after Cambodia, and after Rwanda; and to push forward with efforts to make Canada an international leader in the prevention of mass atrocities and not the international follower we seem to have become for some undefined reason.

Honourable senators, I will quote from the conclusion of a book I wrote called *Shake Hands with the Devil: The Failure of Humanity in Rwanda*. “The failure of humanity in Rwanda” encompasses the whole of humanity having failed the Rwandans. I quote.

[Translation]

As soldiers we have been used to moving mountains to protect our own sovereignty or risks to our way of life. In the future we must be prepared to move beyond national self-interest to spend our resources and spill our blood for humanity. We have lived through centuries of enlightenment, reason, revolution, industrialization, and globalization. No matter how idealistic the aim sounds, this new century must become the Century of Humanity, when we as human beings rise above race, creed, colour, religion and national self-interest and put the good of humanity above the good of our own tribe. For the sake of the children and of our future. *Peux ce que veux. Allons-y.*

(On motion of Senator Comeau, debate adjourned.)

LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS

MOTION TO AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE TO REFER
DOCUMENTS FROM STUDIES ON BILL S-210 DURING
SECOND SESSION OF THIRTY-NINTH PARLIAMENT
AND BILL S-205 DURING SECOND SESSION
OF FORTIETH PARLIAMENT TO CURRENT STUDY
ON BILL S-215 ADOPTED

Hon. Joan Fraser, pursuant to notice of April 29, 2010, moved:

That the papers and evidence received and taken and work accomplished by the Standing Senate Committee

on Legal and Constitutional Affairs during its study of Bill S-210, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (suicide bombings), during the Second Session of the Thirty-ninth Parliament, and of Bill S-205, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (suicide bombings), during the Second Session of the Fortieth Parliament, be referred to the committee for the purposes of its study on Bill S-215, An

Act to amend the Criminal Code (suicide bombings) during the current session.

(Motion agreed to.)

(The Senate adjourned until Wednesday, May 5, 2010, 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 James S. Cowan

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

Gary W. O'Brien

LAW CLERK AND PARLIAMENTARY COUNSEL

Mark Audcent

USHER OF THE BLACK ROD

Kevin MacLeod

THE MINISTRY

(In order of precedence)

(May 4, 2010)

The Right Hon. Stephen Joseph Harper	Prime Minister
The Hon. Robert Douglas Nicholson	Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
The Hon. Jean-Pierre Blackburn	Minister of Veterans Affairs and Minister of State (Agriculture)
The Hon. Marjory LeBreton	Leader of the Government in the Senate
The Hon. Chuck Strahl	Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians and Minister of the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency
The Hon. Peter Gordon MacKay	Minister of National Defence
The Hon. Stockwell Day	President of the Treasury Board and Minister for the Asia-Pacific Gateway
The Hon. Vic Toews	Minister of Public Safety
The Hon. Rona Ambrose	Minister of Public Works and Government Services and Minister of State (Status of Women)
The Hon. Diane Finley	Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development
The Hon. Beverley J. Oda	Minister for International Cooperation
The Hon. Jim Prentice	Minister of the Environment
The Hon. John Baird	Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities
The Hon. Lawrence Cannon	Minister of Foreign Affairs and Minister of State (National Capital Commission)
The Hon. Tony Clement	Minister of Industry
The Hon. James Michael Flaherty	Minister of Finance
The Hon. Josée Verner	President of the Queen's Privy Council, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister for La Francophonie
The Hon. Jay D. Hill	Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
The Hon. Peter Van Loan	Minister of International Trade
The Hon. Gerry Ritz	Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food and Minister for the Canadian Wheat Board
The Hon. Jason Kenney	Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and Multiculturalism
The Hon. Christian Paradis	Minister of Natural Resources
The Hon. James Moore	Minister for Official Languages and Minister of Canadian Heritage
The Hon. Leona Aglukkaq	Minister of Health
The Hon. Lisa Raitt	Minister of Labour
The Hon. Gail A. Shea	Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
The Hon. Keith Ashfield	Minister of National Revenue, Minister of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Minister for the Atlantic Gateway
The Hon. Gary Lunn	Minister of State (Sport)
The Hon. Gordon O'Connor	Minister of State and Chief Government Whip
The Hon. Diane Ablonczy	Minister of State (Seniors)
The Hon. Rob Merrifield	Minister of State (Transport)
The Hon. Lynne Yelich	Minister of State (Western Economic Diversification)
The Hon. Steven John Fletcher	Minister of State (Democratic Reform)
The Hon. Gary Goodyear	Minister of State (Science and Technology) (Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario)
The Hon. Denis Lebel	Minister of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)
The Hon. Peter Kent	Minister of State of Foreign Affairs (Americas)
The Hon. Rob Moore	Minister of State (Small Business and Tourism)

SENATORS OF CANADA

ACCORDING TO SENIORITY

(May 4, 2010)

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
Lowell Murray, P.C.	Pakenham	Ottawa, Ont.
Peter Alan Stollery	Bloor and Yonge	Toronto, Ont.
Peter Michael Pitfield, P.C.	Ottawa-Vanier	Ottawa, 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.
Ethel Cochrane	Newfoundland and Labrador	Port-au-Port, Nfld. & Lab.
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.
Wilbert Joseph Keon	Ottawa	Ottawa, Ont.
Michael Arthur Meighen	St. Marys	Toronto, Ont.
Janis G. Johnson	Manitoba	Gimli, Man.
A. Raynell Andreychuk	Saskatchewan	Regina, Sask.
Jean-Claude Rivest	Stadacona	Quebec, Que.
Terrance R. Stratton	Red River	St. Norbert, Man.
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.
Sharon Carstairs, P.C.	Manitoba	Winnipeg, Man.
Rose-Marie Losier-Cool	Tracadie	Tracadie-Sheila, N.B.
Céline Hervieux-Payette, P.C.	Bedford	Montreal, Que.
William H. Rompkey, P.C.	Newfoundland and Labrador	St. John's, Nfld. & Lab.
Marie-P. Poulin	Nord de l'Ontario/Northern Ontario	Ottawa, Ont.
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.
Francis William Mahovlich	Toronto	Toronto, Ont.
Joan Thorne Fraser	De Lorimier	Montreal, 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.
Joseph A. Day	Saint John-Kennebecasis	Hampton, N.B.
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 E. Downe	Charlottetown	Charlottetown, P.E.I.

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
Paul J. Massicotte	De Lanaudière	Mont-Saint-Hilaire, Que.
Mac Harb	Ontario	Ottawa, Ont.
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.
Francis Fox, P.C.	Victoria	Montreal, Que.
Sandra Lovelace Nicholas	New Brunswick	Tobique First Nations, N.B.
Bert Brown	Alberta	Kathyrn, Alta.
Fabian Manning	Newfoundland and Labrador	St. Bride's, Nfld. & Lab.
Fred J. Dickson	Nova Scotia	Halifax, N.S.
Stephen Greene	Halifax-The Citadel	Halifax, N.S.
Michael L. MacDonald	Cape Breton	Dartmouth, N.S.
Michael Duffy	Prince Edward Island	Cavendish, P.E.I.
Percy Mockler	New Brunswick	St. Leonard, N.B.
John D. Wallace	New Brunswick	Rothsay, N.B.
Michel Rivard	The Laurentides	Quebec, Que.
Nicole Eaton	Ontario	Caledon, Ont.
Irving Gerstein	Ontario	Toronto, Ont.
Pamela Wallin	Saskatchewan	Kuroki Beach, Sask.
Nancy Greene Raine	Thompson-Okanagan-Kootenay	Sun Peaks, B.C.
Yonah Martin	British Columbia	Vancouver, B.C.
Richard Neufeld	British Columbia	Fort St. John, B.C.
Hector Daniel Lang	Yukon	Whitehorse, Yukon
Patrick Brazeau	Repentigny	Gatineau, Que.
Leo Housakos	Wellington	Laval, Que.
Suzanne Fortin-Duplessis	Rougemont	Quebec, Que.c
Donald Neil Plett	Landmark	Landmark, Man.
Michael Douglas Finley	Ontario—South Coast	Simcoe, Ont.
Linda Frum	Ontario	Toronto, Ont.
Claude Carignan	Mille Isles	Saint-Eustache, Que.
Jacques Demers	Rigaud	Hudson, Que.
Judith G. Seidman (Ripley)	De la Durantaye	Saint-Raphaël, Que.
Carolyn Stewart Olsen	New Brunswick	Sackville, N.B.
Kelvin Kenneth Ogilvie	Annapolis Valley - Hants	Canning, N.S.
Dennis Glen Patterson	Nunavut	Iqaluit, Nunavut
Bob Runciman	Ontario—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes	Brockville, Ont.
Vim Kochhar	Ontario	Toronto, Ont.
Pierre-Hugues Boisvenu	La Salle	Sherbrooke, Que.
Elizabeth (Beth) Marshall	Newfoundland and Labrador	Paradise, Nfld. & Lab.
Rose-May Poirier	New Brunswick—Saint-Louis-de-Kent	Saint-Louis-de-Kent, N.B.

SENATORS OF CANADA

ALPHABETICAL LIST

(May 4, 2010)

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address	Political Affiliation
THE HONOURABLE			
Andreychuk, A. Raynell	Saskatchewan	Regina, Sask.	Conservative
Angus, W. David	Alma	Montreal, Que.	Conservative
Baker, George S., P.C.	Newfoundland and Labrador	Gander, Nfld. & Lab.	Liberal
Banks, Tommy	Alberta	Edmonton, Alta.	Liberal
Boisvenu, Pierre-Hugues	La Salle	Sherbrooke, Que.	Conservative
Brazeau, Patrick	Repentigny	Gatineau, Que.	Conservative
Brown, Bert	Alberta	Kathyrn, Alta.	Conservative
Callbeck, Catherine S.	Prince Edward Island	Central Bedeque, P.E.I.	Liberal
Campbell, Larry W.	British Columbia	Vancouver, B.C.	Liberal
Carignan, Claude	Mille Isles	Saint-Eustache, Que.	Conservative
Carstairs, Sharon, P.C.	Manitoba	Winnipeg, Man.	Liberal
Champagne, Andr��e, 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
Cools, Anne C.	Toronto Centre-York	Toronto, Ont.	
Cordy, Jane	Nova Scotia	Dartmouth, N.S.	Liberal
Cowan, James S.	Nova Scotia	Halifax, N.S.	Liberal
Dallaire, Rom��o Antonius	Gulf	Sainte-Foy, Que.	Liberal
Dawson, Dennis	Lauson	Ste-Foy, Que.	Liberal
Day, Joseph A.	Saint John-Kennebecasis	Hampton, N.B.	Liberal
De Ban��, Pierre, P.C.	De la Valli��re	Montreal, Que.	Liberal
Demers, Jacques	Rigaud	Hudson, Que.	Conservative
Dickson, Fred J.	Nova Scotia	Halifax, N.S.	Conservative
Di Nino, Consiglio	Ontario	Downsview, Ont.	Conservative
Downe, Percy E.	Charlottetown	Charlottetown, P.E.I.	Liberal
Duffy, Michael	Prince Edward Island	Cavendish, P.E.I.	Conservative
Dyck, Lillian Eva	Saskatchewan	Saskatoon, Sask.	Liberal
Eaton, Nicole	Ontario	Caledon, Ont.	Conservative
Eggleton, Art, P.C.	Ontario	Toronto, Ont.	Liberal
Fairbairn, Joyce, P.C.	Lethbridge	Lethbridge, Alta.	Liberal
Finley, Michael Douglas	Ontario—South Coast	Simcoe, Ont.	Conservative
Fortin-Duplessis, Suzanne	Rougemont	Quebec, Que.	Conservative
Fox, Francis, P.C.	Victoria	Montreal, Que.	Liberal
Fraser, Joan Thorne	De Lorimier	Montreal, Que.	Liberal
Frum, Linda	Ontario	Toronto, Ont.	Conservative
Furey, George	Newfoundland and Labrador	St. John's, Nfld. & Lab.	Liberal
Gerstein, Irving	Ontario	Toronto, Ont.	Conservative
Greene, Stephen	Halifax - The Citadel	Halifax, N.S.	Conservative
Harb, Mac	Ontario	Ottawa, Ont.	Liberal
Hervieux-Payette, C��line, P.C.	Bedford	Montreal, Que.	Liberal
Housakos, Leo	Wellington	Laval, Que.	Conservative
Hubley, Elizabeth M.	Prince Edward Island	Kensington, P.E.I.	Liberal
Jaffer, Mobina S. B.	British Columbia	North Vancouver, B.C.	Liberal
Johnson, Janis G.	Manitoba	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, No��l A., <i>Speaker</i>	Fredericton-York-Sunbury	Fredericton, N.B.	Conservative
Kochhar, Vim	Ontario	Toronto, Ont.	Conservative

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address	Political Affiliation
Lang, Hector Daniel	Yukon	Whitehorse, Yukon	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	Tracadie-Sheila, N.B.	Liberal
Lovelace Nicholas, Sandra	New Brunswick	Tobique First Nations, N.B.	Liberal
MacDonald, Michael L.	Cape Breton	Dartmouth, N.S.	Conservative
Mahovlich, Francis William	Toronto	Toronto, Ont.	Liberal
Manning, Fabian	Newfoundland and Labrador	St. Brides's, Nfld. & Lab.	Conservative
Marshall, Elizabeth (Beth)	Newfoundland and Labrador	Paradise, Nfld. & Lab.	Conservative
Martin, Yonah	British Columbia	Vancouver, B.C.	Conservative
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
Mitchell, Grant	Alberta	Edmonton, Alta.	Liberal
Mockler, Percy	New Brunswick	St. Leonard, N.B.	Conservative
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
Neufeld, Richard	British Columbia	Fort St. John, B.C.	Conservative
Nolin, Pierre Claude	De Salaberry	Quebec, Que.	Conservative
Ogilvie, Kelvin Kenneth	Annapolis Valley - Hants	Canning, N.S.	Conservative
Oliver, Donald H.	South Shore	Halifax, N.S.	Conservative
Patterson, Dennis Glen	Nunavut	Iqaluit, Nunavut	Conservative
Pépin, Lucie	Shawinigan	Montreal, Que.	Liberal
Peterson, Robert W.	Saskatchewan	Regina, Sask.	Liberal
Pitfield, Peter Michael, P.C.	Ottawa-Vanier	Ottawa, Ont.	Independent
Plett, Donald Neil	Landmark	Landmark, Man.	Conservative
Poirier, Rose-May	New Brunswick—Saint-Louis-de-Kent	Saint-Louis-de-Kent, N.B.	Conservative
Poulin, Marie-P.	Nord de l'Ontario/Northern Ontario	Ottawa, Ont.	Liberal
Poy, Vivienne	Toronto	Toronto, Ont.	Liberal
Raine, Nancy Greene	Thompson-Okanagan-Kootenay	Sun Peaks, B.C.	Conservative
Ringuette, Pierrette	New Brunswick	Edmundston, N.B.	Liberal
Rivard, Michel	The Laurentides	Quebec, Que.	Conservative
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.	Newfoundland and Labrador	St. John's, Nfld. & Lab.	Liberal
Runciman, Bob	Ontario—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes	Brockville, Ont.	Conservative
St. Germain, Gerry, P.C.	Langley-Pemberton-Whistler	Maple Ridge, B.C.	Conservative
Segal, Hugh	Kingston-Frontenac-Leeds	Kingston, Ont.	Conservative
Seidman (Ripley), Judith G.	De la Durantaye	Saint-Raphaël, Que.	Conservative
Sibbeston, Nick G.	Northwest Territories	Fort Simpson, N.W.T.	Liberal
Smith, David P., P.C.	Cobourg	Toronto, Ont.	Liberal
Stewart Olsen, Carolyn	New Brunswick	Sackville, N.B.	Conservative
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
Wallace, John D.	New Brunswick	Rothsay, N.B.	Conservative
Wallin, Pamela	Saskatchewan	Kuroki Beach, Sask.	Conservative
Watt, Charlie	Inkerman	Kuujuuaq, Que.	Liberal
Zimmer, Rod A. A.	Manitoba	Winnipeg, Man.	Liberal

SENATORS OF CANADA
BY PROVINCE AND TERRITORY
(May 4, 2010)

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 Anne C. Cools	Toronto Centre-York	Toronto
5 Colin Kenny	Rideau	Ottawa
6 Consiglio Di Nino	Ontario	Downsview
7 Wilbert Joseph Keon	Ottawa	Ottawa
8 Michael Arthur Meighen	St. Marys	Toronto
9 Marjory LeBreton, P.C.	Ontario	Manotick
10 Marie-P. Poulin	Northern Ontario	Ottawa
11 Francis William Mahovlich	Toronto	Toronto
12 Vivienne Poy	Toronto	Toronto
13 David P. Smith, P.C.	Cobourg	Toronto
14 Mac Harb	Ontario	Ottawa
15 Jim Munson	Ottawa/Rideau Canal	Ottawa
16 Art Eggleton, P.C.	Ontario	Toronto
17 Nancy Ruth	Cluny	Toronto
18 Hugh Segal	Kingston-Frontenac-Leeds	Kingston
19 Nicole Eaton	Ontario	Caledon
20 Irving Gerstein	Ontario	Toronto
21 Michael Douglas Finley	Ontario—South Coast	Simcoe
22 Linda Frum	Ontario	Toronto
23 Bob Runciman	Ontario—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes	Brockville
24 Vim Kochhar	Ontario	Toronto

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 W. David Angus	Alma	Montreal
5 Pierre Claude Nolin	De Salaberry	Quebec
6 Céline Hervieux-Payette, P.C.	Bedford	Montreal
7 Lucie Pépin	Shawinigan	Montreal
8 Serge Joyal, P.C.	Kennebec	Montreal
9 Joan Thorne Fraser	De Lorimier	Montreal
10 Jean Lapointe	Saurel	Magog
11 Raymond Lavigne	Montarville	Verdun
12 Paul J. Massicotte	De Lanaudière	Mont-Saint-Hilaire
13 Roméo Antonius Dallaire	Gulf	Sainte-Foy
14 Andrée Champagne, P.C.	Grandville	Saint-Hyacinthe
15 Dennis Dawson	Lauzon	Ste-Foy
16 Francis Fox, P.C.	Victoria	Montreal
17 Michel Rivard	The Laurentides	Quebec
18 Patrick Brazeau	Repentigny	Gatineau
19 Leo Housakos	Wellington	Laval
20 Suzanne Fortin-Duplessis	Rougemont	Quebec
21 Claude Carignan	Mille Isles	Saint-Eustache
22 Jacques Demers	Rigaud	Hudson
23 Judith G. Seidman (Ripley)	De la Durantaye	Saint-Raphaël
24 Pierre-Hugues Boisvenu	La Salle	Sherbrooke

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 Terry M. Mercer	Northend Halifax	Caribou River
6 James S. Cowan	Nova Scotia	Halifax
7 Fred J. Dickson	Nova Scotia	Halifax
8 Stephen Greene	Halifax - The Citadel	Halifax
9 Michael L. MacDonald	Cape Breton	Dartmouth
10 Kelvin Kenneth Ogilvie	Annapolis Valley - Hants	Canning

NEW BRUNSWICK—10

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
1 Noël A. Kinsella, <i>Speaker</i>	Fredericton-York-Sunbury	Fredericton
2 Rose-Marie Losier-Cool	Tracadie	Tracadie-Sheila
3 Fernand Robichaud, P.C.	Saint-Louis-de-Kent	Saint-Louis-de-Kent
4 Joseph A. Day	Saint John-Kennebecasis, New Brunswick	Hampton
5 Pierrette Ringuette	New Brunswick	Edmundston
6 Sandra Lovelace Nicholas	New Brunswick	Tobique First Nations
7 Percy Mockler	New Brunswick	St. Leonard
8 John D. Wallace	New Brunswick	Rothsay
9 Carolyn Stewart Olsen	New Brunswick	Sackville
10 Rose-May Poirier	New Brunswick—Saint-Louis-de-Kent	Saint-Louis-de-Kent

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 E. Downe	Charlottetown	Charlottetown
4 Michael Duffy	Prince Edward Island	Cavendish

SENATORS BY PROVINCE-WESTERN DIVISION

MANITOBA—6

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

BRITISH COLUMBIA—6

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
1 Gerry St. Germain, P.C.	Langley-Pemberton-Whistler	Maple Ridge
2 Mobina S. B. Jaffer	British Columbia	North Vancouver
3 Larry W. Campbell	British Columbia	Vancouver
4 Nancy Greene Raine	Thompson-Okanagan-Kootenay	Sun Peaks
5 Yonah Martin	British Columbia	Vancouver
6 Richard Neufeld	British Columbia	Fort St. John

SASKATCHEWAN—6

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
1 A. Raynell Andreychuk	Saskatchewan	Regina
2 David Tkachuk	Saskatchewan	Saskatoon
3 Pana Merchant	Saskatchewan	Regina
4 Robert W. Peterson	Saskatchewan	Regina
5 Lillian Eva Dyck	Saskatchewan	Saskatoon
6 Pamela Wallin	Saskatchewan	Kuroki Beach

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.	Newfoundland and Labrador	St. John's
3 George Furey	Newfoundland and Labrador	St. John's
4 George S. Baker, P.C.	Newfoundland and Labrador	Gander
5 Fabian Manning	Newfoundland and Labrador	St. Bride's
6 Elizabeth (Beth) Marshall	Newfoundland and Labrador	Paradise

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 Dennis Glen Patterson	Nunavut	Iqaluit

YUKON—1

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
1 Hector Daniel Lang	Yukon.	Whitehorse

CONTENTS
Tuesday, May 4, 2010

PAGE	PAGE
Visitor in the Gallery The Hon. the Speaker.	Foreign Affairs and International Trade Official Languages. Hon. Maria Chaput Hon. Marjory LeBreton Hon. Pierre De Bané
445	448 449 449
Afghanistan—Fallen Sailor Silent Tribute. The Hon. the Speaker.	Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency Regional Development. Hon. Fabian Manning Hon. Marjory LeBreton
445	449 449
<hr/>	
SENATORS' STATEMENTS	Public Safety Quality of Translation. Hon. Céline Hervieux-Payette Hon. Marjory LeBreton
Child and Youth Mental Health Hon. Judith Seidman	450 450
National Hospice Palliative Care Week Hon. Elizabeth Hubley	Delayed Answers to Oral Questions Hon. Gerald J. Comeau
445	451
Canadian Navy Congratulations on One Hundredth Anniversary. Hon. Terry M. Mercer	Heritage Telecommunications—Foreign Ownership. Question by Senator Poulin. Hon. Gerald J. Comeau (Delayed Answer).
446	451
<hr/>	
ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS	Infrastructure Broadband Access to Remote Areas. Question by Senator Fox. Hon. Gerald J. Comeau (Delayed Answer).
Human Resources and Social Development Agreement on Social Security between Government of Canada and Republic of Macedonia—Document Tabled. Hon. Gerald J. Comeau	451
446	
Indian Affairs and Northern Development State of Inuit Culture and Society in the Nunavut Settlement Area— 2007-08 Annual Report Tabled. Hon. Gerald J. Comeau	ORDERS OF THE DAY
446	Tax Conventions Implementation Bill, 2010 (Bill S-3) Third Reading. Hon. Stephen Greene
Nisga'a Final Agreement—2006-07 and 2007-08 Annual Reports Tabled Hon. Gerald J. Comeau	452
446	The Senate Motion to Strike Special Committee on Anti-terrorism Adopted. Hon. Gerald J. Comeau
Criminal Code (Bill S-9) Bill to Amend—First Reading. Hon. Gerald J. Comeau	452
446	Library of Parliament Report of Joint Committee Pursuant to Rule 104 Adopted. Hon. Percy E. Downe.
Canadian NATO Parliamentary Association 2009 Annual Session—November 13-17, 2009—Report Tabled. Hon. Jane Cordy	452
446	Erosion of Freedom of Speech Inquiry—Debate Continued. Hon. James S. Cowan. Hon. Marjory LeBreton Hon. Joan Fraser
The Senate Notice of Motion to Encourage the Minister of National Defence to Change the Official Structural Name of the Canadian Navy. Hon. Bill Rompkey	458 459
447	Impact of Dementia on Society Inquiry—Debate Continued. Hon. Wilbert J. Keon
<hr/>	
QUESTION PERIOD	460
International Cooperation Maternal Health Conference. Hon. Grant Mitchell. Hon. Marjory LeBreton	Environment and Human Rights Inquiry—Debate Adjourned. Hon. Grant Mitchell.
447 447	460
Status of Women New Brunswick Coalition for Pay Equity. Hon. Rose-Marie Losier-Cool Hon. Marjory LeBreton	The Senate Motion to Establish National Day of Remembrance and Action—Debate Adjourned. Hon. Roméo Antonius Dallaire.
448 448	463
	Legal and Constitutional Affairs Motion to Authorize Committee to Refer Documents from Studies on Bill S-210 During Second Session of Thirty-ninth Parliament and Bill S-205 During Second Session of Fortieth Parliament to Current Study on Bill S-215 Adopted. Hon. Joan Fraser
	465



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