



CANADA

Debates of the Senate

3rd SESSION

•

40th PARLIAMENT

•

VOLUME 147

•

NUMBER 72

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Wednesday, December 1, 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

Wednesday, December 1, 2010

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

Prayers.

AFGHANISTAN—FALLEN SOLDIER

SILENT TRIBUTE

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, before we proceed, I would ask senators to rise and observe one minute of silence in memory of Captain Francis Cecil Paul, a fallen Afghanistan hero.

Honourable senators then stood in silent tribute.

SENATORS' STATEMENTS

MR. ALEXANDER COLVILLE, P.C., C.C.

CONGRATULATIONS ON NINETIETH BIRTHDAY

Hon. Donald H. Oliver: Honourable senators, one of Canada's living legends recently celebrated his ninetieth birthday. I refer to world-famous visual artist, Nova Scotia's own Alexander Colville.

On November 13, I was delighted to attend a reception in honour of Alex Colville at the Art Gallery of Nova Scotia in Halifax. The AGNS marked his ninetieth birthday with a commemorative exhibit of some of his work. The exhibit will be on display until February 20, 2011.

Alex Colville was born in Toronto in 1920, but soon moved his family to Nova Scotia, where he still lives with his wife of 60 years. He studied fine arts at Mount Allison University, where he graduated in 1942. Soon after, he travelled to Europe as an official war artist to record his artistic impressions of the Second World War. He returned to Canada after the war and taught at Mount Allison University.

In 1963, he finally decided to fully commit himself to his art. Soon his work — paintings, sketches and prints — would travel the world and become featured pieces in exhibits at home and abroad. He is considered one of Canada's most important realist painters.

One of his 1953 paintings, entitled *Man on Veranda*, was auctioned last week for \$1.3 million, setting a new record in Canada for a work by a living Canadian artist.

Mr. Colville's style combines surrealism and symbolism, blended with dream-like elements. His art is featured in many permanent collections in such cities as Ottawa, Halifax, Montreal, Paris, New York, Berlin and Vienna.

In a featured piece in *The Globe and Mail* on November 22, journalist Sandor Fizli described him as "arguably the best-known living Canadian painter."

Shannon Parker, the AGNS's curator of collections, said this about him:

Within Nova Scotia, he's not just this amazing painter that people know about far beyond our borders, but he's also someone people know. As a person and not just an artist.

For me, Alex Colville will be synonymous with talent, but above all, with compassion. In 1991, when my mother died, Alex Colville delivered a touching eulogy in her honour at her funeral. He saw in her a fellow artist whose creativity remained regrettably unfulfilled. I have his original handwritten notes of that eulogy framed and hanging in my office.

To this day, at age 90, Mr. Colville continues to sketch, draw and paint, still producing a few major pieces every year.

In a 2000 CBC interview, Mr. Colville was asked why his work was sometimes considered controversial. He said:

What troubles people about my work, in which they find mystery and intrigue, may well be the idea that ordinary things are important.

Honourable senators, one thing is certain: Alex Colville's interpretations of simple human situations have made him one of Canada's most important visual artists. He is an extraordinary Canadian and a living legend whose art is both inspiring and inspirational.

Please join me in wishing Alex Colville a happy ninetieth birthday.

THE LATE HONOURABLE DAVID C. (SEE-CHAI) LAM, O.C.

Hon. Vivienne Poy: Honourable senators, I rise today to pay tribute to the Honourable David C. Lam, the first Canadian lieutenant-governor of Asian descent, who served British Columbia from 1988 to 1995. David was a trailblazer, an entrepreneur, a community builder, a philanthropist and a dear friend. He passed away last week at the age of 87.

As lieutenant-governor, David remained a man of the people, unimpressed by pomp and ceremony. He fulfilled his duties with such enthusiasm that both he and his wife needed medical treatment for shaking thousands of hands.

David was born in Hong Kong, the son of a Baptist minister. He left a banking career there to immigrate to Vancouver with his family in 1967 because, he said, “the beauty of the city brought tears to my eyes.”

Within 20 years, his entrepreneurship made him a fortune estimated at \$100 million. When he retired at the age of 60, he decided to give away \$1 million a year to Canadian institutions.

In an interview in 1987 with the *Vancouver Sun*, he said:

I have seen a lot of wealth — like gold, silver, diamonds and cash in the bank. But these are dead wealth. These are useless to me. True riches are of the mind.

• (1340)

Throughout his life, David combined the Confucian philosophy of harmony and moderation with evangelical Baptist theology. The result was a deep appreciation for values, education and simple beauty. He believed the key elements for prosperity and success for Canada lie in the quality of education, flexibility of the economy and the adaptability of the workforce.

His philanthropic endeavours were often aimed at building bridges between new Canadians from Asia and mainstream society. One example was the establishment of the David Lam Centre for International Communication at Simon Fraser University, which focuses on building intercultural understanding. David knew that ignorance can only be overcome if people really get to know one another. He said: “One can easily legislate against discrimination, but no one can legislate love.”

In 1993, David told a reporter he wanted to be remembered as “a man who preached harmony, goodness and understanding.” His lasting legacy to all Canadians is that wealth, whether monetary, spiritual or intellectual, needs to be generously shared.

Honourable senators, please join me in extending our sympathies to his family and to the province of British Columbia at the loss of a great man.

[Translation]

GREY CUP 2010

CONGRATULATIONS TO MONTREAL ALOUETTES

Hon. Leo Housakos: Honourable senators, I would like to congratulate the Montreal Alouettes on their big win!

[English]

The gridiron, for generations, has offered a test of endurance, skill and courage. Football provides an opportunity for athletes to display these attributes and to demonstrate for us the power of the human spirit. The Grey Cup is Canada’s oldest professional sports trophy and is synonymous with football supremacy in this country. The Grey Cup has been awarded since 1909, beginning with the University of Toronto, and culminating this year with the Montreal Alouettes.

In this championship match the best of Canadian attributes — fortitude, persistence, bravery and honour — continue to capture our attention and imagination. Last Sunday, the Montreal Alouettes and the Saskatchewan Rough Riders competed for the Grey Cup and underscored these Canadian qualities yet one more time.

[Translation]

There could be only one winner. This time, to the great joy and pride of all Montrealers, the Alouettes claimed the victory for the second straight year.

[English]

Montreal has a long tradition of competitive sports, and the city has celebrated not only Grey Cup championships but also a succession of Stanley Cups. Indeed, we gave the world the game of hockey and helped to introduce football to North America.

[Translation]

On this special day, we are happy to celebrate the Montreal Alouettes’ victory. Congratulations to the coaches, the players and their families on this big win!

[English]

There are really no losers when you are in reach of the Grey Cup so I also want to acknowledge the Saskatchewan Rough Riders for a splendid effort and for giving us a memorable game. However, this moment in history belongs to our Alouettes. We are so proud of you!

MIGRANT WORKERS

Hon. Mobina S. B. Jaffer: Honourable senators, I rise today to speak about the rights of thousands of migrant workers in Canada who work under our Temporary Foreign Worker Program. Just last week, I hosted a workshop that shed light on this important issue. This workshop was facilitated by Dr. Kerry Preiebisch and Ms. Evelyn Encalada. There it was brought to our attention that over 130 temporary migrant agricultural workers in Simcoe, Ontario, were dismissed from their jobs and sent home to Mexico and the Caribbean. Each of these workers was owed over \$1,000 in unpaid wages. When journalists and migrant rights advocates investigated the wage dispute, they found deplorable living conditions, including unheated, overcrowded bunkhouses and leaking sewage.

These men worked hard to provide for their families back home. They worked up to 12 hours a day, seven days a week for minimum wage. These adult men fought back tears as they told their stories of being unable to buy their children Christmas presents or even to feed their families in the absence of their expected wages.

Since migrant workers are forced to return home when their contracts end, or in this case when their contracts are broken, they cannot seek legal redress on Canadian soil. Even though each of the Simcoe workers paid hundreds of dollars in EI contributions this year, they cannot collect Employment Insurance benefits now

that they have lost their jobs. Therefore, these men were forced to return to their homes this week empty-handed and with broken spirits.

Honourable senators, injustices such as these happen across our country every single day. The rights and dignity of migrant workers are violated routinely because there is no legislation in place to systemically monitor employers and labour recruiters. These workers would go to great lengths to protect their opportunity to work in Canada, which is why they do not complain when they are refused health and safety training or equipment.

Many seasonal agricultural workers have worked hard for over four decades to put food on our tables and to sustain our vital agricultural industry. Despite the fact that they have spent more than half of their lives in our country, we offer them neither a chance to become permanent residents nor migrant support services.

Honourable senators, it is time for Canada to create protections for and to grant rights to all 300,000 temporary migrant workers who work in Canada under the Temporary Foreign Worker Program. It is time for the creation of an independent regulatory body, a migrant worker commission that can investigate and address the challenges of Canada's labour migration programs and protect Canada's legacy as a fair and just society.

We nourish ourselves with the food they produce; now we have to start protecting migrant workers' rights.

GLOBAL WATER SECURITY INSTITUTE

Hon. Pamela Wallin: Honourable senators, in my home province of Saskatchewan, water is a big deal because even with all of our key resources and commodities, we are still a farming province where rain and snowfall are vital, unpredictable and sometimes devastating. Many can still remember the heartbreak of the Dirty Thirties when the parched prairie topsoil literally blew away. Just this spring and again in the fall heavy rains and flooding left many with no grain in the bin.

Water and how to manage it is critical in a world with food and water shortages and insatiable energy needs. Canada has only 0.5 per cent of the world's population, but our land mass holds about 9 per cent of the world's renewable water supply; talk about a strategic resource.

At the University of Saskatchewan, a Canada Excellence Research Chair has been awarded, and the Global Institute for Water Security is being established with \$30 million in funding, \$10 million of which comes from the federal government. This institute will build on the University of Saskatchewan's already renowned water research program by recruiting 85 people to join the 65 researchers already there. Together, they will work on answers to the world's water challenges and train the next generation of water scientists.

Dr. Howard Wheeler, Canada Excellence Research Chair in Water Security and head of the institute, is one of the world's leading hydrologists. He comes to Saskatchewan from Imperial College London. He is vice-chair of the World Climate Research Programme's Global Energy and Water Cycle Experiment, and leads UNESCO's arid zone water resources program.

Water research is a highly complex, interdisciplinary endeavour involving ecology, toxicology and hydrology. The Global Institute for Water Security will work together with partners at Environment Canada and at the Saskatchewan Research Council, and, of course, with industry. This is good news for the world because 900 million people have no access to safe drinking water, and 1.6 billion lack even basic sanitation, which requires a reliable water supply.

Honourable senators, the Canada Excellence Research Chair Program was established by this government in 2008 to attract the highest calibre of researchers and scholars; and that it is doing across disciplines. The program's aim is to put Canada at the leading edge of breakthroughs in priority research, to generate benefits for Canadians and to establish Canada as a location of choice for leading research in science and technology.

I congratulate the University of Saskatchewan for its leadership, for being awarded the Canada Excellence Research Chair and for establishing the Global Water Security Institute. I wish Dr. Wheeler and his team the very best. It is about all of our futures.

THE HONOURABLE DANNY WILLIAMS

Hon. George J. Furey: Honourable senators, I rise to pay tribute to someone I have known all my life; someone who has always been on the other political side; someone who has, at times, been at political odds with me; but someone who has always been a great friend; and someone, honourable senators, whose family has always been friends with my family.

Danny Williams came to politics in Newfoundland and Labrador with great pride, great dignity and impeccable integrity. Despite his many achievements, this week he leaves all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians saddened by his departure but enriched by his gift to us of a share in this pride, this dignity and this integrity.

• (1350)

As premier of our province, Danny Williams was always steadfast in his desire to see all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians have a better life. Danny Williams was always steadfast in his desire to see our province flourish.

Early in his mandate as our premier, Danny Williams established a reputation for being a tough negotiator in the political arena. However, this same tough negotiator is both kind and generous when he sees people in need.

Danny Williams is never lost for words when negotiating with companies or other governments. Yet I have often seen this same hard-nosed negotiator left speechless by the beauty of our province's wonderful coastline; left speechless by the joy he takes in spending time with his grandchildren; and left speechless by the plight of the poor and the underprivileged.

The hallmark of his government and his governing style has always been about ordinary Newfoundlanders and Labradorians and ordinary Canadians. Danny Williams never was, and, dare I say, never will be, about the powerful, the wealthy and the influential.

Today, honourable senators, I want to say thank you to Danny Williams on behalf of myself, my family and my fellow Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. Thank you for having served us so selflessly and so well. Thank you for showing us all that with perseverance, spirit and integrity, we in Newfoundland and Labrador can claim our own special place in this great federation we call Canada.

Most of all, honourable senators, Danny Williams has shown us that politics can and should be about serving people, about rising above partisanship and doing what is best for those we serve. As he leaves this phase of his political career, no greater legacy can be left than by history recording that this man, Danny Williams, has made a difference.

Thank you, Danny, for being there and for your continued friendship.

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH CENTRE

CONGRATULATIONS ON FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY

Hon. Hugh Segal: Honourable senators, I rise today to pay tribute to the remarkable work of the International Development Research Centre, which is celebrating its fortieth anniversary this year.

In a host of areas and regions worldwide, Canadian expertise and resources have been deployed to assist partners in developing countries in the development of skills and best practices that help them build stronger countries and communities and move their countries and people up the development ladder. This Canadian support has been in the best traditions of Canadian foreign policy: ambitious as to goals; humble as to public posture; and respectful of the cultures, traditions and histories of the countries with which IDRC engages. This humanity and rigorous attention to issues of competence and empirical value for research has had huge impact worldwide.

In 1995, then South African President Nelson Mandela noted:

South Africans have benefited greatly from the IDRC's assistance.

Canada's IDRC worked closely with South African researchers to prepare for the end of apartheid and the transition to democracy based on an agreement for that purpose between Prime Minister Mulroney and Mr. Mandela himself. More than half the cabinet in the South African government after the historic 1994 election had participated in IDRC projects.

IDRC has supported research in Chile since 1977. It has helped the country develop strong research capabilities and improve government policies. IDRC grantees in Chile have contributed to policy-makers' understanding of the economy, labour markets, social service provision and key resource sectors.

Since the regional office opened its doors in September 1971, Asia has undergone dramatic change. IDRC research has helped with government policies focusing on the poor isolated communities, access to modern communication technology such as the Internet, and has been a huge part of the modernization of Asian democracies.

These are just a few examples of the many other projects of equal impact and import. The IDRC board has always had distinguished foreign nationals sharing their advice and expertise with Canadian members. The present CEO, David Malone, represents the very best of Canada's foreign service and international presence worldwide. He brings to his present role vast experience at the UN as our High Commissioner to India and Ambassador to Bhutan and Nepal.

Honourable senators, Canada's foreign service is not perfect — none worldwide are — but it is a vital part of the continuing Canadian presence that serves the enduring Canadian values of freedom, democracy, human rights, economic prosperity and social justice.

The International Development Research Centre is a free-standing Crown agency where research, foreign policy and development priorities blend to serve the broader world in a way of which we can all be proud. The IDRC is an agency of the Canadian way. It deserves our praise.

Congratulations and gratitude for 40 years of remarkable Canadian service for a better world and a compelling engagement to serve even more effectively in the future.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

NATIONAL HUNTING, TRAPPING AND FISHING HERITAGE DAY BILL

FIRST READING

The Hon. the Speaker informed the Senate that a message had been received from the House of Commons with Bill C-465, An Act respecting a National Hunting, Trapping and Fishing Heritage Day.

(Bill read first time.)

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

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

CANADA-EUROPE PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

CONFERENCE OF PARLIAMENTARIANS OF THE ARCTIC REGION, SEPTEMBER 13-15, 2010— REPORT TABLED

Hon. Percy E. Downe: Honourable senators, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the report of the Canadian parliamentary delegation of the Canada-Europe Parliamentary

Association regarding its participation at the Ninth Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region, held in Brussels, Belgium, from September 13 to 15, 2010.

I should like to inform the chamber that no honourable senators participated in this delegation.

[Translation]

THE SENATE

NOTICE OF MOTION TO URGE THE EUROPEAN UNION TO APPLY A PRESERVATION POLICY OF THE EASTERN ATLANTIC BLUEFIN TUNA

Hon. Céline Hervieux-Payette: Honourable senators, I give notice that, at the next sitting of the Senate, I will move:

That, whereas the scientific community considers that there is a threat to the sustainability of the Eastern Atlantic bluefin tuna (*Thunnus Thynnus*),

Whereas the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) has classified *Thunnus Thynnus* as in critical danger of extinction and has appealed for a moratorium on the fishery,

Whereas the European Union's environmental imprint on the Eastern Atlantic bluefin tuna stock is considerable, with France, Spain, Italy and Malta being the main harvesters of the young of this species,

Whereas the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT) has set a quota for 2011 that will give the bluefin tuna population only a 60% chance of recovering by 2022, even without taking into account the effects of poaching and of weaknesses in the catch declaration system,

Whereas the government of Canada, Canadian industry and Canadian scientists are working together to ensure that bluefin tuna stocks in the Western Atlantic can support a sustainable fishery,

The Senate of Canada urges the European Union to apply to the situation of the Eastern Atlantic bluefin tuna the moral values underlying the Union's new regulations on the seal hunt (even though the harp seal is not an endangered species), with a view to protecting the species *Thunnus Thynnus*, respecting scientific opinion and encouraging its member countries to implement an adequate policy guaranteeing preservation of the species for the generations to come.

• (1400)

[English]

QUESTION PERIOD

ENVIRONMENT

CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY

Hon. Grant Mitchell: Honourable senators, it is clear that the Government of Canada is going to do on climate change whatever it is that the United States government is going to do. Interestingly, the Government of the United States has just announced that, given the changes in Congress, they will not be able to do certain things, so they will regulate major emitters under their environmental protection legislation. While many people know about that, it was pretty clear that when the part-time Environment Minister, Mr. Baird, was asked about it, he did not have a clue what the issue was.

Could the leader give us some idea when the Prime Minister will put enough priority on the environment to actually appoint a full-time Minister of the Environment, or is he just happy having someone who has no time to do what needs to be done on that important file?

An Hon. Senator: Well, we are doing way more than you did.

Hon. Marjory LeBreton (Leader of the Government): Absolutely, honourable senators. Everything that we do is 100 per cent more than what was done before.

An Hon. Senator: That is right.

Senator LeBreton: The Honourable John Baird is the Minister of the Environment at the present time. He has a lot of experience in this portfolio. He picked up the file quickly following the departure of Jim Prentice, the former Minister of the Environment. Obviously, all of us are involved in the deliberations in cabinet. Mr. Baird stayed on top of the issues. He will go to Cancun next week and will represent the government as the Minister of the Environment.

Senator Mitchell: Given that the government takes all this credit for doing so much on climate change, it must have some measurements; it must have some report telling it how much it has actually reduced carbon emissions. After all, the Prime Minister actually gets reports on how many signs he has on stimulus projects. Surely he could have a report on how much carbon he has reduced.

To be fair, because the leader keeps throwing it up, could she tell us how much carbon all of their vaunted greenhouse gas programs have actually reduced over the last one or two years? Is that possible?

An Hon. Senator: Come clean!

Senator LeBreton: Imagine that! A Liberal telling a Conservative to come clean!

Senator Comeau: Let's get the brown paper bags!

Senator Di Nino: You should hide in shame — forever!

Senator Mercer: Are you allowed to talk to Brian yet?

Some Hon. Senators: Oh, oh!

Senator LeBreton: I said many times that Senator Mercer is in the wrong job. They should put him on a little tugboat in the harbour in Halifax and use him as a foghorn. He would be a lot more effective.

Some Hon. Senators: Oh, oh!

Senator Comeau: A good lighthouse. Man the lighthouse!

Senator LeBreton: Honourable senators, in Cancun, Canada will seek an outcome that includes commitments from all major emitters and reflects the balance achieved in Copenhagen in the only accord that includes all major emitters. I will get to the honourable senator's question on carbon in a minute.

The Copenhagen Accord has the support of 139 countries, representing approximately 85 per cent of global greenhouse gas emissions. It is important that we build upon this achievement. As the honourable senator knows, under the accord we committed to reduce Canada's emissions by 17 per cent below 2005 levels by 2020, which is in line with the United States' target. We are already working with the Obama administration through implementing the North American-wide regulations, as the honourable senator knows; and through important initiatives like the Clean Energy Dialogue. We are already harmonizing regulations in sectors such as light vehicles. In other areas, we are developing equivalency standards. As Minister Baird recently stated, this is the approach we will be using.

In terms of greenhouse gas emissions, one of the major initiatives of our government, as we announced in June, was to phase out dirty coal-fired power plants. This will significantly reduce emissions from that sector. I believe, honourable senators, that all major emitters will be going to Cancun with the goal of continuing with the Copenhagen Accord. After that, perhaps we will have a proper measuring mark from all countries on their reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

Senator Mitchell: I think we have just been listening to a major emitter. Speaking of "fog," that would characterize that answer quite well.

There are 700 major emitters in this country. Of course, later in the week Mr. Baird said that he will regulate them because the U.S. is regulating them. Great. Can the leader tell us exactly when he will start regulating them? Is that in the plan? Do we have some schedule on that? Can she give us a date by any chance, or is Minister Baird too busy to come up with one?

Senator LeBreton: Honourable senators, we are working on a plan. When we are ready to announce it, we will announce it.

Senator Mitchell: I will keep asking about that.

Finally, just so Minister Baird does not use this problem as an excuse — the problem being that certain greenhouse gas trading regimes would cause net regional outflows that would

disadvantage a province like Alberta, if it were true — the C.D. Howe Institute, the market-driven, right-wing economic institute that the leader probably admires, has just done a study that indicates that this kind of trading regime can be done without net regional transfers. Could the leader make sure that Mr. Baird is aware of that new fact and analysis so that he does not use the excuse that he is just too busy to do what needs to be done on this important file?

Senator LeBreton: I can assure the honourable senator that Minister Baird does not need instructions from me or anyone else to be well aware of what any institute, including the C.D. Howe Institute, is saying. I am sure he is well aware of it. I do not need prompting from the honourable senator and the minister does not need prompting from me to read things that are important to his portfolio.

Hon. Bill Rompkey: Honourable senators, there is an immediate opportunity for the government to invest in the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and in green energy if it were to assist with the development of the Lower Churchill project, which will be of benefit to all of the Atlantic provinces, including the province that Senator Comeau comes from. Actually, it will be a benefit to the whole of Canada. The construction industry is spread throughout Central Canada. It will have a great deal of interest and input into that.

The Government of Newfoundland and Labrador has asked for something like \$327 million from the Government of Canada. If the minister was prepared to cut the cheque today and to go to St. John's and make the presentation, the leader would make all four Atlantic provinces very happy.

Senator LeBreton: I thank the honourable senator for the question. I will be very happy to pass on that suggestion to the minister.

[Translation]

CANADIAN HERITAGE

LINGUISTIC DUALITY AT 2015 PAN AMERICAN GAMES

Hon. Maria Chaput: Honourable senators, my question is for the Leader of the Government in the Senate and concerns the Pan American Games to be held in Toronto in 2015.

On November 29, an article in *Le Devoir* revealed that the linguistic failure of the opening of the 2010 Olympic and Paralympic Games in Vancouver could happen again at the Pan American Games in Toronto in 2015.

The article stated, and I quote:

... the agreement between the organizing committee and the government is no more specific than the agreement signed with Vancouver.

The article also said that this agreement does not reflect any of the recommendations made by the Commissioner of Official Languages.

• (1410)

My question for the Leader of the Government in the Senate is the following: did the federal government learn its lesson from the linguistic fiasco during the opening ceremony of the Vancouver 2010 Olympic Games, when only one song was performed in French? Should the government not be more strict and far-sighted in order to respect linguistic duality?

[English]

Hon. Marjory LeBreton (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, with regard to the Vancouver 2010 Winter Olympics, the government made record levels of investments to ensure that both official languages were incorporated into all aspects of the Games, including the Cultural Olympiad, the Olympic Torch Relay and every Olympic site.

The Commissioner of Official Languages told the Canadian Press earlier this year that, with the exception of the opening ceremonies, he was well pleased with the level of bilingualism at the Games.

Honourable senators, I have acknowledged in this place, as has the government, that the opening ceremonies were a disappointment. We expressed that, as did the Minister of Canadian Heritage, the minister responsible for the Olympics. That having been said, record levels of money and effort were put into the Vancouver 2010 Winter Olympics.

I hope that the planning committee for the Pan American Games will be mindful of what happened at the opening ceremony, and it was only at the opening ceremony of the Vancouver Winter Olympics.

[Translation]

Senator Chaput: I would like to thank the leader for her response. She acknowledged that I was talking about the opening ceremonies, which were a failure. That would not have happened had responsibilities been more clearly defined in the agreement between the federal government and Vancouver.

My next question is this: would it not be reasonable to include language clauses in the contribution agreement for the 2015 Pan American Games that more carefully delineate the obligation of funded organizations to ensure substantive equality between the two official languages?

[English]

Senator LeBreton: Honourable senators, I believe I have answered that question. With regard to the Vancouver Winter Olympics, despite massive efforts on the part of the government, and despite the fact that the Commissioner of Official Languages was well satisfied with everything that the government did and with all aspects of the Vancouver Olympics, there is no doubt that the opening ceremonies were a disappointment. I would not go so far as to say they were a failure; I would say they were a disappointment with regard to respecting the Official Languages Act and Canada's official languages policy.

[Senator Chaput]

I will certainly draw the honourable senator's comments to the attention of the Minister of Canadian Heritage so that when the organizers planning the Pan American Games meet with government officials, they will be reminded of the incidents surrounding the opening ceremonies of the Vancouver Winter Olympics.

[Translation]

Senator Chaput: I sincerely thank the leader for her response. When the leader discusses this matter with Minister Moore, will she ensure that language clauses will be detailed enough to prevent the same problem from happening again? There is still time; the games are not until 2015.

Can the leader ask the minister to make certain that the agreement is detailed enough to ensure that federal funding will be spent in accordance with requirements to respect linguistic duality and the equality of the official languages during these ceremonies?

[English]

Senator LeBreton: Honourable senators, I will be happy to pass on the honourable senator's comments to the Minister of Canadian Heritage. However, I must reiterate that, except for the opening ceremony, the Official Languages Act was fully complied with and fully respected at the Vancouver Winter Olympics, in all the venues and all the other events surrounding the Olympics. Proof of that is the positive report that was given to the services by the Commissioner of Official Languages.

[Translation]

FINANCE

QUEBEC—HARMONIZED SALES TAX

Hon. Francis Fox: Honourable senators, my question is also for the Leader of the Government in the Senate. Can the minister provide us with an update on the status of the discussions and negotiations between the Government of Canada and the Government of Quebec on the matter of the compensation owed to Quebec for harmonizing its sales tax? When can we expect a positive resolution to the issue?

[English]

Hon. Marjory LeBreton (Leader of the Government): I thank the honourable senator for the question. I can only report, as the Minister of Finance has reported, that negotiations and talks are being held, which have been positive, although no conclusion has been reached. They are talking and they are working on this file and the dialogue has been positive. Other than that, honourable senators, I have nothing to report.

[Translation]

Senator Fox: The minister is telling us that she cannot assure us of a positive resolution, which surprises me. Can she comment on the fact that the Conservative government said "yes" to British Columbia and Ontario regarding compensation? So how could the government possibly deny Quebec compensation?

[English]

Senator LeBreton: As the honourable senator is aware, this is a completely different situation because of the way tax is collected in the province of Quebec. Again, honourable senators, this is a responsibility that falls to the Minister of Finance. The minister has reported that he has had very positive discussions with the Minister of Finance for the Province of Quebec. Having been a cabinet minister, Senator Fox would know that there is little more that I, as the Leader of the Government in the Senate, can add to this at this time.

[Translation]

Senator Fox: I have another question. The Leader of the Government in the Senate mentioned how taxes are collected. Is the manner in which taxes are collected really important to the outcome of this issue? Does it really make a difference if the tax is collected by the Government of Quebec, as it is now, or does it absolutely have to be collected by the Department of National Revenue? Is tax collection so deeply entrenched in the Department of National Revenue that it is the only body capable of collecting taxes?

[English]

Senator LeBreton: To give a very honest answer, honourable senators, this is not something that I am privy to and I will not comment. I will simply take the honourable senator's question as notice. I will ask the proper officials in the Department of Finance and the Department of National Revenue, who are the people responsible to answer this question. I will not enter into an area of jurisdiction about which I have little or no knowledge.

[Translation]

INDUSTRY

2011 CENSUS

Hon. Claudette Tardif (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, my question is for the Leader of the Government in the Senate. The second annual report on the implementation of the European Statistics Code of Practice, prepared by the European Statistical Governance Advisory Board, was released last week. One of the recommendations indicates that statistics laws must guarantee that statistical services can develop, produce and disseminate statistics independently and transparently. The report gives the example of Canada and its rejection of the mandatory long-form census to highlight the importance of the professional independence of statistical authorities.

Through this report, the international community is publicly deploring our management of statistics. How do you plan to restore Canada's reputation in this area, and what is your response to this report?

• (1420)

[English]

Hon. Marjory LeBreton (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I read the report with great interest and the government is not changing its position on the long-form census.

Senator Tardif: That is unfortunate because the report clearly states that statistics agencies should be able to operate without any government interference. Your minority government has chosen to ignore Statistics Canada, experts, professionals, provinces, organizations and municipalities by moving forward with its heavily criticized decision to scrap the mandatory nature of the long-form census. How can the government keep justifying this irrational measure?

The international community has noticed. Our reputation is now tarnished in yet another area. What is this government prepared to do if the findings of our National Household Survey prove to be what most are predicting: incomparable to previous years, tainted with non-response bias and significant lower response rates?

Senator LeBreton: The most important part of the honourable senator's question was one of the smallest words in the English language, "if," because she is assuming that Canadians will not fill out the voluntary household survey. I have indicated before that the survey has the same number of questions and will be more widely distributed.

We have every reason to believe that Canadians will fill out the voluntary long-form household survey, and that the information provided by the survey will be as valuable to all of the people who access the information as was the previous form. It is really a misnomer to say it was a mandatory long-form census. Mandatory is mandatory, like the short-form census which every Canadian is compelled to fill in. A long form sent to 20 per cent of Canadian households can hardly be described as mandatory, although that was the name given it.

We believe that the National Household Survey, with the same questions sent to a wider distribution of people, who will fill it out and return it without the threat of fines or harassment, will provide the information that is sought. I would caution Senator Tardif not to assume that if this or that does not happen someone will be upset. I think we should wait and give Canadians credit and trust that they will fill out the form as it is sent to them.

Senator Tardif: I am not assuming anything. This is a report put forward by the relative council of the European Parliament.

I have a third question on the census issue.

Senator Tkachuk: Oh, oh!

Senator Tardif: Would the honourable senator like to ask a question when our roles are reversed, perhaps?

Senator Mercer: They will be soon.

Senator Tardif: I have a third question on the census issue. Will the results of the new long-form survey be treated exactly like the old one? That is, will they be sent to Library and Archives Canada for permanent storage and safekeeping with the public allowed access after 92 years?

Senator LeBreton: Honourable senators, I will take the question as notice. Many jurisdictions in the world, including the United States and Great Britain, are getting out of the census business

completely. There were recent changes as a result of Senator Milne's efforts in the Senate. I will get an answer on that specific point from the Minister of Industry, who is responsible for StatsCan.

HEALTH

TOBACCO CONTROL STRATEGY

Hon. Grant Mitchell: Honourable senators, I want to ask a question on smoking. I hope I do not get a filtered answer, but I am not counting on it.

Science and research tells us that labels and warnings on tobacco packages must be changed periodically or people become inured to them. In fact, it is in the regulations that these changes should be made. Of course, cigarette companies do not want to make such changes because that would be negative marketing. It turns out that this Conservative government is actually quite happy to allow the tobacco companies off the hook by not requiring that they change these warnings.

Why is it that this government would side with cigarette tobacco companies against science and the health of Canadians when it will not cost the Canadian taxpayer any money to make the change?

Hon. Marjory LeBreton (Leader of the Government): I will give the honourable senator the unfiltered answer: That is a blatant falsehood and he knows it. The fact is we have committed \$15.7 million annually through our grants and contributions program under the Federal Tobacco Control Strategy to help people stop smoking, prevent youth from starting to smoke and to protect Canadians from second-hand smoke. Honourable senators heard the stories last week about the dangers of second-hand smoke.

With regard to the health warnings on tobacco packaging, unlike the senator's claim, Health Canada has not ended this program. Health Canada is looking into this whole issue of health warning on tobacco packaging and will arrive at a decision on how to proceed, whether to renew or to change. Health Canada has not closed the door on renewing the health warnings on cigarette packages.

Senator Mitchell: I guess they have not "closed the door" on doing something about climate change, either, but God knows how long we will have to wait for it.

The government has actually made a decision, and we know that and they know that. They said they will concentrate on doing away with contraband cigarettes instead, as if they could not do both at the same time. Do they not understand that they can do both at the same time? They can reduce smoking by virtue of things like warnings, which would reduce demand for contraband cigarettes, making the job easier.

Senator LeBreton: Senator Mitchell makes things up. Where on earth did the honourable senator ever get the idea that the government would simply concentrate on contraband tobacco and, somehow or other, not keep working through our grants and

contributions program to do everything possible to prevent young people from starting to smoke, encouraging adults to quit smoking and posting the dangers of second-hand smoke? I wish that Senator Mitchell would quit making things up.

Senator Tkachuk: Yes, quit making stuff up. You make stuff up all the time.

Senator LeBreton: Absolutely, and Senator Mitchell is the type of person that if he says it, being a Liberal, it is supposed to be fact.

Senator Tkachuk: Exactly.

Senator Mitchell: I was not going to use this pun because it is so obvious, but I must say that it is clear that, as per usual, the leader, in answering questions, is simply blowing smoke.

Can the government not understand that while they may be undertaking these measures they could take the next step of requiring cigarette companies, tobacco companies, to change their labels, reduce smoking potentially, reduce health care costs, all for free, for no cost to the Canadian taxpayer? Why is it that the government just cannot understand that?

Senator LeBreton: Senator Mitchell says that I am blowing smoke. He creates enough smoke spinning his wheels in uttering his ridiculous comments.

The fact is the government is committed to dealing with the issue of contraband tobacco and to the smoking cessation program. It is a "no-brainer," honourable senators, that any government, no matter what political stripe, would be doing everything possible to reduce the serious consequences of smoking on the health of Canadians.

• (1430)

Hon. Sharon Carstairs: Honourable senators, we come to this chamber and we pose questions based on information we have been given. We do not make up our questions out of thin air.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Senator Carstairs: The Minister of Health went to a meeting of the health ministers of all the provinces. The provincial health ministers were expecting an announcement about enhanced advertising on cigarette packages. The Minister of Health, despite the fact that the department had been working on this for months, announced there would be no such enhanced advertising on cigarette packages.

Will the Leader of the Government now suggest that all the provincial ministers of health are also "making it up"?

Senator LeBreton: First, there is no need to shout; I can hear perfectly well.

Senator Cordy: I do not think so.

Senator LeBreton: Honourable senators, I cannot answer for what ministers of health of the jurisdictions anticipated the Minister of Health would say. I can only answer about what the Minister of Health is doing. The Minister of Health is an outstanding minister who is working on many important fields. She is a great credit to our country and to the North where she is from.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I undertook yesterday to come back this afternoon with my ruling on the point of order that was raised yesterday.

Honourable senators, yesterday, during debate on the sixth report of the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce, a point of order was raised as to whether the report, which recommends that the Senate not further consider Bill S-216, was properly before the Senate. This concern arose from the fact that the committee had not gone through the bill clause-by-clause, a usual requirement under rule 96(7.1). That rule states that “[e]xcept with leave of its members present, a committee cannot dispense with clause-by-clause consideration of a bill.” Against this requirement, there is rule 100, which states, in part, that “[w]hen a committee to which a bill has been referred considers that the bill should not be proceeded with further in the Senate, it shall so report to the Senate, stating its reasons.”

[Translation]

There are relatively few instances in which Senate committees have used the process allowed under rule 100. Research has identified eight cases since 1975, of which the 1998 example of Bill C-220 is the most recent. According to the available records, committees have always made the decision to report against a bill without starting clause-by-clause study. That is to say, the basic issue of whether a committee considers that a bill should be proceeded with is decided, either explicitly or, most often, implicitly, before clause-by-clause. If the committee decides to make a recommendation under rule 100, it does not ever reach the clause-by-clause stage.

[English]

This helps to understand how rule 96(7.1), which was added to the *Rules of the Senate* in 2005, is to be used. This rule only applies if the committee actually gets to the stage of considering a bill clause-by-clause. If that point is not reached, because a committee decides to recommend against the bill pursuant to rule 100, the requirement of rule 96(7.1) does not come into play. To require that a committee must go through a bill clause-by-clause when it has already decided to report against the bill would be contradictory and inconsistent.

[Translation]

A review of the blues of the meeting of the Banking Committee on November 25, indicates that, although the term “dispense with clause-by-clause” was used at one point, this was quickly

corrected to “not proceed with clause-by-clause.” A motion to that effect was put to a recorded vote and carried. A report was then proposed, with a recommendation that the Senate not continue consideration of the bill. This report was adopted on another recorded vote. The proceedings, except for the passing reference to dispensing with clause-by-clause, which was corrected, were thus in order. Not proceeding with clause-by-clause when the committee is recommending against a bill is, as already noted, proper practice.

[English]

Honourable senators, as a ruling of September 16, 2009, noted, “[w]hile committees are often said to be ‘masters of their own proceedings,’ this is only true insofar as they comply with the *Rules of the Senate*.” This is in keeping with rule 96(7), which prohibits committees from adopting inconsistent special procedures or practices without the Senate’s approval, and also reflects points to be found at pages 1047-1048 of the second edition of the *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*.

This said, the practice in our committees has been that they are permitted considerable freedom in governing their proceedings. When there are concerns about the propriety of proceedings in committee, they should be raised at that time and that venue when corrective action can be more easily taken.

The ruling is that the sixth report is properly before the Senate, and debate can continue when the item is called.

Hon. Wilfred P. Moore: Honourable senators, I read the Speaker’s ruling as he went over it, and I did not see any reference to the fact that the committee —

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, there is no debate on the ruling. If the ruling is being appealed, then I should hear that the ruling is being appealed, but there is no debate on the ruling.

Senator Moore: Honourable senators, I do not want to challenge the Speaker, but I am concerned that things were not looked into. We had an agreement in the committee, two agreements —

The Hon. the Speaker: Order.

CRIMINAL CODE

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING— DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Hervieux-Payette, P.C., seconded by the Honourable Senator Tardif, for the second reading of Bill S-204, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (protection of children).

Hon. Donald Neil Plett: Honourable senators, a few weeks ago I received a phone call from my brother in British Columbia who was calling to catch up and see how things were going in the Senate. When I told him I would be speaking to Bill S-204, the anti-spanking bill, he was shocked. His reply to me was, "Shouldn't you be worrying about a fragile economic recovery rather than wasting taxpayers' dollars and time telling responsible parents how to raise their children?"

Honourable senators, I must say I tend to agree with him. However, since our democratic process allows for any and all private members' bills to be presented, I will spend the next 40 minutes of taxpayers' dollars and time trying to explain why we should not allow responsible parents, parents who have brought children into this world, to responsibly correct and discipline their children.

Bill S-204, an Act to amend the Criminal Code (protection of children), seeks to repeal section 43 of the Criminal Code. Section 43 of the Criminal Code reads as follows:

Every schoolteacher, parent or person standing in the place of a parent is justified in using force by way of correction toward a pupil or child, as the case may be, who is under his care, if the force does not exceed what is reasonable under the circumstances.

• (1440)

In 2004, the wording of section 43 was interpreted and significantly narrowed by the Supreme Court of Canada. This decision narrowed the situations in which the defence in section 43 of the Criminal Code can apply, setting out limitations that are consistent with both the Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child.

As a result, the defence is now open only to parents who can show they use reasonable force within the circumstances and that the force was minor, resulting in nothing more than trivial and trifling effects on the child. As a result of this ruling, since 2004 in Canada, the defence has not been available to parents where there are any marks on the child, where an object has been used, where force is used on the child's head, or where the child is incapable of learning from the correction.

There are inherent dangers in repealing the defence in section 43 as part of a ban on corporal punishment. As a government, we are inappropriately crossing a line into where the government, rather than the parent, is now determining how to raise a child.

It is my view that the current law, which has been upheld by the Supreme Court of Canada, represents the best balance to protect children from abusive parents, while also allowing responsible parents the decision in how they choose to raise their children. I do not believe that an outright repeal of the defence for parents in section 43 will result in a better balance than that already achieved by the Supreme Court of Canada.

Honourable senators, repealing section 43 of the Criminal Code goes beyond taking away a reasonable, responsible parent's ability to spank; it takes away their ability to parent. By repealing

section 43, general assault provisions of the Criminal Code would be applied to any parent, teacher or guardian who chooses to use force against a child without their consent. This means that a statutory defence based on reasonable correction could no longer be used.

Considering that section 265 of the Criminal Code prohibits non-consensual application of force and section 279 of the Criminal Code prohibits forcible confinement of another person without lawful authority, it raises a concern that by repealing section 43, the actions of parents would become criminalized if, for example, they physically put a child who is having a temper tantrum to bed or restrain an uncooperative child in a car seat.

Any person with small children will instantly realize how many times a day in the course of normal parenting non-consensual touching or the threat of it occurs. Ordinary everyday activities include dressing a child, feeding a child, getting them into a car, to school and back home, bathing a child and putting one to bed. Just think of a situation where a young child refuses to go to school. How is a responsible parent to get a child to school without picking up their child against their will and carrying them?

Honourable senators, this is not child abuse; this is normal, everyday, responsible parenting. The honourable senator in her speech to this chamber said:

Parents do not own their children. Children are individuals. Their protection should therefore take precedence over the protection of adults and over the imaginary risk of legal action against them. . . .

The honourable senator is correct in that, yes, children are individuals, but they are underage individuals and not yet capable of independent existence or making adult choices. In our society, until a child turns 18 and becomes an adult, parents are responsible for the well-being and protection of that child. While parents are responsible for their children, they should have the choice in how to parent that child.

The honourable senator throughout her speech to this chamber suggested that by spanking a child, a parent is being violent. Disciplining a child has nothing to do with abuse or violence. In Bill S-204, the honourable senator has unfortunately lumped both child discipline and child abuse into the same category. There is a marked difference between an open-handed spank to a child's bottom, where one has explained to the child why they are being punished, compared to a closed-fisted punch to the face that leaves a bruise. The former is discipline; the latter is abuse.

Let me be clear: There is a definitive line between punishing a child and abusing a child. Parents who abuse their children should be subject to the full force of the criminal law, but responsible parents punish their children, not abuse them. By repealing section 43, we are blurring that line and risk unduly charging responsible parents with criminal offences.

By repealing section 43, we are inappropriately crossing a line into where the government would be determining how to raise a child, rather than the parent.

As Dave Quist, the Executive Director of the Institute of Marriage and Family Canada, commented:

... we must ask ourselves, "Does the state have a role in the raising of our children?"

I believe that the state only has a role in limiting society's "rights and freedoms," if those "rights and freedoms" are deemed to be harmful to society and its members. There is no evidence that the state needs to interfere in this issue.

We must also be very careful in the conclusions drawn from research and studies done on punitive child punishment. In her speech, the honourable senator references several recent studies that claim that force is ineffective and even harmful in child rearing. Unfortunately, more often than not, these studies confuse correlation with causation, and have methodological problems. Also, these studies do not often offer a clear distinction between spanking and physical abuse, thereby skewing their conclusions.

The honourable senator mentioned in her speech to this chamber on June 10: "... a very broad study carried out by Statistics Canada, which indicates all the negative effects which I discussed in a previous speech."

What the honourable senator failed to mention about this study is that the study itself says:

It should be noted that these findings do not prove that punitive parenting practices caused aggressive behaviour, anxiety, or limited pro-social behaviour in the children.

The paper entitled "A Review of the Outcomes of Parental Use of Nonabusive or Customary Physical Punishment" in the *Medical Journal of Pediatrics* concludes that:

The most important finding of the review is that there are not enough quality studies that document detrimental outcomes of nonabusive physical punishment to support advice or policies against this age-old parental practice. Only 30 relevant journal articles were found from 1974 through 1995, an average of less than 1 1/2 per year. Next, many of the studies had methodological weaknesses, and the stronger ones were more likely to find beneficial outcomes of physical punishment. A particularly pervasive weakness was that no prospective or retrospective study controlled for the original frequency or severity of child problem behavior, which would be like studying cancer recurrences following radiation treatment without taking into account the severity or existence of the original cancer. More quality research is needed on nonabusive physical punishment. Public and private agencies should make quality research on the broader topic of parental discipline a top priority.

How parents use discipline tactics may be more important than which ones they consider off limits. Effects of physical punishment, as well as nonphysical punishment, probably depend on when and how parents implement it, its role in their overall approach to parental discipline, and the overall parent-child relationship. Other aspects of parental discipline may be more important indicators of dysfunctional parenting than whether parents spank or not.

• (1450)

Also, in the 2009 Akron Law Review, Jason M. Fuller of the University of Akron School of Law published an article entitled: "The Science and Statistics behind Spanking Suggest that Laws Allowing Corporal Punishment are in the Best Interests of the Child." In this article he outlines some of the issues with current spanking research, as follows:

... many spanking opponents begin their research with a conclusion, not a hypothesis. For instance, Dr. Murray Straus admits that his goal is to prove that spanking, 'by itself has harmful psychological side effects for children and hurts society as a whole.' Moreover, a review of spanking research suggests that eighty-three percent of the corporal punishment articles in clinical and psychosocial journals are 'merely opinion-driven editorials, reviews or commentaries, devoid of new empirical findings.'

When scientists begin their research already having formed a conclusion it's more likely that their bias 'will be confirmed, not amended or rejected, by the ensuing evidence.' Indeed, spanking opponents have been known to design studies that peculiarly suit their bias; they have been known to address problems with their research only in endnotes that few people read; and they have been known to simply not report data that are inconsistent with their hypothesis.

Throughout the honourable senator's speech she erroneously claims that spanking is "child rearing violence" and the violent application of force. I believe the honourable senator has misunderstood our current laws. As previously mentioned, since 2004, parents can no longer use the defence under section 43 of the Criminal Code where there are any marks on the child, where an object has been used, where there is force used on the child's head or where the child is incapable of learning from the correction. Under the current provision, technically speaking, "corporal punishment" of children is prohibited under Canadian law. Further, Webster's dictionary defines violence as "exertion of physical force so as to injure or abuse." With this in mind, it is quite clear that the honourable senator has failed to distinguish between child abuse and child discipline.

Abuse is when a parent intends to injure or harm a child; discipline is when a parent intends to guide a child's development, making it possible for them to learn from the experience and to take responsibility for their actions by showing them boundaries of what is acceptable or unacceptable behaviour. The *Sioux Star* commented in an editorial: "are we that dense as a society that we can't tell the difference between a corrective spank and abuse?"

The purpose of spanking is not to injure or abuse a child and should not be violent. Its purpose is to discipline a child for misbehaviour. Spanking should only be one part of a clear and consistent style of child discipline. I do not believe it should be the only form of child discipline. It is my belief that spanking should be controlled, structured and done in private. Spanking should not be done with malice or rage. It is about conveying a message: You have crossed the line; your behaviour is not appropriate. The reason for spanking should be explained. I believe it is very important to explain to a child why they are being punished

before spanking them. Spanking should also not be used to humiliate a child. It is my opinion that it should not be done in public, it should be done in the privacy of the home.

Honourable senators, in my time of a little over a year here in the Senate, I have taken note that there are a few senators who use personal stories to augment their speeches while addressing this chamber. In keeping with that tendency, I intend to make a few personal comments of my own and relay three short stories.

When my oldest son was 4 or 5 years old, he did something that I thought warranted a spanking. This would be the first time that he would be spanked, so as a young father I wanted the discipline to go just right. I took my son to our bedroom, sat on a chair with my son on my knee and explained to him that what he had done was wrong and, as a result, I would have to punish him by means of a spanking.

At this point my son was looking up at me with tears welling up in his eyes and he said to me, "Dad, I understand that you have to punish me, but I have to tell you one thing first." My feeling was that he should have an opportunity to defend himself, so I said, "Sure, son, what is it?" At this point he reached up, put his arms around my neck and said, "Dad, I just want to tell you that I love you." Needless to say, he did not receive a spanking that day. I am still not sure quite why he did not grow up to become a politician.

The next time he did something that warranted a spanking he tried this act again; however, it did not work this time. Generally speaking, I did not have to spank my oldest son very often in his life. I only used spanking as a broader way to discipline. However, the few times I did, it definitely did not have any adverse effects on him and definitely worked as a suitable disciplinary measure. Today he is a proud parent of two wonderful children and, in my opinion, has no psychological problems.

I do not believe that spanking has the same disciplinary impact on all children. As a parent you have to vary disciplinary measures for each child. For instance, my youngest son has a much different personality from that of my oldest, as was shown one day when I came home from work and my wife was quite upset with him. He was also about 4 years old at the time, had gone into the bathroom, pulled all our towels and linens down and strewn them across the bathroom floor. My wife said he was now refusing to pick them up and that I needed to deal with it.

I took my son by the arm, led him into the bathroom and told him quite forcefully that he needed to clean up the mess he had made. He looked me square in the eye and let out a defiant "no." At this point, I took him by the arm a bit more forcefully and again instructed him to clean up the mess, and if he did not I would have to spank him. He again looked me in the eye and exclaimed "no."

At this point I felt I now needed to spank him and proceeded to take him over my knee and give him a few swats on the behind. He began to cry. I again instructed that he needed to clean up the mess he had made. He still refused, so I put him back on my knee and spanked him a few more times. By this point we were both crying.

After I was finished, I again instructed him to clean up the mess. "No," he replied. By this time I am at my wit's end and I am thinking what am I going to do to make this child listen. I decided I would have to try something else. I looked at my teary eyed son and said, "Son, if I help, will you pick up this mess with me?" He instantly replied, "Yes, Dad, I will."

Honourable senators can see from this illustration that while spanking may be appropriate punishment for one child, it may not be for another. This is not to say that he got away in the future without spankings, but now he and his brother are successfully running a heating and plumbing company in Landmark — a little plug for my community. He and his wife are now expecting their second child. I am hoping it is a boy. He is not an advocate of spanking and they have a very well behaved and disciplined son.

Now I will go to a story about myself. When I was about 12 or 13 years old, I went to watch a local football game at my schoolyard. Being a teenager, I was not satisfied with simply watching the game, so I, along with a few other boys, decided we needed some cigarettes. There happened to be a house that was on the schoolyard and, knowing that the owner smoked, we decided to break in and steal some.

A few days after this incident, while I was coming home one evening, I was walking by my father's plumbing and heating supply store. He came out and instructed me to come into the store. Once inside he asked me if I knew anything about a local break-in where cigarettes were stolen. At this time I knew that the jig was up and admitted to my crime.

My father told me that he was going to give me a spanking. He told me to get onto a furnace that was on display so I was higher up and he could get better traction. He told me before he started that it was going to hurt him more than it would hurt me. After a sound spanking, he then made me go and apologize to the owner of the house and make restitution. I am not sure which was worse, the spanking or the apologizing.

Sitting by my dad's hospital bedside just a few weeks ago, days before he passed away, we were visiting and I reminded him of this incident and asked if he recalled the spanking. He said he most certainly did.

• (1500)

I then asked him if he still believed that the spanking had hurt him more than it had hurt me. At this time, with a smile on his lips he said, no, he did not think it had.

I am curious, honourable senators, how many of you received a form of physical discipline growing up? How many could say that this has emotionally scarred them or that they developed some violent disposition as a result? Looking around this chamber, I would say that most of us appear reasonably normal.

In my opinion, and in that of many Canadians, a parent should be free to decide how to discipline their child, as long as it is reasonable and not abusive.

In January 2004, on the night before the Supreme Court was due to rule on the legality of section 43 of the Criminal Code, a survey was conducted by SES-Sun Media of 1,000 people across Canada, gathering their current opinions on the use of force, such as spanking, by parents to discipline a child. This survey found that 64 per cent of the people surveyed supported the use of force such as spanking by parents to discipline a child. Only 7 per cent of respondents supported criminal charges for parents who spanked their children. This survey clearly shows that Canadians want responsible parents to have their own choice in how they choose to discipline their children.

Part of the problem in Canada is that there are extensive inconsistencies in our criminal justice system with regard to youth justice and parental responsibility. By repealing section 43 of the Criminal Code, we risk creating even greater inconsistency. On the one hand, three provinces — Manitoba, Ontario and British Columbia — currently have legislation in place that provides parental liability for actions committed by their children. These parental responsibility acts make parents civilly liable for any property damage caused by their children.

The Civil Code of Quebec also has a provision that deals with parental liability, where parents are liable for reparations, where there is injury, whether it be bodily, moral or material in nature, caused by their children. These provincial laws convey a message that parents have a responsibility over their child's actions.

Yet, on the other hand, one can get an abortion anywhere in Canada without parental consent. This conveys the opposite message, that parents have no place in their children's business.

An article in *Today's Family News* states:

Meanwhile, *Canadian Press* reported that Quebec Superior Court Justice Suzanne Tessier ruled on Friday that a divorced custodial parent had no right to deny his 12-year-old daughter permission to go on a three-day class field trip to mark her graduation from elementary school. His actions were meant to punish her for posting inappropriate photos of herself on the Internet after he had repeatedly warned her not to.

With her mother's backing, the girl challenged her father's actions in court, as she needed both her parents' consent in order to go on the field trip. Tessier found that keeping her from going was unduly severe punishment, as the girl and her parents are already caught up in a bitter custody battle. The father has vowed to appeal the decision.

National Post columnist Lorne Gunter called Tessier's logic "dumbfounding." "Here is a father," he wrote, "who has full-time custody struggling to keep his daughter from getting caught up in the whole world of Internet predators, while also dealing with all the issues of discipline and conflicted loyalties that arise from divorce, and now the court has made his task far more difficult."

The irony, as the *Ottawa Citizen* suggested, is that his behaviour ought to be applauded by those who oppose the use of even "reasonable force" to discipline a wayward child.

"This was hardly an instance of cruel or arbitrary authority. There was no abuse involved, not even close," it stated. "The father, it seems, used clear and consistent warnings, letting his child know that there would be consequences for inappropriate behaviour. This is how you raise responsible children who understand the results of their actions. It is an approach to discipline that should be encouraged, not outlawed by the state."

By repealing section 43 of the Criminal Code, we further risk eroding parental responsibility. It is not the government's place to decide how responsible parents choose to raise their children. I do not feel it is our place to tell responsible parents how to raise their children. Parents have a duty to fulfill their responsibilities to their children, and responsible parents do just that. Responsible, loving parents want what is best for their children, and want to raise productive members of our society. Responsible parents need and deserve to have room to parent, without the state looking over their shoulders. They deserve the choice in how they choose to raise their children.

The honourable senator suggested we follow Sweden's example of 30 years ago and prohibit the use of force in child-rearing. To quote an article from *Newsmax* written by Theodore Kettle:

A study entailing 2,600 interviews pertaining to corporal punishment, including the questioning of 179 teenagers about getting spanked and smacked by their parents, was conducted by Marjorie Gunnoe, professor of psychology at Calvin College in Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Gunnoe's findings, announced this week: "The claims made for not spanking children fail to hold up. They are not consistent with the data."

Those who were physically disciplined performed better than those who weren't in a whole series of categories, including school grades, an optimistic outlook on life, the willingness to perform volunteer work, and the ambition to attend college, Gunnoe found. And they performed no worse than those who weren't spanked in areas like early sexual activity, getting into fights, and becoming depressed. She found little difference between the sexes or races.

Another study published in the *Akron Law Review* last year examined criminal records and found that children raised where a legal ban on parental corporal punishment is in effect are much more likely to be involved in crime.

A key focus of the work of Jason M. Fuller of the University of Akron Law School was Sweden, which 30 years ago became the first nation to impose a complete ban on physical discipline and is in many respects "an ideal laboratory to study spanking bans," according to Fuller.

Since the spanking ban, child abuse rates in Sweden have exploded over 500 percent, according to police reports. Even just one year after the ban took effect, and after a massive government public education campaign, Fuller found that "not only were Swedish parents resorting to pushing, grabbing, and shoving more than U.S. parents, but they were also beating their children twice as often."

After a decade of the ban, “rates of physical child abuse in Sweden had risen to three times the U.S. rate” and “from 1979 to 1994, Swedish children under seven endured an almost six-fold increase in physical abuse,” Fuller’s analysis revealed.

“Enlightened” parenting also seems to have produced increased violence later. “Swedish teen violence skyrocketed in the early 1990s, when children that had grown up entirely under the spanking ban first became teenagers,” Fuller noted. “Preadolescents and teenagers under fifteen started becoming even more violent toward their peers. By 1994, the number of youth criminal assaults had increased by six times the 1984 rate.”

In closing, honourable senators, I would like to simply say that I thought I would go a step beyond just citing what adults have to say, so I thought I would ask a 10-year-old girl for her perspective on spanking.

My 10-year-old granddaughter was visiting not so long ago and, as she was sitting on my knee, I mentioned to her that she was such a sweet and well-behaved girl, helping her grandmother around the kitchen, helping her mother with her younger siblings, and so on. My granddaughter looked me in the eye and said, “Grandpa, I have not had a spanking in almost three years.” I explained that now she was too old to get a spanking. She replied, “Oh, no, I am not. If I do not behave, I still need to be spanked.” I countered with, “Well, maybe a timeout would be better.” She said, “No, timeouts are not scary and they have no merit.”

• (1510)

I asked my granddaughter if she would write me a letter outlining her views, and she agreed. The following is the exact wording of a 10-year-old. This letter was given to me in a sealed envelope at our Thanksgiving dinner table; even her parents had not read the letter.

To whom it may concern:

My name is Emily Summer Plett. I am the daughter of Brad and Cynthia Plett, granddaughter of Senator Don and Betty Plett. I live at Camp Cedarwood. I am 10 years old and currently in grade 6. I love children and helping people such as the elderly. I can’t wait until I am old enough to babysit and one day become a mother.

When I become a mother I want my kids to be disciplined. I want them to do good in school, to be able to get a job, to be responsible and be good citizens. To discipline a child it is important to punish disobedience. There are different ways of punishing a child. While, for one, a time out would work, another might feel pushed away and left alone, and might at this time even plan to escape or pay his parents back.

I remember when my mom or dad would give me time outs. I would think how mean they were for sending me to my room all alone, instead of thinking about what I had done wrong. I think spanking is the most effective way of disciplining a child because the child will know that it hurts

to do the wrong thing, and when he grows up he won’t have to pay the consequences. For example, if a kid goes and steals from a friend and you spank him, he will know not to do that again.

Spanking is also a quick way of dealing with a problem and the kid can forget about it and go back and play. But parents should never spank without a reason. As I said before, for some kids it works to take something away or ground them, but others won’t learn unless it physically hurts. Therefore, parents should be allowed to choose the proper punishment for their children and spanking should not be disallowed.

I hope you have a great rest of the year!

Sincerely,

Emily Summer Plett

Honourable senators, does this sound like an abused child or someone who has not learned well? This sounds more like the words of a well-adjusted 10-year-old.

In closing, let me reference one more comment from the honourable senator’s speech where she quotes Alice Miller, a French philosopher and sociologist:

When you nurture a child, the child learns to nurture. When you reprimand a child, the child learns to reprimand. When you warn a child, you teach the child to warn others. When you chew them out, that is precisely what they learn to do. When you mock them, they learn to mock. When you humiliate them, they learn to humiliate. . .

I will simply add to that, when you discipline your child in love, you teach the child to discipline in love.

Hon. David P. Smith: Will the honourable senator accept a question?

Senator Plett: Yes.

Senator Smith: With regard to the story about the break-in to steal cigarettes and with regard to your health, I am curious, has the medical evidence sunk in on you? Have you seen the light or are you still smoking?

Senator Plett: Thank you very much for that question, senator. That is the last house I broke into and I stopped smoking about 30 years ago.

The Hon. the Speaker: Continuing debate?

Hon. Céline Hervieux-Payette: I would like to say I am speechless but I hope we will be able to discuss this question at the committee level.

Senator Cowan: She is asking a question.

Senator Hervieux-Payette: Maybe just a few questions to make sure that I understood your rationale. The first question would be, are you aware that the United Nations has never given us a clean bill with regard to this question of spanking because we still allow it in our country and 24 countries have banned spanking,

mostly OECD countries? Are you aware of that, because you quoted the United Nations charter but we do not respect the charter? Are you aware that we do not respect the charter?

Senator Plett: Honourable senator, I will speak to the second part of the question first. I wonder how many of those 30 nations who banned it entirely fall under the same category as Sweden, where obviously it did not work. On the first question, no.

Senator Hervieux-Payette: Honourable senators, I have another question: You were talking about “something else.” I would like to know why something else, when you love someone, would not work more efficiently than spanking.

Senator Plett: I thank you for that question. Very clearly, honourable senator, I think numerous times throughout my speech I said there were other methods of discipline. Certainly, in my own family illustration, I said one of my sons was not an advocate of spanking and he has a very well-behaved son because they used other forms of discipline — not to say that he has never spanked his son.

I very clearly encourage people to use other forms of discipline. I am only suggesting that a responsible parent should be given the choice, not be told how to discipline, because disciplinary tactics will work differently for one person versus another.

Senator Hervieux-Payette: Honourable senators, I have a third question. If you were doing the same kind of spanking for a young child who was staying at your home — either your neighbour’s child or some visiting children who were not behaving properly — what do you think would happen to you?

Senator Plett: I am not sure that I understood the question. Are you asking me what would happen to me if I would spank my neighbour’s child?

Senator Hervieux-Payette: Yes.

Senator Plett: Let me only suggest that if my neighbour spanked my child, I would certainly want to take action to find out why he spanked my child. I do not think anywhere in my speech did I even remotely suggest that we should allow our neighbours to spank our children.

I am responsible to raise my children, as you are to raise yours and as my neighbour is to raise his or hers. I would certainly take strong offence to my neighbour spanking my children.

Senator Hervieux-Payette: Honourable senators, I conclude that this would be considered a criminal act and that, at that time, you are not allowed to do that to anyone else but your child. Do you agree?

Senator Plett: I am not going to make reference to whether or not that would warrant a criminal charge. I suppose, depending on the circumstances and how forgiving a person I was, I might decide to forgive my neighbour. I am not sure. I think that is entirely hypothetical to ask me what I would do in a situation that, in my opinion, has never occurred to me.

Senator Hervieux-Payette: Honourable senators, I just wanted to remind Senator Plett, although the senator was not here, that

60 children came and studied the question of the bill in this house. This was recorded by some television stations. Of the 60 children, not one considered spanking the proper remedy for their conduct. They gave us a wide range of penalties that they could receive that, in fact, helped them to reflect on their infraction.

You have the testimony of your granddaughter; and I agree that probably everyone says, in the former generation, spanking was a means of discipline. However, I hope that in your province, you believe in the research of psychologists, psychiatrists and all the medical professions. They have all pronounced themselves against spanking.

What do we reply to these people who are responsible for the health of our children?

Senator Plett: First, honourable senator, I used the illustration of my granddaughter simply to imply or to give my view. It has not psychologically impacted on my grandchild negatively, nor did it on my children or on myself.

Do I believe that we should allow children to write our laws? No, I am sorry, I do not. I do not think that 60 children should be deciding, nor should my granddaughter decide what the laws should be. I asked her for an opinion, and I wish we would have had 61 children that day because there would have been one who would not have agreed.

Senator Hervieux-Payette: Honourable senators, this is my last question, and perhaps a remark. I hope that you want to refer the bill as soon as possible to the committee for further study. However, I was wondering if the second time you were spanking your son, did you see some marks on your son’s bottom?

Senator Plett: No, I think they were worn off by then.

The Hon. the Speaker: Further debate?

Senator Plett: If I could, this is 30 some years ago, well before section 43 of the Criminal Code came into effect.

(On motion of Senator Carstairs, debate adjourned.)

• (1520)

[Translation]

GOVERNANCE OF CANADIAN BUSINESSES EMERGENCY BILL

SECOND READING—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Hervieux-Payette, P.C., seconded by the Honourable Senator Tardif, for the second reading of Bill S-205, An Act to provide the means to rationalize the governance of Canadian businesses during the period of national emergency resulting from the global financial crisis that is undermining Canada’s economic stability.

Hon. Gerald J. Comeau (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, Senator Gerstein is currently absent, and I see that this item has been on the Order Paper for 14 days. I therefore wish to move the adjournment in his name for the remainder of his time.

(On the motion of Senator Comeau, for Senator Gerstein, debate adjourned.)

REORGANIZATION AND PRIVATIZATION OF ATOMIC ENERGY OF CANADA BILL

SECOND READING—DEBATE SUSPENDED

Hon. Céline Hervieux-Payette moved the second reading of Bill S-225, An Act respecting the reorganization and privatization of Atomic Energy of Canada Limited.

She said: Honourable senators, I rise today to talk to you at second reading of Bill S-225, An Act respecting the reorganization and privatization of Atomic Energy of Canada Limited and providing for other measures relating to nuclear energy.

Having realized the indifference of the Conservative government towards strategic economic sectors in Canada and its emphasis on short-term political and financial gains, I decided to follow up on the recommendations made by the nuclear industry during the hearings on AECL this summer at the Standing Senate Committee on National Finance.

The solutions I propose in this bill aim to effectively reorganize AECL into a profitable organization that will be able to continue to benefit Canada. They also aim to boost confidence in this organization's ability to research, engineer, manufacture, install, repair and refurbish CANDU reactors at home and abroad.

[English]

AECL has contributed in more ways than one to our international reputation, our economy, and to the fields of medicine and nuclear physics. Despite these exploits, this corporation is at risk of being sold off without much consideration given to the benefits it has created for Canadians.

This week, the Government of Ontario decided to assert its confidence in Canada's nuclear industry by unveiling a long-term energy plan for the province. Ontario plans to refurbish 10 nuclear reactors and to build 2 new reactors. With an estimated cost of about \$30 billion to \$40 billion and job creations of around 25,000, this commitment is far from a small investment. If the Government of Ontario believes in Canada's nuclear technology, why can not the Government of Canada believe? As time was running out to protect our nuclear industry, I decided one week ago to table Bill S-225 to save Atomic Energy of Canada Limited.

Bill S-225 aims to insure that one of our Crown jewels, Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, remains within the control of the federal government, while involving the private sector in a minority stake in order to raise capital and increase the

corporation's marketability of its reactor business. To remain competitive and expand in new markets, AECL must receive an influx of capital. However, this bill will introduce rules that will protect the nuclear industry from evaporating all profits and innovation into the hands of foreign entities.

[Translation]

Canada's nuclear sector is a \$6.6 billion per year industry generating \$1.5 billion in federal and provincial revenues from taxes and providing 71,000 jobs — 21,000 direct and 10,000 indirect, plus 40,000 spin-off jobs. It represents 150 firms and \$1.2 billion per year in exports.

For 48 years, Canada's nuclear industry has achieved an unparalleled record of safe, reliable and economical power generation in three provinces.

AECL has since operated as Canada's national nuclear research and development institution, contributing its science and engineering research capabilities to developing and supporting commercial CANDU products and service businesses, nuclear medicine and materials research for a wide range of industries.

Although we must rapidly address the issue of reorganizing AECL in order to reduce the negative impacts delays are having on AECL and the thousands of small businesses that support it, I must emphasize that the unregulated sale of AECL to the private sector or foreign corporations could undermine our capabilities as a global leader in the nuclear field as well as put tens of thousands of jobs at risk.

The nuclear industry is a very select club; it is composed of roughly six big players that are in one way or another backed financially by a government. The need for government involvement in this sector is essential. The federal government is the only actor that can finance research and development that will keep AECL competitive globally. Furthermore, the federal government is the only actor that can safely regulate this sector in order for it to continue to benefit Canadians in the energy, medical and scientific sectors.

[English]

Honourable senators, time is of the essence with Bill S-225. The Canadian nuclear industry cannot lay dormant while it awaits the outcome of the reorganization of AECL. Faced with a government that wants to dismantle AECL, we must act now and achieve a positive outcome that will benefit the Canadian nuclear industry. The Canadian nuclear industry has been abandoned by the Conservative government, the Minister of Natural Resources and the Prime Minister.

Bill S-225 creates a new role for the private sector and AECL. With a 30 per cent stake, the private sector will be in charge of managing the corporation while the federal government, with its majority share set at 70 per cent, will ensure that decisions are taken in the best interests of Canadians and will ensure further investment in research and development in the nuclear sciences. The majority stake of the federal government in AECL will guarantee safety standards as well as preserve employees' pensions and ensure that employees can work in both official languages.

As stated by the dozens of witnesses heard by the Standing Senate Committee on National Finance during its study of Bill C-9, the omnibus budget bill, the world is on the cusp of a nuclear renaissance with an estimated 400 nuclear reactors to be built throughout the world within the next 20 years.

[Translation]

Signs of the incoming nuclear renaissance can be seen around the world. As of February 1, 2010, there were 54 nuclear reactors under construction, another 148 being planned and 342 being proposed. Canada can and should benefit from this renaissance in the form of job creation, innovation and investment in universities, businesses and communities. In fact, this will guarantee that Canada will train, in English and French, thousands of new engineers, nuclear physicists, welders and so on.

As a result, any action taken by AECL to expand into new markets should directly benefit Canadians. The government partnered with a minority-share-held private sector is the perfect solution to all the problems that exist with the current structure of AECL.

As we have seen in the past, nuclear reactor sales are often been the culmination of a meeting of heads of state, as was the case with AECL's last large deal between the Chrétien government and the Chinese government. AECL is truly a global corporation; Canada has sold CANDU nuclear reactors around the world, including in Argentina, South Korea, China, Pakistan and India.

• (1530)

Before certain senators opposite say that AECL is but a small player among other bigger corporations with different technologies, I would like to point out that AECL fills a void in the nuclear market and has effectively become an expert in a niche market. Just as Bombardier has become an important player in the small business jets market, AECL has become synonymous with safe, efficient and reliable nuclear energy production using non-enriched uranium or recycled nuclear fuel in its heavy water reactors.

The nuclear industry in Canada employs roughly 70,000 people and is composed of academics, researchers, scientists, small businesses, utility companies, provincial governments and the federal government.

[English]

Canadian control of AECL is essential in preserving existing jobs and creating new ones. People in the academic field have often said that, without AECL, there would no be leading nuclear science faculties in Canada. Canada has trained many of its nuclear specialists in the many faculties our universities have. The loss of control of AECL to a foreign government would lead to the loss of new graduates in the field of nuclear science, along with a reduced need for parallel fields such as engineering, law, finance, et cetera.

Our competitors are funded by their governments and, as such, have immense monetary resources. They will not think twice about swallowing our talented workers in this field. Honourable

senators, you must think of this industry as nation to nation, and, if Canada will not defend our nuclear industry, another country will conquer it and take it as their own.

AECL is a strategic industry and, as such, demands protections that will ensure the safety of Canadians. Forfeiting this sector to another country would devastate our sovereignty and our ability to control critical infrastructures such as nuclear reactors. We cannot afford to eliminate our energy independence, nor can we accept foreign countries appropriating all our scientists and technologies.

[Translation]

Honourable senators, we have a duty as legislators to act in the best interests of our fellow citizens but we are occasionally confronted with the obligation to consider the best interests of the world. In an age of fragile world security, Canada must remain a strong voice on the international scene.

As we saw last month, the international community judged Canada harshly at the United Nations for its positions on the international scene. AECL is a perfect tool for a renewal of Canadian diplomacy around the world and as the torchbearer of the electrification of small and developing countries.

[English]

AECL is a strong diplomatic tool. The threat of nuclear proliferation is still very present. One only has to look at countries such as Iran, North Korea or even terrorist groups. AECL's CANDU nuclear reactors are the ideal product for exporting safe and reliable nuclear energy to developing countries because they use non-enriched uranium that cannot be refined into weapons grade material using the CANDU technology. This unique characteristic gives AECL's products a competitive edge versus technologies offered by other manufacturers and serves to preserve geopolitical balances of power in sensitive regions.

Moreover, Canada's reputation to provide leading edge technology without the political compromises that other companies might enforce gives CANDU reactors a special status when dealing with other countries that need more energy to develop their economies.

Bill S-225 also addresses another important component of AECL's mandate, which is to produce medical isotopes that are critical in treating and diagnosing a wide range of diseases. Canada provides over 50 per cent of the global supply of medical isotopes for nuclear medicine used in over 50,000 procedures per day, 5,000 of those in Canada. This bill will ensure that the federal government continues its responsibility to Canadians and to the world to insure a secure supply of medical isotopes. The recent medical isotope shortage illustrates the need for a secure and well managed supply of these diagnostic and treatment materials.

[Translation]

The government needs to make a public commitment to keep the Chalk River NRU reactor operational beyond the arbitrary date of 2016, as long as necessary and until secure alternative supplies of isotopes or proven alternative radiopharmaceuticals are in place.

Chalk River Laboratories remains Canada's nuclear research laboratory. It employs over 2,700 people, supports a scientific community of over 400 researchers and engineers from the Canadian industry, government and over 50 university departments across Canada. It also supports operations in a global network of neutron beam facilities, attracting collaboration with over 100 institutions from more than 20 countries.

[English]

The Minister of Natural Resources has even confirmed in a letter dated October 4, 2010, that one of the priorities of the Government of Canada is the secure supply of medical isotopes for the Canadian health care system. This is contrary to the same minister's position at the Standing Senate Committee on National Finance when admitting that the government was 100 per cent behind the sale of AECL. I ask you, honourable senators, when will this Conservative government take actions to stand up for the best interests of Canadians?

At the Canadian Medical Association's 2009 General Council, delegates adopted a motion that, in part, called on the federal government to retain Canada's leadership and ability to produce and export medical isotopes and reconsider its decision to withdraw from their production.

The government's decision to abandon Canada's international responsibilities and world leadership in this sector is counter to the government's own innovation and productivity agenda. Basing Canada's supply strategy on relicensing of the Chalk River reactor five years past its current licence, with no current guarantees that the plant will be operational and remain in production, in the absence of a contingency plan if, in 2016, alternative sources of supply and/or alternative emerging technology do not meet clinical needs, is unacceptable.

The government's decision to abandon Canada's long-standing international leadership in this sector is disheartening, and the absence of both immediate and medium-term solutions to address the current and impending challenges facing nuclear medicine is unacceptable.

The shutdown of Chalk River resulted in roughly 12,000 fewer medical exams using medical isotopes. This is unacceptable. AECL provides 70,000 people with a living and also ensures that thousands of Canadians stay alive. I do not need to remind honourable senators of the despicable comments of the former minister for natural resources, Lisa Raitt, proudly stating that the medical isotope crisis was "sexy" as an example of this Conservative government's disregard for Canadians' health. I invite you to remember this when you decide whether to support the bill.

[Translation]

Some of my honourable colleagues have insisted that AECL can be divided up without any impact on the quality of the research and products this corporation produces. This is ludicrous. AECL is all about interdependence: the interdependence of the NRU with the medical isotope business, the interdependence of AECL with

the support of the federal government and finally the interdependence of the thousands of small and medium businesses that create and supply tools and materials needed by AECL to effectively fulfill its mandate.

Furthermore, control of AECL by the federal government will guarantee that monies are invested in nuclear research. Research is by nature not a profit-making operation. However, it is morally necessary as well as being a critical element of the success of AECL's CANDU reactor business.

• (1540)

And control by the federal government will ensure that Canadians have a secure and reliable supply of medical isotopes, that our brightest nuclear scientists continue their research, which will lead to medical breakthroughs, and that AECL is better able to build class-leading nuclear reactors that are economical, reliable and safe.

[English]

I would like to set the record straight regarding figures that my colleagues opposite have often thrown around regarding the cost of AECL to the Canadian taxpayer. They have often claimed that AECL has gobbled close to \$20 billion of taxpayers' money in 50 years. Even if this figure were true, that would represent \$400 million per year. To put that into perspective, the Conservative government spent \$850 million for the two-day long G8 and G20 summits. That amount represents over two years of investment in AECL. One of these two things is a waste of taxpayers' money, and certainly AECL is not.

Does the Conservative government really want to abandon the \$1.5 billion in tax revenue to the federal government and the provinces? I do not think I need to remind honourable senators that we have a \$50-billion-plus budget deficit.

To understand the true cost, we must separate investments in research and development from operational budgets. Research will never generate profits; it is an activity that is time-consuming, costly and requires highly specialized professionals to accomplish. The investments made in R&D have benefited the reactor business and will continue to do so for years to come. Our reactors are popular around the world, and steps must be taken to maintain our ability to satisfy a growing demand for nuclear energy.

Let me cite a witness at a Bill C-9 budget hearing this summer:

Argentina just passed a bill — it took longer than expected — through their congress in November last year to refurbish their existing CANDU reactor and also to build two new CANDU reactors. It was, so to speak, in our backyard. We had that job locked up, but they kept trying to get a signal from the Canadian government as to where they stood. If they did the restructuring, would they still be behind the business somehow? Would they still keep a piece of the company? They did not get any response and, frankly, they are fed up.

— and contemplating suing the federal government.

[Senator Hervieux-Payette]

When will this government start aiding Canadians who need jobs during these hard economic times and protecting this proud Canadian industry? We have countries willing to buy our products, yet this government is telling them to go look somewhere else. This is beyond reason.

[Translation]

AECL is an organization working for the good of Canadians and humanity. Its discoveries are part of our heritage and our common intellectual property. Millions of dollars have been injected into nuclear research in Canada, which has resulted in discoveries heralded around the world. Some senators may cringe, but I will say to them that we must not repeat the mistake we made with the Avro Arrow. We must defend this industry tooth and nail and take steps to ensure that its renewal leads to prosperity rather than depriving the corporation of a place on the world stage.

If we support the reorganization of AECL by giving a solid minority interest to the private sector, Canada will remain a leader in nuclear science and will benefit from the looming renaissance of the nuclear industry. Developing countries such as China, India and Brazil have an insatiable appetite for energy and non-renewable resources. CANDU reactors are a means of meeting their energy needs, while mitigating the environmental impact of their energy consumption.

[English]

Our competitors are funded by their governments and, as such, have immense monetary resources. They will not think twice about swallowing our talented workers in this field. Honourable senators, you must think of this industry as a nation-to-nation business and, if Canada will not defend our nuclear industry, another country will conquer it and take it as their own.

[Translation]

Minister Paradis recently promised that a decision would be made in the near future. The government has already taken too long to table the options that have been under review for several years now. The government promised to submit all this information to parliamentarians for a frank and open discussion. While we are waiting to hear the government's suggestions, talented men and women are waiting impatiently for the government to take a rational position.

Innovative components have allowed for the modernization of current reactors, in terms of both design and composite materials, and new markets have opened up as a result of the new generation of CANDU reactors. Canada thus has the high level of expertise needed to meet the energy challenge facing humankind. Our nuclear industry is ready, and we hope that we can begin moving forward immediately.

[English]

Hon. Nicole Eaton: Will the honourable senator take a question?

Senator Hervieux-Payette: Yes.

Senator Eaton: I agree that research does not make money, but I find it interesting that the honourable senator wants the government to keep a majority share in Atomic Energy of Canada Limited. Is it because she wants to protect the unions in their negotiations for their new contracts coming up in the spring? Is protecting union employees the reason we are rushing?

Senator Hervieux-Payette: With an industry that has existed for 48 years, it never came to mind that the employees have lost their right to be unionized, whether it be in the private sector or the public sector. As far as I am concerned, that issue is not on the table.

Hon. W. David Angus: Would the honourable senator accept another question? I have a couple of questions for her.

Senator Hervieux-Payette: Yes.

Senator Angus: First, I want to congratulate her on her detailed, lengthy and informative speech and for highlighting the nuclear renaissance that is under way.

I think the honourable senator is aware that the Energy Committee travelled in the last weeks, not only to Chalk River, the research facilities and the NRU reactor, but also to the OPG facilities in Darlington and to the Bruce Power facilities up on Lake Huron.

It is unfortunate that some of the data the honourable senator based her speech on is out of date. For example, she said that the NRU produces 50 per cent of the world's isotopes. The real number, according to them, is 20 per cent.

I will ask my question of the honourable senator, because I am very confused about something. Is she against the sale of AECL or any part of it, period, or is she against the sale to a foreign sovereign nation?

I know well, and we in this chamber all know, of the honourable senator's great belief in the genius of the private sector and the entrepreneurial bent of Canadians. Is she against the private sector running the CANDU subsidiary of AECL?

Senator Hervieux-Payette: I know the honourable senator did not have time to read the bill, but I proposed 30 per cent ownership by the private sector. In my model, I refer a bit to the first phase of Petro-Canada. When we privatized part of it, we had private sector management and a board of directors.

I want AECL to remain in Canadian hands. However, I have also provided that 30 per cent of the 30 per cent could be held by foreign entities. For instance, if we were to partner with India, Canadian companies could be associated with another partner and go around the world and sell the units.

As far as I am concerned, I believe in the skill of the private sector on the marketing side, managing the corporation. However, I believe the government is the main salesperson in the deal. To close the deal, I think we need the federal government and we need the research. I do not see how we can reconcile the fact that we put x million dollars a year in research and development and not take advantage of the profitability of the enterprise.

Senator Angus: I have a supplementary question, if I may.

The committee will soon be reporting its findings from having visited these incredible plants. There is no doubt that we have an amazing nuclear industry here in Canada. The things we saw at Bruce Power, for example, which is wholly owned by the private sector and is getting things done, are most impressive.

• (1550)

Would the honourable senator be against a scenario whereby AECL remained a government entity and retained ownership of the Chalk River research labs and the NRU reactor; which, by the way, was never set up to be a commercial supplier of isotopes? It was only because they were generating isotopes. Today they just give the isotopes over to MDS Nordion, which was privatized by the great Brian Mulroney government, which the honourable senator will remember she was against. They are the ones who market and sell the isotopes.

The question I have for the honourable senator is this: Would she be against selling only the CANDU production, sale and maintenance business to the Canadian-owned private sector and the rest being retained in government hands?

Senator Hervieux-Payette: Yes, I would be against that and I will tell the honourable senator why: When we privatize a Canadian company that Canadian company can sell to anyone else; there are no limitations. That is where I have some reservations, and also because there is a security factor in this kind of business.

We are not dealing with a regular oil and gas company; we are dealing with nuclear power. As far as I am concerned, we are privileged to have a large stock of uranium, so we have the basic product to start with, and we have a lot of foreign investment.

As far as I am concerned, if I look at the French model that inspired me, I would like us to be able to compete with a large entity like that. If we are to support research and development, I do not see why the Canadian people cannot participate in the added value of the corporation because, in fact, taxpayers would become shareholders and would benefit like the private sector from that investment.

Hon. Michael A. Meighen: Honourable senators, I confess right from the start that I have not had the opportunity to read the bill.

Going back to the 30 per cent though, I wonder why the honourable senator stopped at 30 per cent. Why not 49 per cent or 51 per cent? Who would be likely to purchase 30 per cent, which is big enough to be a large sum of money but not enough to control? The exit strategy would be rather difficult because they would be selling a large portion of the company. I think 30 per cent is problematic. Perhaps the honourable senator has a reason for choosing that rather than something else.

Senator Hervieux-Payette: Since I want the company to remain in Canadian hands and not to be traded, I think the committee would be able to examine another model. I have to admit that I have no more shares of SNC but I was vice-president of SNC. While I was there, we were involved with Canatom. The president

of Canatom was a vice-president of SNC and was my neighbour. Therefore I have been familiar with the atomic energy industry for a long time. There is a place for companies, but I do not see any Canadian company that can get the billions of dollars for the research and development. I believe we should share the risk. If the committee thinks 40 per cent would be more appropriate the case can be built. It is my proposal. I thought this could be a start and we could discuss this option.

Hon. Elizabeth (Beth) Marshall: Would the honourable senator take another question?

Senator Hervieux-Payette: Yes.

Senator Marshall: I found the honourable senator's comments very interesting. I am on the National Finance Committee and we have heard many witnesses talking about Atomic Energy of Canada Limited. I would say most witnesses have indicated there are two things that the corporation needs; one is new direction and the other is an influx of private capital.

Does the honourable senator think that by the government having a majority share of the corporation there would be a new direction in the corporation?

My concern is if the government maintains a majority shareholder position in the company it would be more of the same. Does the senator think that splitting it 70-30 with the private sector would help materialize that required new direction?

Senator Hervieux-Payette: Nowadays in Quebec there is a law stipulating that boards are composed 50-50 of men and women. Head hunters are being asked to look for independent directors who can contribute to the future of a company. I suppose a new corporation would have to find a team of directors that would represent the business community well, including users and so on, and I do not see any conflict with the government having some directors on the board but not the majority of directors.

We did that with Petro-Canada. We did not have control of all the seats on the board. The board of directors gives direction to the corporation of where the corporation is to go. As far as I am concerned it is a partnership. I feel this kind of partnership would alleviate the risk because this is a risky business. We have seen with the Point Lepreau refurbishing that advancing to the next generation is a difficult task. Therefore we should accompany Canadian companies in that new generation of nuclear reactors. I feel it is a win-win situation if both the private and public sectors work hand-in-hand on this.

Senator Marshall: Would the honourable senator take a follow-up question?

Senator Hervieux-Payette: Yes.

Senator Marshall: When the honourable senator was talking about the 70-30 split, when the witnesses appeared at National Finance one of the other issues that kept coming up was this need for private capital.

Does the honourable senator think a private sector company will raise money to put into a corporation that is still controlled by the government? Governments historically do not have a good track record with regard to making money, and I am sure any private sector company would be interested in making money. I could see there would probably be an issue with regard to attracting people or attracting private sector companies to put their money in and then government having majority control. Does the senator have any comments on that?

Senator Hervieux-Payette: I took some time to think about that, but we have several examples in corporations in Quebec controlled by families. We have the Bombardier family that controls the company but they raise money in the public market. We have the Jean Coutu organization; we have Power Corporation. We have many examples in the private sector where a group of shareholders control the company with multiple votes. This has never prevented these companies from finding financial support from the business community. That situation of shareholders owning a majority and at the same time raising money already exists in the public arena, usually with pension funds.

Hon. Richard Neufeld: Will the senator take another question?

Senator Hervieux-Payette: Yes.

Senator Neufeld: I thank the honourable senator for her remarks. The situation with Petro-Canada was a little different. The Liberal government of the day decided to buy companies that were solvent, that were working and create a government-owned identity in the oil and gas industry. AECL is something totally different that started from absolute scratch as a government entity in Canada, going back many years and having done hugely good things.

When the senator talked about competitiveness and only the government could maintain that competitiveness, could she tell us why there has not been a sale of a reactor in 13 years when there have been sales of reactors around the world by other companies?

Second, I also sit on the National Finance Committee with Senator Marshall. I am alarmed that AECL requested over \$1 billion last year alone, to keep itself operational. I will use round numbers because I am not sure of the exact numbers. This year I believe it was \$402 million to start. Supplementary Estimates (B) just came in with another request for \$296 million, and we are not finished yet so we will probably be well over \$1 billion to keep something going.

There should be a rethinking of how we manage AECL, while keeping that industry and those people in Canada. I think they do

great work and I think we should keep them working. Their CANDU reactors are great. They tell us they are great and they use low-grade uranium. Why are they not being sold around the world? The senator says it is because government is the only one that can do it but they certainly have not demonstrated it and that is both a Conservative government and a Liberal government.

Maybe the honourable senator would respond to those observations, please, and tell honourable senators how much money we have to continue to put into AECL for the next 50 years if we were to keep it.

Senator Hervieux-Payette: Honourable senators, I hope that Senator Neufeld listened to my speech when I said Argentina is almost begging us to sell them two CANDU reactors. I have been travelling to countries with the Inter-Parliamentary Forum of the Americas and this question is often discussed. Even our ambassadors are embarrassed because when they are asked questions they cannot sell reactors because there is no response on this end.

In addition, an economic situation prevented that sale from going ahead. We need to think in terms of the cost per unit that this can produce, but we know that the other conventional means of producing electricity are in fact now making it possible. I believe Ontario is showing good judgment in deciding to build two new units.

We talk about the “rebirth,” and we are not the only people using that term. The industry is saying that worldwide. We are on the verge and there is a lot of competition now. Russia and France are selling their units worldwide. If we want to make these investments and if we want this company viable, we have to let them market it. I believe and I trust it is a partnership.

Bruce Power and SNC could be two partners in that company, and there are enough countries in the world where sales can be made. However, a sales force is needed on the ground, doing business around the world but, at the same time, the support of the government is also needed because the final sale is made government-to-government. We know that EDC has intervened in terms of helping the financing, but if we could find \$9 billion for GM, which is an American company, I think we can find the money for the continued survival of AECL.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, it being four o'clock, pursuant to the order adopted by the Senate on April 15, 2010, I declare the Senate continued until Thursday, December 2, 2010, at 1:30 p.m., the Senate so decreeing.

(The Senate adjourned until Thursday, December 2, 2010, at 1:30 p.m.)

APPENDIX

Officers of the Senate

The Ministry

Senators

(Listed according to seniority, alphabetically and by provinces)

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)

(December 1, 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 Transport, Infrastructure and Communities
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 Western Economic Diversification
The Hon. Beverley J. Oda	Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development
The Hon. John Baird	Minister for International Cooperation
	Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
	Minister of the Environment (acting)
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. 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. John Duncan	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. 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

(December 1, 2010)

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
Lowell Murray, P.C.	Pakenham	Ottawa, Ont.
Anne C. Cools	Toronto Centre-York	Toronto, Ont.
Charlie Watt	Inkerman	Kuuujuaq, 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.
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.
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.
David Braley	Ontario	Burlington, Ont.
Salma Ataullahjan	Toronto—Ontario	Toronto, Ont.

SENATORS OF CANADA

ALPHABETICAL LIST

(December 1, 2010)

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address	Political Affiliation
THE HONOURABLE			
Andreychuk, A. Raynell	Saskatchewan	Regina, Sask.	Conservative
Angus, W. David	Alma	Montreal, Que.	Conservative
Ataullahjan, Salma	Toronto—Ontario	Toronto, Ont.	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
Braley, David	Ontario	Burlington, Ont.	Conservative
Brazeau, Patrick	Repentigny	Gatineau, Que.	Conservative
Brown, Bert	Alberta	Kathryn, 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, Andrée, P.C.	Grandville	Saint-Hyacinthe, Que.	Conservative
Chaput, Maria	Manitoba	Sainte-Anne, Man.	Liberal
Cochrane, Ethel	Newfoundland and Labrador	Port-au-Port, Nfld. & Lab.	Conservative
Comeau, Gerald J.	Nova Scotia	Saulnierville, N.S.	Conservative
Cools, Anne C.	Toronto Centre-York	Toronto, Ont.	Independent
Cordy, Jane	Nova Scotia	Dartmouth, N.S.	Liberal
Cowan, James S.	Nova Scotia	Halifax, N.S.	Liberal
Dallaire, Roméo Antonius	Gulf	Sainte-Foy, Que.	Liberal
Dawson, Dennis	Lauzon	Ste-Foy, Que.	Liberal
Day, Joseph A.	Saint John-Kennebecasis	Hampton, N.B.	Liberal
De Bané, Pierre, P.C.	De la Vallière	Montreal, Que.	Liberal
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, Céline, 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
Kinsella, Noël 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, 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
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
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
(December 1, 2010)

ONTARIO—24

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

SENATORS BY PROVINCE AND TERRITORY

QUEBEC—24

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
1 Charlie Watt	Inkerman	Kuujuaq
2 Pierre De Bané, P.C.	De la Vallière	Montreal
3 Jean-Claude Rivest	Stadacona	Quebec
4 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 Daniel Lang	Yukon	Whitehorse

CONTENTS

Wednesday, December 1, 2010

	PAGE
Afghanistan—Fallen Soldier	
Silent Tribute.	
Hon. the Speaker.	1466

SENATORS' STATEMENTS

Mr. Alexander Colville, P.C., C.C.	
Congratulations on Ninetieth Birthday.	
Hon. Donald H. Oliver.	1466

The Late Honourable David C. (See-Chai) Lam, O.C.	
Hon. Vivienne Poy.	1466

Grey Cup 2010	
Congratulations to Montreal Alouettes.	
Hon. Leo Housakos.	1467

Migrant Workers	
Hon. Mobina S. B. Jaffer.	1467

Global Water Security Institute	
Hon. Pamela Wallin.	1468

The Honourable Danny Williams	
Hon. George J. Furey.	1468

International Development Research Centre	
Congratulations on Fortieth Anniversary.	
Hon. Hugh Segal.	1469

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

National Hunting, Trapping and Fishing Heritage Day Bill (Bill C-465)	
First Reading.	1469

Canada-Europe Parliamentary Association	
Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region, September 13-15, 2010—Report Tabled.	
Hon. Percy E. Downe.	1469

The Senate	
Notice of Motion to Urge the European Union to Apply a Preservation Policy of the Eastern Atlantic Bluefin Tuna.	
Hon. Céline Hervieux-Payette.	1470

QUESTION PERIOD

Environment	
Climate Change Policy.	
Hon. Grant Mitchell.	1470
Hon. Marjory LeBreton.	1470
Hon. Bill Rompkey.	1471

Canadian Heritage	
Linguistic Duality at 2015 Pan American Games.	
Hon. Maria Chaput.	1471
Hon. Marjory LeBreton.	1472

Finance	
Quebec—Harmonized Sales Tax.	
Hon. Francis Fox.	1472
Hon. Marjory LeBreton.	1472

Industry	
2011 Census.	
Hon. Claudette Tardif.	1473
Hon. Marjory LeBreton.	1473

Health	
Tobacco Control Strategy.	
Hon. Grant Mitchell.	1474
Hon. Marjory LeBreton.	1474
Hon. Sharon Carstairs.	1474

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Speaker's Ruling	
The Hon. the Speaker.	1475
Hon. Wilfred P. Moore.	1475

Criminal Code (Bill S-204)	
Bill to Amend—Second Reading—Debate Continued.	
Hon. Donald Neil Plett.	1476
Hon. David P. Smith.	1480
Hon. Céline Hervieux-Payette.	1480

Governance of Canadian Businesses Emergency Bill (Bill S-205)	
Second Reading—Debate Continued.	
Hon. Gerald J. Comeau.	1482

Reorganization and Privatization of Atomic Energy of Canada Bill (Bill S-225)	
Second Reading—Debate Suspended.	
Hon. Céline Hervieux-Payette.	1482
Hon. Nicole Eaton.	1485
Hon. W. David Angus.	1485
Hon. Michael A. Meighen.	1486
Hon. Elizabeth (Beth) Marshall.	1486
Hon. Richard Neufeld.	1487

Appendix	i
---------------------------	---



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