



DEBATES OF THE SENATE

1st SESSION



44th PARLIAMENT



VOLUME 153



NUMBER 199

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

The Honourable RAYMONDE GAGNÉ,
Speaker

CONTENTS

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

Publications Centre: Publications@sen.parl.gc.ca

Published by the Senate
Available on the Internet: <http://www.parl.gc.ca>

THE SENATE

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

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

Prayers.

SENATORS' STATEMENTS

ARTWORK AND HERITAGE ADVISORY WORKING GROUP

Hon. Andrew Cardozo: Honourable senators, I want to say a few words as the Chair of the Artwork and Heritage Advisory Working Group — a subcommittee of the Standing Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration — to draw your attention to the work we are doing, supported by Heritage and Curatorial Services, on matters related to the Senate policy for heritage and arts. The bottom line for us is reflecting the art and heritage of Canadians in the Senate of Canada Building and our planned return to Centre Block.

The members of the working group include Senator Ataullahjan, Senator Burey and Senator Moodie. We work closely with the Speaker's office, the Property and Services Directorate and the Long Term Vision and Plan Subcommittee.

Here are some highlights of the year ahead.

To mark Asian Heritage Month, the working group and the Canada-Japan Inter-Parliamentary Group are displaying a *katana* for the month of May, which is on loan to the Senate from the Embassy of Japan. Many of you were at the event last Thursday to launch this exposé. In the months ahead, the Senate will have on display artistic works related to our Agriculture and Forestry Committee's study on soil health in Canada. Also on display until August 2024 is "Honouring Canada's Black Artists," a rotating exhibit that was started in 2020 through the initiative of the working group under the then-chair, Senator Patricia Bovey.

To increase access to artwork and artifacts in the Senate's collection, we have started a new Collection Spotlight program. Every three months, we will see an exhibition in the Senate foyer. Furthermore, to mark the sixtieth anniversary of the Canadian flag next year, we are developing a strategy that will last through the year, focusing on the flag.

We are also keeping an eye on the Centre Block renovations, and have reviewed the plans for Centre Block and the parliamentary welcome centre. That is a huge project that we will focus on in the years ahead. The plan will continue the historic display of specific works of art while making space to increase regional representation, women, Indigenous peoples and racialized Canadians.

In closing, I want to remind you, colleagues, of the significance of the artifacts of the Senate, which include a world-class collection of 6,000 works of art; ceremonial objects; and furniture, such as the heritage desks and chairs we are

privileged to occupy every day here in the Senate Chamber. This furniture is over 100 years old and bears witness to Canada's dynamic political journey.

Here is the part I really want you to listen to: Always treat our desks here carefully. If you notice any wear and tear, or water marks, please bring that to the attention of the pages or staff so that the items can be fixed immediately. We have set aside a modest budget for the constant upkeep of these important desks, and, each year, a few of them will be restored over the summer months. These desks are over 100 years old. We have to take care of them.

We welcome your input and ideas that may support the work of our committee.

Thank you.

BATTLE OF THE ATLANTIC

Hon. Jane MacAdam: Honourable senators, I rise today to recognize the individuals who served in the Battle of the Atlantic, the longest continuous military campaign in World War II.

Covering a major part of the war's naval history, the Battle of the Atlantic lasted from 1939 until the defeat of Nazi Germany on May 8, 1945. From the very start of hostilities, the supply route from North America to the United Kingdom and other European Allies was threatened. Germany's warships and submarines focused on sinking merchant shipping, reducing the supplies crossing the Atlantic and severing the lifelines to Britain. The outcome of the war was dependent upon the success of these transatlantic convoys.

For six long years, Canada's role in this battle was significant, with the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Merchant Navy and the Royal Canadian Air Force as central participants. Beginning from a tiny base, with a mere 13 vessels and 3,500 personnel, the Royal Canadian Navy grew to become one of the largest navies in the world, making Canada one of the foremost Allied powers in the Atlantic war. At war's end, it comprised 373 fighting ships and more than 110,000 members, including 6,500 women who served in the Women's Royal Canadian Naval Service. Additionally, the Royal Canadian Air Force's Eastern Air Command reached a peak of over 21,000 strong.

But with extensive participation came a high cost. Thousands gave their lives in the unforgiving environment.

My uncle Earl O'Hanley of St. Peter's Bay, Prince Edward Island, served in the Battle of the Atlantic in the Canadian Merchant Navy. Along with his cousin Albert O'Hanley, he perished in the sinking of the S.S. *Maplecourt* on February 6, 1941, at the age of 21 when the ship was torpedoed by a German U-boat. The entire crew of 38 was lost.

The Halifax Memorial, erected in Nova Scotia's Point Pleasant Park, is one of the few physical reminders of those who served, bearing 23 bronze panels upon which are inscribed the names of thousands of Canadians and Newfoundlanders buried at sea. The inscription reads in part "Their Graves Are Unknown But Their Memory Shall Endure."

Those who served in the Battle of the Atlantic achieved much and sacrificed even more. That battle was a pivotal struggle that secured an Allied victory in all of Europe, with immense help from Canada. In speaking today, I wish to commemorate the valour displayed by the thousands of brave men and women who put their lives on the line to help ensure the freedoms we enjoy today. May we never forget.

Thank you.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

VISITORS IN THE GALLERY

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I wish to draw your attention to the presence in the gallery of Justice Charles Chang and his daughter, Lia Chang. They are the guests of the Honourable Senator Martin.

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

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

ASIAN HERITAGE MONTH

Hon. Yonah Martin (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, I rise today during Asian Heritage Month to acknowledge and celebrate the contributions that Asian Canadians have made to the growth and prosperity of Canada. Today, I have the honour of highlighting four trailblazers of the Korean-Canadian community.

First, let me begin by acknowledging the courageous efforts of the first pioneering immigrants of the Korean-Canadian community in the 1960s and 1970s. Through their sweat, blood and tears, they built the strong foundation upon which their sons and daughters stand. These pioneers — like my parents, the late Lee Sung Kim and the late Kye Soon Kwon — began their new life in Canada, making great sacrifices. They toiled and laboured long hours to survive and build a new life for their children and future generations. Many were forced to set aside their own dreams in the hopes their children and unborn children would have greater opportunities to fully realize their dreams.

Like me, there are children of immigrant parents whose successes and achievements in life were possible because of the sacrifices that were made for us. I take this opportunity to recognize four of them who are pioneers of the next generation of Korean Canadians in the field of law.

The first pioneer is former Justice Grace Choi who, on May 29, 2015, was appointed as a judge of the Supreme Court of British Columbia, becoming the first Canadian of Korean descent to be appointed to the bench in Canadian history. She retired on July 14, 2022.

The second is Canadian-born Justice Leonard Kim, a former Crown attorney who was appointed to the Ontario Court of Justice on November 18, 2021, becoming the first Korean-Canadian male judge in Canadian history and the first Korean Canadian to be appointed to the bench in Ontario's history.

• (1410)

On May 8, 2023, Justice Julia Shin Doi was appointed to the Superior Court of Justice of Ontario, becoming the first female Korean Canadian judge in Ontario history.

Last, I would like to acknowledge Justice Charles Chang, who on June 27, 2022, was appointed a judge of the Superior Court of Justice of Ontario. Justice Chang is a leader in the Greater Toronto Area community with a distinguished career in law and commitment to helping his community.

Honourable senators, I am honoured to know these distinguished trailblazers of the next generation of Korean Canadians who, inspired by their selfless immigrant parents, are paving the way for others to realize their dreams.

Let us celebrate their achievements and the valuable contributions of Asian Canadians across our great nation during Asian Heritage Month and beyond.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL VISION HEALTH MONTH

Hon. Sharon Burey: Honourable senators, I rise today to recognize May as National Vision Health Month in Canada.

[*English*]

Healthy vision impacts our physical and mental health, quality of life and productivity. Sight loss can impact anyone at any time. According to recent statistics, there are 2.1 million Canadians who live with vision loss or blindness, and over 5.6 million Canadians are living with a vision-threatening condition. Meanwhile, 75% of vision-loss cases can be prevented if patients are diagnosed early and have access to treatment.

I had the honour of speaking with former senator Asha Seth a few days ago. Some of you will remember her tireless work in the Senate, especially in establishing May as national Vision Health Month, an opportunity to raise awareness about the importance of eye health and ways to prevent vision loss. As I have spoken about previously, I am becoming aware that part of my and our role as senators is to continue the work and stand on the shoulders of those who have come before us.

I would like to draw your attention to the importance of early intervention and regular eye examinations starting from birth as recommended by the Canadian Paediatric Society. These examinations are essential in diagnosing critical eye conditions like congenital cataract or retinoblastoma. Additionally, regular eye examinations will pick up common childhood visual disorders like amblyopia and refractive disorders.

However, we know there are barriers for vulnerable populations in receiving regular and accessible vision care and treatment. In my province of Ontario, only 65% of children have had an eye exam before their seventh birthday. As a pediatrician, I find this alarming. Ten per cent of preschool children will have a refractory error that can be corrected with a simple pair of glasses. Those who need more specialized support and services can get help from organizations like CNIB and Vision Loss Rehabilitation Canada.

Myopia is one of today's biggest threats to eye health because it is predicted to affect one in two people by 2050. Increases in screen time by children and adolescents, especially during the pandemic, have only magnified these problems.

Children with moderate to severe myopia are at risk of developing cataracts, glaucoma and other conditions that could lead to blindness.

[Translation]

In closing, simply getting a regular eye exam and wearing sunglasses to protect one's eyes can help contribute to good vision health.

Thank you. *Meegwetch.*

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

[English]

VISITORS IN THE GALLERY

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I wish to draw your attention to the presence in the gallery of the Honourable Enrique Manalo, Secretary of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of the Philippines, and Her Excellency Maria Andrelita S. Austria, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Republic of the Philippines, who are accompanied by a delegation. They are the guests of the Honourable Senator Osler.

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

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

[Translation]

MENTAL HEALTH WEEK

Hon. Marie-Françoise Mégie: Honourable senators, since it is National Mental Health Week, I would like to acknowledge the contribution of Jude Mary Cénat, Associate Professor of

Psychology and Research Chair in Black Health at the University of Ottawa. He is also the head of the Interdisciplinary Centre for Black Health at the University of Ottawa.

His team is currently organizing the second national conference on Black mental health, which will bring together hundreds of experts and will take place in Ottawa from October 16 to 18, 2024. The theme of this year's conference is "Reclaiming the Path to Joy."

Over the past few months, a great deal of research has been published, and new programs for mental health promotion and prevention and culturally adapted and anti-racist intervention have been implemented across Canada.

This second national conference will be an opportunity to talk about the many barriers that continue to prevent Black people from receiving care adapted to their needs, as well as the social determinants that continue to hinder the mental health of Black people and communities in Canada.

We will learn more about the advances being made across the country and about all the knowledge gained to help ensure that Black communities in Canada live healthier, happier lives. I would invite all parliamentarians to attend the second national conference on Black mental health, which will be held in Ottawa during our October recess. Thank you.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

[English]

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

CITIZENSHIP ACT

IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEE PROTECTION ACT

BILL TO AMEND—TWENTIETH REPORT OF SOCIAL AFFAIRS, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE PRESENTED

Hon. Ratna Omidvar: Honourable senators, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the twentieth report of the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology, which deals with Bill S-235, An Act to amend the Citizenship Act and the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act.

(For text of report, see today's Journals of the Senate, p. 2745.)

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, when shall this report be taken into consideration?

(On motion of Senator Omidvar, report placed on the Orders of the Day for consideration at the next sitting of the Senate.)

BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION BILL, 2024, NO. 1NOTICE OF MOTION TO AUTHORIZE CERTAIN COMMITTEES TO
STUDY SUBJECT MATTER

Hon. Marc Gold (Government Representative in the Senate): Honourable senators, I give notice that, at the next sitting of the Senate, I will move:

That, notwithstanding any provision of the Rules, previous order or usual practice:

1. in accordance with rule 10-11(1), the Standing Senate Committee on National Finance be authorized to examine the subject matter of all of Bill C-69, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on April 16, 2024, introduced in the House of Commons on May 2, 2024, in advance of the said bill coming before the Senate;
2. in addition, the following committees be separately authorized to examine the subject matter of the following elements contained in Bill C-69:
 - (a) the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Commerce and the Economy: those elements contained in Divisions 11, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 33, 41 and 42 of Part 4, and in Subdivision A of Division 34 of Part 4;
 - (b) the Standing Senate Committee on Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources: those elements contained in Division 28 of Part 4;
 - (c) the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade: those elements contained in Divisions 6, 7, 8 and 9 of Part 4;
 - (d) the Standing Senate Committee on Indigenous Peoples: those elements contained in Divisions 25 and 26 of Part 4;
 - (e) the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs: those elements contained in Divisions 29, 30, 35, 36, 43 and 44 of Part 4, and in Subdivisions B and C of Division 34 of Part 4;
 - (f) the Standing Senate Committee on National Security, Defence and Veterans Affairs: those elements contained in Division 39 of Part 4;
 - (g) the Standing Senate Committee on Official Languages: those elements contained in Division 24 of Part 4;
 - (h) the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology: those elements contained in Divisions 3, 4, 5, 14, 21, 22, 23, 31, 32 and 38 of Part 4; and

- (i) the Standing Senate Committee on Transport and Communications: those elements contained in Divisions 27 and 37 of Part 4;
3. each of the committees listed in point 2 that are authorized to examine the subject matter of particular elements of Bill C-69:
 - (a) submit its final report to the Senate no later than June 10, 2024; and
 - (b) be authorized to deposit its report with the Clerk of the Senate if the Senate is not then sitting;
4. as the reports from the various committees authorized to examine the subject matter of particular elements of Bill C-69 are tabled in the Senate, they be placed on the Orders of the Day for consideration at the next sitting, provided that if a report is deposited with the Clerk, it be placed on the Orders of the Day for consideration at the next sitting following the one on which the depositing is recorded in the *Journals of the Senate*;
5. the aforementioned committees be authorized to meet for the purposes of their studies of the subject matter of all or particular elements of Bill C-69, even though the Senate may then be sitting or adjourned, with the application of rules 12-18(1) and 12-18(2) being suspended in relation thereto; and
6. the Standing Senate Committee on National Finance be authorized to take any reports tabled under point 3 into consideration during its study of the subject matter of all of Bill C-69, submit its final report to the Senate no later than June 17, 2024, and be authorized to deposit its report with the Clerk if the Senate is not then sitting.

• (1420)

ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE OF MOTION

Hon. Patti LaBoucane-Benson (Legislative Deputy to the Government Representative in the Senate): Honourable senators, I give notice that, at the next sitting of the Senate, I will move:

That, when the Senate next adjourns after the adoption of this motion, it do stand adjourned until Tuesday, May 21, 2024, at 2 p.m.

QUESTION PERIOD

CANADIAN HERITAGE

PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

SENATE APPOINTMENTS

Hon. Donald Neil Plett (Leader of the Opposition): Leader, the Trudeau government's Senate appointment process is just an illusion of openness and transparency. Canadians watching at home might not know that the so-called Independent Advisory Board for Senate Appointments did not bother to issue a report on its activities or costs from 2019 or 2020. They reported in December of 2021, after Conservative senators repeatedly asked for this information. Their most recent report only covers up to March 31, 2023.

Since then, Prime Minister Trudeau has announced the appointment of 15 more senators to this chamber. Currently, six provinces have no members on the board. Does that mean the board now costs less than the \$465,000 it did in 2022-23? When will it next report?

Hon. Marc Gold (Government Representative in the Senate): Thank you for your question. I do not know when the next report will be issued. The government continues to have confidence in the integrity of the process that it put into place and resulted in the recommendations to the Governor General of 81 senators, the great majority of whom still sit in this chamber. The government will continue to pursue this method of vetting and appointing senators in the interests of continuing the process toward a more independent and less partisan Senate.

Senator Plett: Well, of course, I wasn't questioning the appointment process. I was questioning costs. Where is the transparency, Senator Gold? Why don't you want to give us the costs?

On June 10, 2021, the media reported that the Trudeau government had stopped using the Liberal Party's donor database, known as the Liberalist, to vet judicial appointments. Leader, that day, I asked you if the Prime Minister's Office, or PMO, had also stopped using the Liberalist to vet their Senate appointments. You admitted you didn't know the answer, but I still haven't gotten the answer, three years later, Senator Gold.

Does three years of silence mean you still use the Liberalist as part of your appointment process? Yes or no?

Senator Gold: Thank you for your question. I simply do not know the answer to your question, and that is the answer to your question.

An Hon. Senator: Why don't you ask?

Hon. Leo Housakos: Senator Gold, the Trudeau government, in its infinite wisdom, in the estimates in February gave an extra \$100 million a year to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, or CBC, raising the taxpayer-funded subsidy to the CBC to close to \$1.4 billion. In the meantime, the CBC has hit rock-bottom in terms of viewership, ratings and ad revenue, and the geniuses that your government appointed to the board of the CBC decided to issue management \$15 million in bonuses for their wonderful work. Some executives at the CBC earn as much as half a million dollars with their bonuses.

Senator Gold, would you agree that if the Trudeau government and the CBC lived in the real world, that company would be bankrupt and closed?

Hon. Marc Gold (Government Representative in the Senate): Senator, thank you for your question and your ongoing criticism of and attacks on the CBC; I say that with as much seriousness as I can muster. The real world is simply not one where market decisions and forces not only dominate, but exclude all other forms of involvement in our collective life. The CBC, as a public broadcaster, serves an important function. There is no question that it is falling on hard times — that it and others around the world are facing increased competition from web giants and changes in the way that current and younger generations consume information and news. It does not, however, follow that it does not serve a useful public purpose.

Senator Housakos: Senator Gold, we already know your government doesn't care about market forces. That is obvious; just look at your fiscal budget and your situation. But don't you also care about ratings? No one is paying attention. No one is actually buying into or looking at this public service that you are offering and investing \$1.4 billion in. Those are the facts.

Bill C-11, An Act to amend the Broadcasting Act and to make related and consequential amendments to other Acts, which your government forced upon this institution, was supposed to change everything. You must agree that it has clearly failed. Will your government repeal Bill C-11 and go back to the drawing board?

• (1430)

Senator Gold: You make it so hard to resist, reminding us that there are politicians south of the border who seem more concerned about ratings than good public policy. You know what I'm talking about.

The fact remains that if you speak to Canadians across this country, you'll know that many of them, especially in smaller communities, continue to rely upon the CBC, and the CBC has dedicated itself to finding ways to adapt to this new reality.

PUBLIC SERVICES AND PROCUREMENT

CANADA POST

Hon. Tony Loffreda: Senator Gold, I would like to talk about Canada Post. We learned Monday that the price of a domestic stamp is increasing. This comes as no surprise, considering the bad news we heard a few days ago about its losses.

Senator Gold, how will the government work with Canada Post to secure its long-term viability? The corporation recorded a loss before tax of \$748 million in 2023, and projects even larger — and unsustainable — losses in the future if they don't make changes to align the postal service to today's needs.

For instance, we know that Canadians received, on average, two letters per week in 2023; it was seven letters back in 2006. Times have changed for sure.

Hon. Marc Gold (Government Representative in the Senate): Thank you for your question. As colleagues surely know, Canada Post is a Crown corporation that not only operates at arm's length from the government, but its operations are also fully funded by the revenue generated by the sale of its products and services, not by taxpayer dollars.

I understand that Canada Post is considering a number of options, and that the government is currently waiting to see a new model emerge from the Crown corporation so that it can boost revenues and save costs.

Senator Loffreda: Thank you for that answer. I appreciate that there is no easy solution to this problem that has been years in the making. Since the act that governs the corporation clearly states that it shall conduct its operations on a self-sustaining financing basis, what are the government's options to ensure its future operations without public subsidies? As I understand it, the only parliamentary appropriation that Canada Post receives is approximately \$22 million per year.

Senator Gold: Thank you. As I stated, it's my understanding that Canada Post is reviewing all of its options, and will be providing the government with a new model for the Crown corporation to both boost revenues and reduce costs. The government is looking forward to receiving that proposal from Canada Post.

FINANCE

RECOVERY OF COVID-19 SUPPORT PAYMENTS

Hon. Kim Pate: Senator Gold, research from the Institut de recherche et d'informations socioéconomiques in Quebec recently highlighted the extent to which large companies have participated in offshore tax avoidance while also receiving public subsidies from the federal government.

In one example, a Montreal-based multinational transferred \$99.2 million in profits offshore in 2020-21 while also receiving \$115.7 million from the federal government in the form of COVID-19 wage and rent subsidies.

What concrete steps is the government taking to investigate and make accountable the companies that simultaneously claimed public subsidies while also dodging taxes?

Hon. Marc Gold (Government Representative in the Senate): Thank you for your question and your continued advocacy on this. As I've said before, it is important that everyone must contribute their fair share to finance public services. The government has redoubled its efforts to make sure that they pay, and that they don't use loopholes to avoid their responsibilities.

It is my understanding that the Canada Revenue Agency, or CRA, employs experts and continues to use sophisticated tools to better detect and deal with the most serious cases of non-compliance. For example, by using electronic tools to conduct risk assessments of the corporate tax returns of all large businesses, the CRA is improving its ability to detect high-risk transactions and to focus its audit resources in the areas of highest risk. The CRA will continue to relentlessly track down those who use tax havens or other tax avoidance schemes to avoid paying their fair share.

Senator Pate: Thank you, Senator Gold. The government is continuing to require repayment from individuals, including many who desperately needed income support and legitimately claimed the Canada Emergency Response Benefit, or CERB, during the pandemic. In at least 27,000 cases, the government was in error, and individuals who repaid money were actually entitled to the CERB.

What steps is the government taking to ensure that its efforts to recuperate COVID-19 benefits focus on those who took and profited most — not those with the fewest resources, including no money to hire teams of lawyers to defend themselves?

Senator Gold: Thank you for the question. As we mentioned — and it's important to remind ourselves — when we passed the CERB, the government put it in place to urgently help Canadians. The government said that verifications would be done later.

The government recognizes that the situation of every taxpayer is different. In terms of reimbursement of excess CERB payments for the most vulnerable taxpayers, I've been informed that the CRA works with diligence and empathy on a case-by-case basis to resolve their debts based upon their ability to pay.

The Hon. the Speaker: I would ask senators to lower the volume of their phones, or turn them off. There have been tests of the emergency alert system that can be problematic for the interpreters. If you could shut off your phones, please.

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

CHALLENGES FACED BY FARMERS

Hon. Robert Black: Senator Gold, the message from the agricultural sector in news headlines in the past few weeks has been very clear: From the Canadian Federation of Agriculture: “CFA Disappointed with Lack of Agriculture in Federal Budget 2024.”

From the Grain Growers of Canada: “Budget 2024 Falls Short of Providing Critical Investments for Grain Farmers.”

From the Wheat Growers Association: “Failing Grade for an Out of Touch Federal Budget.”

The 2024 federal budget lacks comprehensive support in crucial areas for our farming communities. Notably absent are updates to the Canada Grain Act; investments in grain-related research and development; funding around the Pest Management Regulatory Agency, or PMRA; and extensions to programs, such as the extended rail interswitching pilot. Other concerns include capital gains issues and intergenerational farm transfers.

My question is but one: How does the government plan to address the specific challenges faced by farmers, such as the impact of tax changes on intergenerational farm transfers and the ongoing effects of the carbon tax on agricultural operations?

Hon. Marc Gold (Government Representative in the Senate): Thank you for your question, senator. The government will continue to support our farmers. Recently, the government allocated \$219 million through the AgriRecovery framework to support farmers and ranchers in Western Canada who are dealing with extraordinary costs due to drought conditions and wildfires.

Producers can also apply for interim payments through AgriStability to help them cope with immediate financial challenges. Producers have access to a comprehensive suite of business risk management programs, including AgriStability, AgriInsurance and AgriInvest. The government also has AgPal to search for programs and resources to help with business management, farming, innovation and community support.

ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE

FEDERAL CONTAMINATED SITES

Hon. Judy A. White: My question is for the Government Representative in the Senate.

Canada’s Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development tabled five reports last week, with one of them concluding that contamination sites in Northern Canada continue

to pose serious risks. Among many significant issues, the report highlighted:

The Federal Contaminated Sites Action Plan does not include realistic targets for climate adaptation and is missing targets for Indigenous engagement and socio-economic benefits to support reconciliation with Indigenous peoples—key priorities related to the management of contaminated sites.

Senator Gold, how does the government plan to address these concerns with policy implementation, and how does it plan to ensure that Indigenous voices are heard and incorporated into proposed solutions and the management of these sites?

Hon. Marc Gold (Government Representative in the Senate): Thank you for your question. The recommendation from the report of the Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development will help Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada improve the effectiveness of the Northern Contaminated Sites Program. This will, in turn, result in a more efficient and effective remediation of northern contaminated sites, greater economic opportunities for northern Indigenous communities and, fundamentally, a cleaner northern environment.

My understanding is that the government is actively exploring ways to promote Indigenous participation in remediation activities, and ensuring that they benefit from the management of contaminated sites in the North.

Senator White: The lack of reporting and meaningful information on these contaminated sites, including large abandoned mines, means that the government does not have a clear picture of the environmental and financial consequences of these contaminated sites.

Senator Gold, despite some of these sites being there for decades, why does the government not have meaningful information on them? More importantly, what is the government doing to make sure that this important first step is taken?

Senator Gold: Thank you for the question. In fact, the government is investigating to identify sites to assess risk, estimate cost and record liabilities in order to remediate and close these sites. I’ve been informed that since 2005, over 24,000 federal contaminated sites have been identified. The government has successfully closed more than 75% of them, meaning they no longer pose a risk. The government remains committed to continuing to make progress in addressing the remaining sites.

• (1440)

CANADA MORTGAGE AND HOUSING CORPORATION

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Hon. Yonah Martin (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Leader, *La Presse* recently reported that five families of asylum seekers from India, 16 people in total, are sharing one apartment in your hometown of Montreal, as they are unable to find

affordable rental housing. One couple said they pay \$900 a month for a room in the apartment. A recent report from the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, or CMHC, said the rental market in Montreal remains under pressure this year, with the vacancy rate close to 1%. In my province of B.C., CMHC expects the cost of rent to increase in Vancouver and Victoria this year, next year and the year after that. The same is true for Montreal.

Leader, what year will the cost of rent go down?

Hon. Marc Gold (Government Representative in the Senate): Thank you for your question. That story is a disturbing one for all who read *La Presse* or wherever it appeared. No family should be limited to or forced to live in quarters that are so tight and small.

The Government of Canada is doing its part to help unlock the construction of new rental properties. Indeed, it's taking unprecedented steps in that regard, and if my eyes do not betray me, there are serious investments to unlock tens and tens of rental houses — if not more — in the years to come. I cannot give you a date for when market forces will determine that rental prices will come down, but if Canada works with the provinces, municipalities and the private sector to build the units, then we'll have the solution to the problem.

Senator Martin: Leader, despite all the Trudeau government's recent housing announcements, CMHC's spring forecast repeats a warning it has given previously. This year, rents will rise and vacancy rates will fall across Canada. That is terrible news for Canadians as rent has already doubled under the Trudeau government. Why should renters across Canada believe the Trudeau government can fix this housing crisis it created?

Senator Gold: The government did not create the rental crisis, nor can the federal government alone fix it. Let's be real. But what the federal government can do through its spending power is work with the provinces, which have jurisdiction over housing; and the provinces in turn with the municipalities, which have jurisdiction over zoning; and with the private sector, which plays a major role in this area. If we work together, we can address this problem in a serious way.

HEALTH

MEDICAL ASSISTANCE IN DYING

Hon. Donald Neil Plett (Leader of the Opposition): Leader, Radio-Canada recently shared the story of a truck driver in Quebec, paralyzed in his arms and legs in 2022. He chose assisted suicide in March, leader, after developing a severe bed sore while spending 95 hours — almost four days — on a

stretcher in a hospital emergency room. Trudo Lemmens, an expert in health and legal policy, summed up the sad case as follows:

But reality is, without ableist sanitizing: bed sore really is the reason why he asked for it. Quadraplegia combined with substandard care made him feel a burden. . . .

Leader, during a debate on Bill C-7, you said legislation provided “. . . safeguards necessary to protect the most vulnerable in society. . . .” How did this so-called safeguard protect this individual?

Hon. Marc Gold (Government Representative in the Senate): It's a tragic story which moved all of us when we read it. I'm going to try to answer your question, Senator Plett, without taking exception to your instrumentalization of this.

The safeguards in the federal legislation are designed to ensure that the standards that professionals apply, which are developed by and the responsibility of their professional orders, are such to ensure that decisions that are made in the evaluation and assessment of whether individuals are qualified meet the necessary standards to protect them.

Unfortunately, federal legislation cannot protect individuals from the shortage of hospital beds or, regrettably and tragically, long wait times in the corridors of hospitals.

Senator Plett: So your answer is this: They didn't.

Steven Laperrière, the general director of an inclusion organization in Quebec, had this to say:

That whole story is a crying shame. . . .

It's really a case of disbelief. . . . What are we doing in order to help disabled persons or sick people to live in dignity prior to dying in dignity?

That's a very good question, leader. What is your answer to that?

Senator Gold: Of course it's a fair question, and in the debate on medical assistance in dying and the bill we passed in this chamber, it was properly raised and addressed by many senators. This requires a serious, all-society, all-jurisdictional effort within their jurisdictions to provide support for those who are suffering, whatever the nature of their suffering, and every jurisdiction needs to do its part. That is the serious answer to a very serious question.

INNOVATION, SCIENCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

NET ZERO ACCELERATOR INITIATIVE

Hon. Mary Coyle: Senator Gold, as Senator White just mentioned, the Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development released five reports last week. One of

these reports was on Innovation, Science, and Economic Development Canada's Strategic Innovation Fund's Net Zero Accelerator Initiative. The commissioner reported there's been difficulty attracting applications from Canada's largest carbon emitters because there's little incentive for large emitters to decarbonize their operations. Also, those who did apply found the process lengthy and complex.

Senator Gold, what incentives will the government offer to attract our largest emitters to apply for the Net Zero Accelerator, and will the government commit to improving the application process?

Hon. Marc Gold (Government Representative in the Senate): The government is always looking for ways to improve the application process. But I think it's important to underline, senator, that the Net Zero Accelerator Initiative has been in very high demand since its launch some four years ago. While the government would prefer to reduce heavy emissions even further by 2030, company readiness is very much a factor, since many heavy emitters are still in the planning stages of their decarbonization initiatives.

To that end, I will note, for the benefit of colleagues who don't follow this as closely as some, that the government funded 129 projects through the Sustainable Forestry Initiative, or SFI, totalling \$9.5 billion in funding.

Senator Coyle: That includes only a couple of the largest emitters, however. Thank you, Senator Gold.

The same report reveals there's a potential risk in double counting and tracking emissions reductions since both companies that make clean technology and those that use it can claim credit for emissions reductions, when only using clean technologies actually results in emissions reductions. The commissioner recommended that the methodology for tracking emissions reductions be changed so only those with the net reduction effect are counted.

Senator Gold, will the ministry commit to adjusting their methodology to account for this recommended change?

Senator Gold: Thank you. The government is always looking for ways to improve both its processes — as I mentioned in response to your first question — and, of course, its methodology. In that regard, I have every confidence that the government carefully considered the recommendations that were presented to it.

[Translation]

VETERANS AFFAIRS

PROCESSING OF DISABILITY BENEFITS APPLICATIONS

Hon. Rebecca Patterson: My question is for the Government Representative in the Senate, Senator Gold.

[English]

In the past two years, there has been a 50% increase in denied claims by Veterans Affairs Canada for veterans seeking disability benefits. These Canadians faithfully served King and country and risked their lives and safety in the process. Sadly, this is an ongoing issue that is occurring regardless of the party in power, but you don't need much common sense to know that this is an issue of respect and livelihood, because many veterans are struggling, working-class people who rely on these benefits to make ends meet.

What will the government do to address the increasing rate of claim denial, often through factors claimants are unable to control themselves, such as access to primary care?

Hon. Marc Gold (Government Representative in the Senate): Thank you for your question and also your advocacy on this issue, senator. Indeed, it's a question of respect, and the government could not agree more. It has made serious investments, as I've outlined in this chamber before, but I would never claim that it was enough to close the gap. It will continue to work within its capacity to address this issue so that our veterans can get the support they have earned and deserve.

Senator Patterson: Thank you. When you take this matter back to the minister and make your inquiries, could you please raise the fact that many of these denials are being reversed by the Veterans Review and Appeal Board appointed by the government, and that this is simply prolonging the process of accessing benefits and making veterans wait even longer?

• (1450)

Senator Gold: I'll certainly add that to my inquiries.

CANADIAN HERITAGE

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

Hon. Leo Housakos: Senator Gold, I want to go back to the CBC, because the CBC has announced 800 pending layoffs. When you talk about the fact that the CBC has hit hard times, it's not new. The CBC's ratings have been crashing for many years, and if they lay off these 800 employees, their ratings will probably go down to zero. You talk about hitting hard times, but the only people who have hit hard times are taxpayers who are paying for a service, Senator Gold, that they clearly don't want.

My question is very simple. Why is there an ideological hang-up in your government with regard to spending hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars every year on a service that Canadians have turned their backs on? They're not watching. You talk about consumerism as if it's some kind of a negative. Do you know what consumerism is? It's taxpayers. That's who the consumers are. Why is your government forcing taxpayers to pay for a service they're not receiving and don't want? Why are you forcing them to pay for it?

Hon. Marc Gold (Government Representative in the Senate): I said nothing negative about consumerism. I simply mentioned that there are different ways in which a country as vast as Canada can choose to support — or not support — public, non-commercial broadcasting. Historically, the government and Canada have made a decision to have a national public broadcaster, as other countries have done. It is challenged by changing times and by, if I can use your words, those with an ideology that is, if not indeed hostile — although that might be a fair term — certainly indifferent to the values and virtues of something that is not exclusively driven by market forces. These are political choices that parties and governments are entitled to make.

The CBC is struggling, and they will continue to work to become more relevant to Canadians. There are a lot of Canadians who still benefit from the CBC and want to see it continue.

Senator Housakos: Senator Gold, your government professes to care about broadcasting in general. Private broadcasters are struggling as well, yet you're subsidizing a public broadcaster to the tune of \$1.4 billion and allowing them to compete for private advertising against those private broadcasters. Do you see the problem? Do you see how it doesn't add up? If you care about the health of broadcasting, let it grow and prosper by pulling out an organ like the CBC that is just competing in the marketplace and being paid by your government to compete against broadcasters.

Senator Gold: What I see, Senator Housakos, is that there is a serious policy challenge facing public broadcasters in this 21st century. The question is simply this: What is the responsible way to address it? You and your party have a particular view. It is not one that is shared by the Government of Canada.

PUBLIC SAFETY

FOREIGN INTERFERENCE

Hon. Donald Neil Plett (Leader of the Opposition): Leader, over the course of nine long years, the Trudeau government has never taken the threat posed by Beijing's Communist regime seriously. One of my written questions in 2020 asked about shares held by the Canada Pension Plan Investments Board in Hikvision, a company whose cameras are used in Beijing's mass surveillance of the Uighurs. The Trudeau government's response washed its hands of anything to do with these shares — no leadership.

On Monday, it was reported that 24 departments across the Government of Canada have bought cameras from this company and most of them are now being replaced. Leader, why didn't your incompetent Trudeau government take this matter seriously years ago?

Hon. Marc Gold (Government Representative in the Senate): As I've said on many occasions in this chamber — but I guess perhaps memories need refreshing — the attitudes of the many governments of Canada toward doing business with China and the possibility of relations with China have changed dramatically over the last decades. It is no secret that in recent years the concern about interference, commercial and other

espionage, to say nothing of foreign interference, has grown — properly so — and become a preoccupation not only of this government but of the opposition and of Canadians. In that regard, it is fitting and appropriate that decisions are made within departments to ensure the equipment they have poses no risk to national security.

Senator Plett: Who said that he admired the basic dictatorship of Beijing? Oh yes, that was the Prime Minister.

Leader, how much is it going to cost Canadian taxpayers to replace these cameras? How long will it take for this incompetent Trudeau government to stop using these cameras completely? Stop with the rhetoric and give me my answer.

Senator Gold: I respond very well to that kind of tone.

I will simply say, Senator Plett, that the government and the departments of the government are doing what they need to do to ensure that the technology used within Canada does not pose a threat to our national security.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THE LATE RIGHT HONOURABLE BRIAN MULRONEY, P.C., C.C., G.O.Q.

INQUIRY—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the inquiry of the Honourable Senator LaBoucane-Benson, calling the attention of the Senate to the life of the late Right Honourable Brian Mulroney, P.C.

Hon. Marty Deacon: Honourable senators, it is an honour and a privilege to speak today about the Right Honourable Brian Mulroney. While it has been two and a half months since his passing, it has given me time to pay my respects during his lying in state and time to listen and watch those who knew him well alongside Canadians who just wanted to pay their respects in Ottawa and Montreal.

I speak today about Mr. Mulroney because he had an impact on me, like on so many, that was strong and powerful during the formative years in my life — an impact that continues to this day.

Let's first go back in time. Four decades ago, in 1984, how old were you? What were you up to? For me, while it was the second time I voted, it was the first time I truly listened to party platforms and began to respect the electoral process. I had just finished graduate school. I was embarking on my adult life and my professional life and taking on many new changes.

In July 1984, during a televised debate with John Turner, Mr. Mulroney caught my attention. Partly due to his charisma and partly due to his confidence, I was taken by his ambitious big-picture responses and his references to leading Canada and

aspiring to be a strong global influence. I also remember quite clearly a moment when Mr. Turner tried to shake Mr. Mulroney up a bit regarding political appointments, and I watched as Mr. Mulroney smoothly and tactfully flipped the tables on his opponent at that moment.

• (1500)

It felt like Mr. Mulroney gained so much momentum throughout the month of August. I read what I could in the media — and that was only the newspaper. I learned of his life in the small isolated town of Baie-Comeau, and that he was the son of Irish Catholic Canadian parents.

Over time, and before the election, I also learned of his deep love and appreciation for his wife and best friend. What I really admired was that Brian and Mila presented as a team, both during the campaign and his time in office. I think it was the only time in my life — I don't know if it was a break in protocol — that I saw campaign buttons with a photo of both the candidate and his spouse. They were inseparable throughout, which I found impressive, as soon I would begin my own family.

It was September 4; I remember that morning like it was yesterday. I was in my mid-twenties, and it was my first day in my new apartment — a whopping \$400 for two bedrooms — in a new town, starting a new job, with no car and just a bicycle. I was engaged to my now-husband, and we would be married in five weeks, starting a new life together. That day of September 4, on the first day of my new job, I voted for Mr. Brian Mulroney. Yes, I voted Conservative. I felt that this was the leadership that Canada needed at that moment in time. This was the personality that Canada needed.

Many aspects of Mr. Mulroney's life and career have been well noted over the past few months. As a labour lawyer, business leader, Progressive Conservative Party leader, prime minister and family man, we have been reminded of so much, and a younger generation of Canadians have begun to learn so much about him.

As prime minister, Mr. Mulroney left legacies in social programming, privatization, energy and the environment — and attempted constitutional reform — but, for me, his work in foreign policy will be remembered most. His relationship with his fellow Irishman, U.S. President Ronald Reagan, would serve him well, and his deep desire to develop strong global relationships would serve Canada well.

For me, his work with South Africa to eliminate apartheid stands high and tall in my memory. This was a political dance that I followed with interest. This is where I learned much about the Commonwealth, and the importance of the Commonwealth at this moment in history. Mulroney's work within the Commonwealth to sanction the South African government, to try to put an end to apartheid and to have Nelson Mandela released was tireless.

He did not have the support of Margaret Thatcher, and we were told that these were tough face-to-face meetings. The support of the U.S. president was also not clearly there. But

Mulroney hammered away at this from every angle. His leadership within the UN, the Commonwealth and the G7 were pivotal to the end of apartheid.

His leadership was based on leveraging personal relationships and being in the room, and there is a reason why Nelson Mandela made his first foreign visit to Canada's Parliament after his release from prison.

Fast-forward 10 years later to 1994: It is the Commonwealth Games hosted by Canada in Victoria, B.C. It is my first go at coaching multi-sport games — a big team with lots on the go. It is now opening ceremonies day. Opening ceremonies are special anytime, anywhere, especially on home soil, but it is a long time — usually at least 6 to 8 hours, or maybe 10 hours — from start to finish. So, "hurry up and wait," taking your time and having patience are important.

As we prepared to march in, we heard a lot of commotion, singing and chanting behind us. It was South Africa celebrating, excited to be back in the Commonwealth. Mandela's people were there and shared in this excitement. Our athletes were truthfully unsure of what the big fuss was all about. They were becoming a little tired and wanted to get on with it.

I quickly circled about 30 of them around me, paused and said, "Do you know what is happening? Do you know why this moment is significant? Do you know that you are part of history?" They were athletes. They were focused on their sport. They had no idea. I remember saying:

There will be many memories you make here at these Commonwealth Games — some on the field of play, some off. Today, you will march into the Victoria Stadium alongside South Africa. They are returning to the Commonwealth movement after experiencing years of an apartheid regime. This march in is for their country, for their freedom. This is their first event outside of South Africa. Remember to say hello. You know their team jersey colours. When not competing, look them straight in the eye, introduce yourselves and do what you can to make them feel most welcome.

Fast-forward 30 years later, and many of you may recall that just a few weeks ago — maybe 10 days ago — there was a pivotal 30-year anniversary of the freedom of South Africa. Two of these athletes — now in their fifties — emailed me out of the blue. They said:

Hey, Coach Deac, I just saw on social media that this is the thirtieth anniversary for South Africa celebrating their freedom. I will never forget what you told us in that crazy huddle before the opening ceremonies in Victoria. We certainly now get the importance of that moment.

That moment happened when it did, thanks in great part to the determination of our former prime minister.

To finally complete the circle of impact, I was thrilled to join my Senate colleague Senator Coyle in her home in Antigonish, Nova Scotia, last August. Senator Coyle's home proudly overlooks St. Francis Xavier University. You just cross the street and you're there. Not that long ago, Mr. Mulroney, while attending a football game, envisioned a legacy building — an inspiring place for undergraduate students to learn about issues, policies and civic engagement, while in pursuit of leadership roles in the fields of public policy and governance.

What is so special about this building that opened in 2018 is the museum-like, exact replica of Mr. Mulroney's office that he held in Ottawa — everything down to the furniture, the arrangement of the furniture and the light. Truthfully, you feel like the prime minister has just stepped out of the room. It is a wonderful learning legacy for Canadians.

I share the impact of one prime minister on one person at one moment in time. I believe that this was also the beginning of my interest in federal politics — in structures designed to make Canada the very best. More importantly, the valuing of relationships — regardless of stripes — and the ability to connect, respect, listen and work toward collective compromise are skills that we need more than ever. I saw and valued those through the Mulroney years.

Today, I am honoured to serve in some way with those lessons in mind. Thank you to the Right Honourable Brian Mulroney and his family.

Thank you. *Meegwetch.*

(On motion of Senator LaBoucane-Benson, debate adjourned.)

PARLIAMENT OF CANADA ACT

BILL TO AMEND—MESSAGE FROM COMMONS—
MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN
COMMONS AMENDMENTS—DEBATE ADJOURNED

The Senate proceeded to consideration of the amendments from the House of Commons concerning Bill S-202, An Act to amend the Parliament of Canada Act (Parliamentary Visual Artist Laureate)

1. *Clause 1, pages 1 and 2:*

(a) on page 1, replace line 12 with the following:

“names reflective of Canada's diversity, consistent with the principle that the primary official language spoken by the holder shall alternate and submitted in”;

(b) on page 2, replace line 16 with the following:

“phy, filmmaking and digital creations that reflect the diversity of Canada, including with respect to the languages in use and its ethnocultural composition.”.

Hon. Andrew Cardozo moved:

That, in relation to Bill S-202, An Act to amend the Parliament of Canada Act (Parliamentary Visual Artist Laureate), the Senate agree to the amendments made by the House of Commons; and

That a message be sent to the House of Commons to acquaint that house accordingly.

He said: Honourable senators, I wish to speak to the motion proposing that the Senate accept the two amendments made to Bill S-202 in the other place. I have a couple of words on Bill S-202: This act will create the parliamentary visual artist laureate. It was first introduced in the Forty-second Parliament by Senator Wilfred Moore. The version we are now amending was originally introduced by Senator Patricia Bovey. It is with pride that I am here to pick up where Senator Bovey and Senator Moore left off, and to help this bill through its final parliamentary stage. The objective of Bill S-202 is to create the parliamentary visual artist laureate as an officer of the Library of Parliament. This position would be complementary to the already existing Parliamentary Poet Laureate and would use the same model.

• (1510)

The artist laureate will serve a two-year term and will have a broad mandate to promote the arts in Canada through Parliament, including by fostering enjoyment, awareness and development of the arts.

As you may be aware, colleagues, I am a keen advocate of the arts and, indeed, an artist myself, so I am delighted to speak to this bill.

Public advocacy of the arts in Canada goes back to the Massey Commission which reported in 1951 and included its recommendation to establish the Canada Council of the Arts. That report set out the premise that arts are no tangential matter extraneous to the proper business of state. If I can paraphrase, it is through the arts that communities communicate their self-understanding to future generations. That which can, at first glance, appear to be frivolous to our daily lives and difficulties may well be the thing that endures, which may give a community its power to survive.

I'm looking forward to seeing what the artist laureate will produce and hope that, in time, the works of the parliamentary artist laureate will rank among those of Emily Carr, Stan Douglas, Lawren Harris, Kent Monkman, William Kurelek and Jean Paul Riopelle as visual artists of the character and identity of this nation that will reverberate for years to come.

This bill has been returned to us from the other place with two amendments that we vote upon today — or soon — which, I am happy to say, have improved the bill.

One amendment is from the Conservative Member of Parliament for Sarnia-Lambton, Marilyn Gladu. It further clarifies that, in these modern times, a new art form of digital creation must be considered the artistic equal of other traditional forms of art.

The other amendment deals with the language of the parliamentary artist. Although art is a language all of its own, it is right and reasonable that both official language communities of this country receive due opportunity to express themselves through the platform Parliament can provide. So I welcome the amendment that the primary official language spoken by the holder shall alternate. This reflects the practice already in place for the poet laureate.

In closing, let me say that I am excited to see what the future parliamentary visual artist laureates may do with this position.

Honourable senators, I urge you to join me in supporting these two amendments, as you so graciously supported the previous version of this bill. Thank you.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Leo Housakos: Would Senator Cardozo take a question?

Senator Cardozo: Sure.

Senator Housakos: Senator Cardozo, thank you for the remarks and for the bill, I guess. Can you explain the process to the chamber? What will be the process for the nomination and selection? I assume it would be the Governor General, but maybe you can give us a bit of background on how the process will wheel out.

Senator Cardozo: Thank you, senator. My understanding is that in the past, this was designed to follow the process used for the poet laureate. The process is that people would make applications to the Library of Parliament. It is the Library of Parliament that would make the selection to ensure that there are the various kinds of diversities — certainly the regional diversity — that is sought for this position.

Senator Housakos: I assume, senator, that the nominations would be open for anyone to nominate anyone? Could they nominate themselves? Would parliamentarians be able to send the names of nominees to the committee or to the Library of Parliament?

Senator Cardozo: I understand that is the case. The idea is to make it an office that is open to all Canadians.

(On motion of Senator Martin, debate adjourned.)

CRIMINAL RECORDS ACT

BILL TO AMEND—SIXTEENTH REPORT OF LEGAL AND
CONSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE—
DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Cotter, seconded by the Honourable Senator Ravalia, for the adoption of the sixteenth report of the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs (*Bill S-212, An Act to amend the Criminal Records*

Act, to make consequential amendments to other Acts and to repeal a regulation, with amendments), presented in the Senate on September 26, 2023.

Hon. Brian Francis: Honourable senators, I rise today to read a speech on behalf of Senator Wanda Bernard calling for an urgent report stage vote on Bill S-212, An Act to amend the Criminal Records Act, to make consequential amendments to other Acts and to repeal a regulation.

Before I begin, I wish to acknowledge that we are on the unceded, unsundered Algonquin Anishinaabe territory. Senator Bernard writes as follows:

This legislation would implement automated expiry of criminal records, allowing records to expire without a person having to pay a fee or make an application after a certain number of crime-free years.

This bill is key to addressing injustices that make the criminal record system inequitable and inaccessible, particularly for those who face structural barriers such as racism, poverty and ableism.

It has been nearly seven months since the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs studied and endorsed this bill. Meanwhile, some of the most marginalized and vulnerable Canadians are impacted by our inaction as they struggle daily to find meaningful employment, stable housing and other relief from unjust and unnecessary barriers to community re-entry and integration.

At committee, many witnesses emphasized the disproportionate impact of criminalization on Black and Indigenous communities and the consequential potential of the automated record expiry posed by Bill S-212.

The Canadian Association of Black Lawyers emphasized that the challenge we face as a community is much more on the over-surveillance and over-policing of Black bodies that lead to these criminal records that follow you throughout your life.

The Federal Ombudsperson for Victims of Crime noted that:

Criminal records disproportionately affect racialized people in Canada, specifically people who are Indigenous or Black. Already, these groups are over-incarcerated, and criminal records extend the continuum of criminalization into their communities as they try to reintegrate. This introduces barriers to employment, housing and education, reinforcing the circumstances that contribute to victimization. . . .

The victims' ombudsperson was just one of the numerous witnesses to highlight that in terms of upholding public safety. All of us benefit from safer, stronger and more inclusive communities when people leaving prison are able to successfully re-enter society.

As a result of the committee process, Bill S-212 was amended at the request of Senator Pate and in response to concerns raised by some police witnesses to ensure that

police continue to have access to expired records for investigative purposes. The amended bill requires the government to establish regulations that govern the use that police can make of expired records.

Preparing to vote on the committee's report, I wish to highlight — as the Canadian Association of Black Lawyers did at committee — the importance of clearly defining and drawing the line between legitimate investigative purposes and racial profiling.

At second reading, I shared the story of a Black man I know whose image was actively being shown in a lineup, even though this was years after a crime he had committed in his youth — a crime that he had served time for and had moved on from. He could be brought in as a suspect for a future crime to which he had absolutely no connection, putting him at risk of further stigma and charges.

Black men in Halifax are already 9.2 times more likely to be stopped in a street check than the rest of the population. What if this man is pulled over and the police officer recognizes him as one of the men in the lineup and already has decided he must be guilty of a crime? Scenarios like this may seem hypothetical but are, unfortunately, all too familiar for Black men in this country.

Honourable senators, implementing automated record expiry is the bare minimum we can do to ensure equitable treatment of marginalized people — in particular, for Indigenous, Black and racialized communities. This bill will make a difference for those struggling to access housing, jobs, education and volunteer work as they move on from a record. It is time to move forward with this bill. Thank you. *Asante.*

• (1520)

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Michael L. MacDonald: Honourable senators, I would like to take the adjournment in my name.

[*Translation*]

The Hon. the Speaker: It is moved by the Honourable Senator MacDonald, seconded by the Honourable Senator Martin, that further debate be adjourned until the next sitting of the Senate. Is it your pleasure, honourable senators, to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Some Hon. Senators: No.

The Hon. the Speaker: I recognized Senator MacDonald. The question is as follows: Is it your pleasure, honourable senators, to adopt the motion?

[Senator Francis]

[*English*]

The Hon. the Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say “yea.”

Some Hon. Senators: Yea.

The Hon. the Speaker: All those opposed to the motion will please say “nay.”

Some Hon. Senators: Nay.

The Hon. the Speaker: In my opinion the “nays” have it.

And two honourable senators having risen:

The Hon. the Speaker: I see two senators rising. Do we have agreement on a bell?

Senator Plett: One hour.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, before directing that the bells be rung, I would note that we will complete the bells and vote on this motion, which will take us to after 4 p.m. After that, the bells will ring for another 15 minutes for the deferred vote on Government Motion No. 165.

Senator Plett: Your Honour, would you please explain that one more time? Are we going to vote on this motion at 4:20 p.m. and then ring the bells afterward for 15 minutes? That is the way I understood it. The deferred vote would be sometime after 4:45 p.m. or something like that.

The Hon. the Speaker: I was about to let you know when the first vote will be held. I will repeat everything.

Honourable senators, I would note that we will complete the bells and vote on this motion, which will take us to after 4 p.m. After that, the bells will ring for another 15 minutes for the deferred vote on Government Motion No. 165. That said, the first vote will be at 4:22 p.m.

Call in the senators.

• (1620)

Motion agreed to on the following division:

YEAS
THE HONOURABLE SENATORS

Al Zaibak	Loffreda
Arnot	MacAdam
Ataullahjan	MacDonald
Aucoin	Marshall
Batters	Martin
Black	McBean
Boniface	McNair
Busson	Mégie
Cardozo	Miville-Dechêne

Carignan	Moncion
Clement	Oh
Cotter	Omidvar
Coyle	Oudar
Dasko	Petitclerc
Deacon (<i>Nova Scotia</i>)	Petten
Deacon (<i>Ontario</i>)	Plett
Dean	Poirier
Downe	Quinn
Forest	Ravalia
Galvez	Richards
Gerba	Robinson
Gignac	Saint-Germain
Gold	Seidman
Greenwood	Simons
Housakos	Smith
Jaffer	Sorensen
Kingston	Varone
Kutcher	Wells
LaBoucane-Benson	Yussuff—59
Lankin	

• (1640)

[*Translation*]

RULES, PROCEDURES AND THE RIGHTS OF PARLIAMENT

MOTION TO AMEND THE *RULES OF THE SENATE* ADOPTED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Gold, P.C., seconded by the Honourable Senator LaBoucane-Benson:

That the *Rules of the Senate* be amended:

1. by replacing the words “Leader of the Government” by the words “Leader or Representative of the Government” in rules 2-4(2), 3-6(2), 4-3(1), 4-8(1)(a), 5-7(m), 6-5(1)(b), 12-5(a), 12-23(2) and (3), and 14-1(2);
2. in rules 3-3(1) and (2), 4-2(8)(b), and 7-4(2), by replacing the words “6 p.m.” by the words “7 p.m.” in the marginal notes, as appropriate, and the text of the rules;
3. in rule 4-2(2), by replacing the number 15 by the number 18 in the marginal note and the text of the rule;
4. in rule 4-2(8)(a), by replacing the words “At the request of a whip or the designated representative of a recognized parliamentary group” by the words “At the request of a whip, liaison, or the designated representative of a recognized party or recognized parliamentary group”;
5. by:
 - (a) replacing rules 4-9 and 4-10 by the following:

“Delayed Answers and Written Questions

Delayed answers to oral questions

4-9. (1) When responding to an oral question during Question Period, a Senator may indicate that a delayed answer will be provided in writing pursuant to the terms of this rule.

Written questions

4-9. (2) Subject to subsection (5), a Senator may submit a written question to the Government relating to public affairs by sending it in writing to the Clerk if either:

- (a) a written answer is requested; or
- (b) the question seeks statistical information or other information not readily available.

NAYS

THE HONOURABLE SENATORS

Audette	McCallum
Cordy	Pate
Cuzner	Prosper
Francis	Ringuette
Harder	Ross
Klyne	White
Massicotte	Woo—14

ABSTENTIONS

THE HONOURABLE SENATORS

Brazeau	Osler
Burey	Patterson
Dalphond	Tannas
Greene	Verner—9
Moodie	

• (1630)

The Hon. the Speaker: The bells will ring to call in the senators for the deferred vote on Government Motion No. 165, and the vote will be at 4:45 p.m. Call in the senators.

Publication of written questions

4-9. (3) Upon receipt of a written question, the Clerk shall have it published in the *Order Paper and Notice Paper* on the day following receipt and subsequently on the first sitting day of each week until the earlier of the following:

- (a) an answer is tabled;
- (b) a written explanation why an answer has not been provided is tabled;
- (c) the question is withdrawn; or
- (d) the expiration of the 60-day period provided for in this rule for an answer or explanation.

Withdrawal of a written question

4-9. (4) The Senator who submitted a written question may subsequently withdraw it by writing to the Clerk, who shall have a note to that effect included in the *Order Paper and Notice Paper* the next time the question would have been published there.

Limit on number of written questions

4-9. (5) A Senator shall not submit a written question if they already have four such questions that are to be published in the *Order Paper and Notice Paper* under the provisions of subsection (3).

Answer within 60 days

4-9. (6) Within 60 calendar days of the Leader or Representative of the Government, or a Senator who is a minister, indicating that a delayed answer will be provided to an oral question pursuant to the terms of this rule, or of a written question first appearing in the *Order Paper and Notice Paper*, the Leader or Representative of the Government, or the Deputy Leader or Legislative Deputy of the Government, shall table either the Government's answer to the question or a written explanation why an answer has not been provided.

Tabling

4-9. (7) An answer or explanation to be provided under this rule may be tabled either during Delayed Answers, which shall be called at the end of Question Period, or by being deposited with the Clerk. A copy of any such tabled document shall be provided to the Senator who asked the question, and the delayed answer to an oral question shall be printed in the *Debates of the Senate* of the date the tabling is recorded in the *Journals of the Senate*.

Failure to respond or provide explanation

4-9. (8) If the Government has tabled neither an answer nor an explanation of why an answer has not been provided within the 60-day period provided for under this rule, the absence of an answer shall be deemed referred to the Standing Committee on Rules, Procedures and the Rights of Parliament for

consideration and report, with this referral being recorded in the *Journals of the Senate* as soon as possible thereafter.”; and

- (b) renumbering current rules 4-11 to 4-16 as rules 4-10 to 4-15;
- 6. in current rule 4-13(3), by replacing the words “such sequence as the Leader or the Deputy Leader of the Government shall determine” by the words “such sequence as the Leader or Representative of the Government, or the Deputy Leader or Legislative Deputy of the Government shall determine”;
- 7. by replacing rule 6-3(1) by the following:

“Time limits for speakers

6-3. (1) Except as otherwise provided:

Certain Leaders and Facilitators

(a) the Leader or Representative of the Government, the Leader of the Opposition, and the leader or facilitator of the recognized party or recognized parliamentary group with the most members, other than, if applicable, the recognized parties or recognized parliamentary groups to which either the Leader or Representative of the Government, or the Leader of the Opposition belongs, shall be allowed unlimited time for debate;

Other Leaders and Facilitators

(b) leaders and facilitators, other than those provided for in paragraph (a), shall be allowed up to 45 minutes for debate;

Sponsor of bill

(c) the sponsor of a bill, if not one of the Senators provided for in paragraph (a), shall be allowed up to 45 minutes for debate at second and third reading;

Critic of bill

(d) the critic of a bill, if not one of the Senators provided for in paragraph (a), shall be allowed up to 45 minutes for debate at second and third reading;

Designated Senators

(e) one other Senator designated separately by the leader or facilitator of each recognized party or recognized parliamentary group, except for the recognized party or recognized parliamentary group of the sponsor and critic, shall be allowed up to 45 minutes for debate at second and third reading; and

Others

(f) other Senators shall speak for no more than 15 minutes in debate.”;

8. by replacing rules 7-1(1) and (2) by the following:

“Agreement to allocate time

7-1. (1) At any time during a sitting, the Leader or Representative of the Government, or the Deputy Leader or Legislative Deputy of the Government may state that they have reached an agreement with the representatives of the recognized parties and the recognized parliamentary groups to allocate a specified number of days or hours either:

- (a) for one or more stages of consideration of a government bill, including the committee stage; or
- (b) for consideration of another item of Government Business by the Senate or a committee.

Motion on agreement to allocate time

7-1. (2) The Leader or Representative of the Government, or the Deputy Leader or Legislative Deputy of the Government may then, without notice, propose a motion based on the agreement.”;

9. by replacing rules 7-2(1) and (2) by the following:

“No agreement to allocate time

7-2. (1) At any time during a sitting, the Leader or Representative of the Government, or the Deputy Leader or Legislative Deputy of the Government may state that they have failed to reach an agreement with the representatives of the recognized parties and the recognized parliamentary groups to allocate time to conclude an adjourned debate on either:

- (a) any stage of consideration of a government bill, including the committee stage; or
- (b) another item of Government Business.

Notice of motion to allocate time

7-2. (2) After stating that there is no agreement on time allocation, the Leader or Representative of the Government, or the Deputy Leader or Legislative Deputy of the Government may give notice of a motion to allocate time for the adjourned debate, including the committee stage of a bill. The motion shall specify the number of days or hours to be allocated.”;

10. by replacing rule 7-3(1)(f) by the following:

“(f) Senators may speak for a maximum of 10 minutes each, provided that the Leader or Representative of the Government, the Leader of the Opposition, and the leader or facilitator of any other recognized party or recognized parliamentary group may each speak for up to 20 minutes.”;

11. in rule 7-3(2), by deleting the words “at 6 p.m.” and the words “at 8 p.m.”;

12. in rule 7-4(5)(d), by replacing the words “the Government Whip” by the words “the Government Whip or Liaison”;

13. by replacing rules 9-5(1) to (3) by the following:

“(1) The Speaker shall ask the Government Whip or Liaison, the Opposition Whip, and the whips or liaisons of the three recognized parties or recognized parliamentary groups with the most members, other than, if applicable, the recognized parties or recognized parliamentary groups to which either the Government Whip or Liaison, or the Opposition Whip belongs, if there is an agreement on the length of time the bells shall ring. If a whip or liaison is absent, that whip or liaison’s leader or facilitator may designate a Senator to act for this purpose.

(2) The time agreed to shall not be more than 60 minutes.

(3) With leave of the Senate, this agreement on the length of the bells shall constitute an order to sound the bells for that length of time.”;

14. by replacing rule 9-10(1) by the following:

“Deferral of standing vote

9-10. (1) Except as provided in subsection (5) and elsewhere in these Rules, when a standing vote has been requested on a question that is debatable, the Government Whip or Liaison, the Opposition Whip, or the whip or liaison of any of the three recognized parties or recognized parliamentary groups with the most members, other than, if applicable, the recognized parties or recognized parliamentary groups to which either the Government Whip or Liaison, or the Opposition Whip belongs, may defer the vote.”;

15. by replacing rule 9-10(4) by the following:

“Vote deferred to Friday

9-10. (4) Except as otherwise provided, if a vote has been deferred to a Friday:

(a) the Government Whip or Liaison may, at any time during a sitting, further defer the vote to 5:30 p.m. on the next sitting day if it is on an item of Government Business; and

(b) the Government Whip or Liaison, the Opposition Whip, or the whip or liaison of any of the three recognized parties or recognized parliamentary groups with the most members, other than, if applicable, the recognized parties or recognized parliamentary groups to which either the Government Whip or Liaison, or the Opposition Whip belongs, may, at any time during a sitting, further defer the vote to 5:30 p.m. on the next sitting day if it is on an item of Other Business.”;

16. by replacing rule 10-11(2)(a) by the following:

“(a) by the Leader or Representative of the Government, or the Deputy Leader or Legislative Deputy of the Government, at any time during a sitting; or”;

17. by:

(a) replacing rule 12-3(3) by the following:

“Ex officio members

12-3. (3) In addition to the membership provided for in subsections (1) and (2), and subject to the provisions of subsection (4), the Leader or Representative of the Government, the Leader of the Opposition, and the leaders or facilitators of the three recognized parties or recognized parliamentary groups with the most members, other than, if applicable, the recognized parties or recognized parliamentary groups to which either the Leader or Representative of the Government, or the Leader of the Opposition belongs, are ex officio members of all committees except the Standing Committee on Ethics and Conflict of Interest for Senators, the Standing Committee on Audit and Oversight, and the joint committees. For the purposes of this provision, in case of absence, the Leader or Representative of the Government is replaced by the Deputy Leader or Legislative Deputy of the Government, the Leader of the Opposition is replaced by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and the leader or facilitator of any other recognized party or recognized parliamentary group is replaced by that Senator’s deputy leader or deputy facilitator.

Ex officio members voting

12-3. (4) Of the ex officio members of committees provided for in subsection (3), only the Leader or Representative of the Government, and the Leader of the Opposition, or, in their absence, their respective deputies, shall have the right to vote.”; and

(b) renumbering current rule 12-3(4) as rule 12-3(5);

18. by replacing rule 12-8(2) by the following:

“Service fee proposal

12-8. (2) When the Leader or Representative of the Government, or the Deputy Leader or Legislative Deputy of the Government tables a service fee proposal, it is deemed referred to the standing or special committee designated by them following consultations with the Leader or Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and the leader or facilitator of any other recognized party or recognized parliamentary group, or the designate of such a leader or facilitator.”;

19. by replacing rule 12-18(2) by the following:

“Meetings on days the Senate is adjourned

12-18. (2) Except as provided in subsection (3) and elsewhere in these Rules, a Senate committee may meet:

(a) when the Senate is adjourned for more than a day but less than a week, provided that notice was given to the members of the committee one day before the Senate adjourned;

(b) on a Monday the Senate does not sit that precedes a Tuesday on which the Senate is scheduled to sit; or

(c) during other periods the Senate is adjourned and that are not covered by the above provisions, provided that the meeting was either:

(i) by order of the Senate, or

(ii) with the agreement, in response to a request from the chair and deputy chair, of a majority of the following Senators, or their designates: the Leader or Representative of the Government, the Leader of the Opposition, and the leaders or facilitators of the three recognized parties or recognized parliamentary groups with the most members, other than, if applicable, the recognized parties or recognized parliamentary groups to which either the Leader or Representative of the Government, or the Leader of the Opposition belongs.”;

20. by replacing rule 12-26(1) by the following:

“Appointment of committee

12-26. (1) As soon as practicable at the beginning of each session, the Leader or Representative of the Government shall move a motion, seconded by the Leader of the Opposition, and the leader or facilitator of the recognized party or recognized parliamentary group with the most members, other than, if applicable, the recognized parties or recognized parliamentary groups to which either the Leader or Representative of the Government, or the Leader of the Opposition belongs, on the membership of the Standing Committee on Ethics and Conflict of Interest for Senators. This motion shall be deemed adopted without debate or vote, and a similar motion shall be moved for any substitutions in the membership of the committee.”;

21. in rule 14-1(1), by replacing the words “Leader or Deputy Leader of the Government” by the words “Leader or Representative of the Government, or Deputy Leader or Legislative Deputy of the Government”;

22. in rule 16-1(8), by replacing the words “Leader or Deputy Leader of the Government” by the words “Leader or Representative of the Government, or Deputy Leader or Legislative Deputy of the Government”, both times they appear; and

23. in Appendix I:

(a) in the definition of “Critic of a bill”, by replacing the words “Leader or Deputy Leader of the Government” by the words “Leader or Representative of the Government, or Deputy Leader or Legislative Deputy of the Government”;

(b) by replacing the definition of “Deputy Leader of the Government” by the following:

“Deputy Leader or Legislative Deputy of the Government

The Senator who acts as the second to the Leader or Representative of the Government and who is normally responsible for the management of Government business on the floor of the Senate. The Deputy Leader or Legislative Deputy is also generally responsible for negotiating the daily agenda of business with the Opposition and other recognized parties and recognized parliamentary groups. In the absence of the Deputy Leader or Legislative Deputy, the Government Leader or Government Representative may designate another Senator to perform the role. The full title is “Deputy Leader of the Government in the Senate” or “Legislative Deputy to the Government Representative in the Senate”. (*Leader adjoint ou coordonnateur législatif du gouvernement*);

(c) in the definition of “Evening suspension”, by replacing the words “between 6 and 8 p.m.” by the words “between 7 and 8 p.m.”;

(d) in the definition of “Government Business”, by replacing the words “Leader of the Government or the Deputy Leader” by the words “Leader or Representative of the Government, or the Deputy Leader or Legislative Deputy of the Government”;

(e) by replacing the definition of “Government Leader” by the following:

“Government Leader

See “Leader or Representative of the Government”. (*Leader du gouvernement*);

(f) by replacing the definition of “Government Whip” by the following:

“Government Whip or Liaison

The Senator responsible for ensuring the presence of an adequate number of Senators of the Government party in the Senate for purposes such as quorum and the taking of votes, and to whom the Leader or Representative of the Government normally delegates responsibility for managing the substitution of Government members on committees as appropriate. The Government Whip or Liaison may be responsible for outreach on Government Business in the Senate. (*Whip ou agent de liaison du gouvernement*);

(g) by replacing the definition of “Leader of the Government, or Government Leader” by the following:

“Leader or Representative of the Government

The Senator who acts as the head of the Senators belonging to the Government party, or who is appointed by the Government to represent the Government in the Senate without affiliation to a Government party. In modern practice, the Leader or Representative of the Government is normally sworn in as a member of the King’s Privy Council for Canada and can be a member of Cabinet. The full title is “Leader of the Government in the Senate” or “Government Representative in the Senate”. (*Leader ou représentant du gouvernement*);

(h) by replacing the definition of “Ordinary procedure for determining the duration of bells” by the following:

“Ordinary procedure for determining duration of bells

The Speaker asks the Government Whip or Liaison, the Opposition Whip, and the whips or liaisons of the three largest recognized parties or recognized parliamentary groups, other than, if applicable, the recognized parties or recognized parliamentary groups to which either the Government Whip or Liaison, or the Opposition Whip belongs, if there is an agreement on the length of time, not to exceed 60 minutes, the bells shall ring. With leave of the Senate, this agreement constitutes an order to sound the bells for the agreed length of time, but in the absence of either agreement or leave, the bells ring for 60 minutes. In some cases provided for in the Rules, this procedure is not followed, with the bells ringing for shorter periods of time. (*Procédure ordinaire pour déterminer la durée de la sonnerie*);

(i) in the definition of “Public bill”, under “Bill”, by replacing the words “(introduced by a Cabinet Minister or in a Minister’s name) or a non-Government bill (one introduced by a Senator

who is not a Cabinet Minister)” by the words “(introduced by a Cabinet Minister, in a Minister’s name, or by or on behalf of the Leader or Representative of the Government if that Senator is not a minister) or a non-Government bill (one that is not a Government bill)”;

- (j) by replacing the definition of “Senator who is a minister” by the following:

“Senator who is a minister

A Senator who is a member of the Cabinet. The Leader or Representative of the Government is generally sworn in as a member of the King’s Privy Council for Canada and may be a member of Cabinet. (*Sénateur-ministre*);

- (k) in the definition of “Sponsor of a bill”, by replacing the words “the sponsor will typically be a government member” by the words “the sponsor is designated by the Leader or Representative of the Government”; and

- (l) by adding the following new definitions in alphabetical order:

(i) **“Deputy Leader or Deputy Facilitator**

The Senator who acts as the second to the leader or facilitator of a recognized party or recognized parliamentary group, other than, if applicable, the recognized parties or recognized parliamentary groups to which either the Leader or Representative of the Government, or the Leader of the Opposition belongs. (*Leader adjoint ou facilitateur adjoint*);

(ii) **“Government Liaison**

See “Government Whip or Liaison”. (*Agent de liaison du gouvernement*);

(iii) **“Government Representative**

See “Leader or Representative of the Government”. (*Représentant du gouvernement*);

(iv) **“Leader of the Government**

See “Leader or Representative of the Government”. (*Leader du gouvernement*);

(v) **“Legislative Deputy of the Government**

See “Deputy Leader or Legislative Deputy of the Government”. (*Coordonateur législatif du gouvernement*); and

(vi) **“Representative of the Government**

See “Leader or Representative of the Government”. (*Représentant du gouvernement*);

That all cross references and lists of exceptions in the Rules be updated as required by these changes, but otherwise remain unchanged;

That, in relation to the amendments to current rules 4-9 and 4-10, provided for in point 5 above:

1. new rule 4-9(5) not apply to any written question submitted before the adoption of this motion, so that only written questions submitted after the adoption of this motion are counted as if subject to that provision;
2. the provisions of the new rules have effect from the time of the adoption of this motion in relation to questions arising from that time forward, subject to point 3 below; and
3. the provisions of the new rules relating to the 60-day period for answering written questions, tabling, and a failure to respond or provide an explanation take effect, in relation to written questions submitted before the adoption of this motion, on the date that is six months after the adoption of this motion as if that were the date on which these questions were submitted, provided that if the current session ends before the expiration of this six month period, these elements of the new rules take effect on the last day of the current session; and

That, within 30 days that the Senate sits after the adoption of this motion, the Standing Committee on Ethics and Conflict of Interest for Senators present a report to the Senate proposing changes to the *Ethics and Conflict of Interest Code for Senators* to take account of the amendments to rule 12-26(1) provided for in point 20 above.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, the question is as follows: It was moved by the Honourable Senator Gold, P.C., seconded by the Honourable Senator LaBoucane-Benson:

That the *Rules of the Senate* be amended:

1. by replacing the words “Leader of the Government” by the words “Leader or Representative of the Government” in rules 2-4(2), 3-6(2), 4-3(1), 4-8(1)(a), 5-7(m), 6-5(1)(b), 12-5(a), 12-23(2) and (3), and 14-1(2);
2. in rules 3-3(1) and (2), 4-2(8)(b), and 7-4(2), by replacing the words “6 p.m.” by the words “7 p.m.” in the marginal notes, as appropriate, and the text of the rules;
3. in rule 4-2(2), by replacing the number 15 by the number 18 in the marginal note and the text of the rule;
4. in rule 4-2(8)(a), by replacing the words “At the request of a whip or the designated representative of a recognized parliamentary group” by the words “At the request of a whip, liaison, or the designated representative of a recognized party or recognized parliamentary group”;

5. by:

- (a) replacing rules 4-9 and 4-10 by the following:

“Delayed Answers and Written Questions

Delayed answers to oral questions

4-9. (1) When responding to an oral question during Question Period, a Senator may indicate that a delayed answer will be provided in writing pursuant to the terms of this rule.

Written questions

4-9. (2) Subject to subsection (5), a Senator may submit a written question to the Government relating to public affairs by sending it in writing to the Clerk if either:

- (a) a written answer is requested; or
- (b) the question seeks statistical information or other information not readily available.

Publication of written questions

4-9. (3) Upon receipt of a written question, the Clerk shall have it published in the *Order Paper and Notice Paper* on the day following receipt and subsequently on the first sitting day of each week until the earlier of the following:

- (a) an answer is tabled;
- (b) a written explanation why an answer has not been provided is tabled;
- (c) the question is withdrawn; or
- (d) the expiration of the 60-day period provided for in this rule for an answer or explanation.

Withdrawal of a written question

4-9. (4) The Senator who submitted a written question may subsequently withdraw it by writing to the Clerk, who shall have a note to that effect included in the *Order Paper and Notice Paper* the next time the question would have been published there.

Limit on number of written questions

4-9. (5) A Senator shall not submit a written question if they already have four such questions that are to be published in the *Order Paper and Notice Paper* under the provisions of subsection (3).

Answer within 60 days

4-9. (6) Within 60 calendar days of the Leader or Representative of the Government, or a Senator who is a minister, indicating that a delayed answer will be provided to an oral question pursuant to the terms of this rule, or of a written question first appearing in the *Order Paper and Notice Paper*, the Leader or Representative of the Government, or the Deputy Leader or Legislative Deputy of the Government,

shall table either the Government’s answer to the question or a written explanation why an answer has not been provided.

Tabling

4-9. (7) An answer or explanation to be provided under this rule may be tabled either during Delayed Answers, which shall be called at the end of Question Period, or by being deposited with the Clerk. A copy of any such tabled document shall be provided to the Senator who asked the question, and the delayed answer to an oral question shall be printed in the *Debates of the Senate* of the date the tabling is recorded in the *Journals of the Senate*.

Failure to respond or provide explanation

4-9. (8) If the Government has tabled neither an answer nor an explanation of why an answer has not been provided within the 60-day period provided for under this rule, the absence of an answer shall be deemed referred to the Standing Committee on Rules, Procedures and the Rights of Parliament for consideration and report, with this referral being recorded in the *Journals of the Senate* as soon as possible thereafter.”; and

- (b) renumbering current rules 4-11 to 4-16 as rules 4-10 to 4-15;

6. in current rule 4-13(3), by replacing the words “such sequence as the Leader or the Deputy Leader of the Government shall determine” by the words “such sequence as the Leader or Representative of the Government, or the Deputy Leader or Legislative Deputy of the Government shall determine”;

7. by replacing rule 6-3(1) by the following:

“Time limits for speakers

6-3. (1) Except as otherwise provided:

Certain Leaders and Facilitators

(a) the Leader or Representative of the Government, the Leader of the Opposition, and the leader or facilitator of the recognized party or recognized parliamentary group with the most members, other than, if applicable, the recognized parties or recognized parliamentary groups to which either the Leader or Representative of the Government, or the Leader of the Opposition belongs, shall be allowed unlimited time for debate;

Other Leaders and Facilitators

(b) leaders and facilitators, other than those provided for in paragraph (a), shall be allowed up to 45 minutes for debate;

Sponsor of bill

(c) the sponsor of a bill, if not one of the Senators provided for in paragraph (a), shall be allowed up to 45 minutes for debate at second and third reading;

Critic of bill

(d) the critic of a bill, if not one of the Senators provided for in paragraph (a), shall be allowed up to 45 minutes for debate at second and third reading;

Designated Senators

(e) one other Senator designated separately by the leader or facilitator of each recognized party or recognized parliamentary group, except for the recognized party or recognized parliamentary group of the sponsor and critic, shall be allowed up to 45 minutes for debate at second and third reading; and

Others

(f) other Senators shall speak for no more than 15 minutes in debate.”;

8. by replacing rules 7-1(1) and (2) by the following:

“Agreement to allocate time

7-1. (1) At any time during a sitting, the Leader or Representative of the Government, or the Deputy Leader or Legislative Deputy of the Government may state that they have reached an agreement with the representatives of the recognized parties and the recognized parliamentary groups to allocate a specified number of days or hours either:

- (a) for one or more stages of consideration of a government bill, including the committee stage; or
- (b) for consideration of another item of Government Business by the Senate or a committee.

Motion on agreement to allocate time

7-1. (2) The Leader or Representative of the Government, or the Deputy Leader or Legislative Deputy of the Government may then, without notice, propose a motion based on the agreement.”;

9. by replacing rules 7-2(1) and (2) by the following:

“No agreement to allocate time

7-2. (1) At any time during a sitting, the Leader or Representative of the Government, or the Deputy Leader or Legislative Deputy of the Government may state that they have failed to reach an agreement with the representatives of the recognized parties and the recognized parliamentary groups to allocate time to conclude an adjourned debate on either:

- (a) any stage of consideration of a government bill, including the committee stage; or
- (b) another item of Government Business.

Notice of motion to allocate time

7-2. (2) After stating that there is no agreement on time allocation, the Leader or Representative of the Government, or the Deputy Leader or Legislative Deputy of the Government may give notice of a motion

to allocate time for the adjourned debate, including the committee stage of a bill. The motion shall specify the number of days or hours to be allocated.”;

10. by replacing rule 7-3(1)(f) by the following:

“(f) Senators may speak for a maximum of 10 minutes each, provided that the Leader or Representative of the Government, the Leader of the Opposition, and the leader or facilitator of any other recognized party or recognized parliamentary group may each speak for up to 20 minutes.”;

11. in rule 7-3(2), by deleting the words “at 6 p.m.” and the words “at 8 p.m.”;

12. in rule 7-4(5)(d), by replacing the words “the Government Whip” by the words “the Government Whip or Liaison”;

13. by replacing rules 9-5(1) to (3) by the following:

“(1) The Speaker shall ask the Government Whip or Liaison, the Opposition Whip, and the whips or liaisons of the three recognized parties or recognized parliamentary groups with the most members, other than, if applicable, the recognized parties or recognized parliamentary groups to which either the Government Whip or Liaison, or the Opposition Whip belongs, if there is an agreement on the length of time the bells shall ring. If a whip or liaison is absent, that whip or liaison’s leader or facilitator may designate a Senator to act for this purpose.

(2) The time agreed to shall not be more than 60 minutes.

(3) With leave of the Senate, this agreement on the length of the bells shall constitute an order to sound the bells for that length of time.”;

14. by replacing rule 9-10(1) by the following:

“Deferral of standing vote

9-10. (1) Except as provided in subsection (5) and elsewhere in these Rules, when a standing vote has been requested on a question that is debatable, the Government Whip or Liaison, the Opposition Whip, or the whip or liaison of any of the three recognized parties or recognized parliamentary groups with the most members, other than, if applicable, the recognized parties or recognized parliamentary groups to which either the Government Whip or Liaison, or the Opposition Whip belongs, may defer the vote.”;

15. by replacing rule 9-10(4) by the following:

“Vote deferred to Friday

9-10. (4) Except as otherwise provided, if a vote has been deferred to a Friday:

(a) the Government Whip or Liaison may, at any time during a sitting, further defer the vote to 5:30 p.m. on the next sitting day if it is on an item of Government Business; and

(b) the Government Whip or Liaison, the Opposition Whip, or the whip or liaison of any of the three recognized parties or recognized parliamentary groups with the most members, other than, if applicable, the recognized parties or recognized parliamentary groups to which either the Government Whip or Liaison, or the Opposition Whip belongs, may, at any time during a sitting, further defer the vote to 5:30 p.m. on the next sitting day if it is on an item of Other Business.”;

16. by replacing rule 10-11(2)(a) by the following:

“(a) by the Leader or Representative of the Government, or the Deputy Leader or Legislative Deputy of the Government, at any time during a sitting; or”;

17. by:

- (a) replacing rule 12-3(3) by the following:

“Ex officio members

12-3. (3) In addition to the membership provided for in subsections (1) and (2), and subject to the provisions of subsection (4), the Leader or Representative of the Government, the Leader of the Opposition, and the leaders or facilitators of the three recognized parties or recognized parliamentary groups with the most members, other than, if applicable, the recognized parties or recognized parliamentary groups to which either the Leader or Representative of the Government, or the Leader of the Opposition belongs, are ex officio members of all committees except the Standing Committee on Ethics and Conflict of Interest for Senators, the Standing Committee on Audit and Oversight, and the joint committees. For the purposes of this provision, in case of absence, the Leader or Representative of the Government is replaced by the Deputy Leader or Legislative Deputy of the Government, the Leader of the Opposition is replaced by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and the leader or facilitator of any other recognized party or recognized parliamentary group is replaced by that Senator’s deputy leader or deputy facilitator.

Ex officio members voting

12-3. (4) Of the ex officio members of committees provided for in subsection (3), only the Leader or Representative of the Government, and the Leader of the Opposition, or, in their absence, their respective deputies, shall have the right to vote.”; and

- (b) renumbering current rule 12-3(4) as rule 12-3(5);

18. by replacing rule 12-8(2) by the following:

“Service fee proposal

12-8. (2) When the Leader or Representative of the Government, or the Deputy Leader or Legislative Deputy of the Government tables a service fee proposal, it is deemed referred to the standing or special committee designated by them following consultations with the Leader or Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and the leader or facilitator of any other recognized party or recognized parliamentary group, or the designate of such a leader or facilitator.”;

19. by replacing rule 12-18(2) by the following:

“Meetings on days the Senate is adjourned

12-18. (2) Except as provided in subsection (3) and elsewhere in these Rules, a Senate committee may meet:

(a) when the Senate is adjourned for more than a day but less than a week, provided that notice was given to the members of the committee one day before the Senate adjourned;

(b) on a Monday the Senate does not sit that precedes a Tuesday on which the Senate is scheduled to sit; or

(c) during other periods the Senate is adjourned and that are not covered by the above provisions, provided that the meeting was either:

(i) by order of the Senate, or

(ii) with the agreement, in response to a request from the chair and deputy chair, of a majority of the following Senators, or their designates: the Leader or Representative of the Government, the Leader of the Opposition, and the leaders or facilitators of the three recognized parties or recognized parliamentary groups with the most members, other than, if applicable, the recognized parties or recognized parliamentary groups to which either the Leader or Representative of the Government, or the Leader of the Opposition belongs.”;

20. by replacing rule 12-26(1) by the following:

“Appointment of committee

12-26. (1) As soon as practicable at the beginning of each session, the Leader or Representative of the Government shall move a motion, seconded by the Leader of the Opposition, and the leader or facilitator of

the recognized party or recognized parliamentary group with the most members, other than, if applicable, the recognized parties or recognized parliamentary groups to which either the Leader or Representative of the Government, or the Leader of the Opposition belongs, on the membership of the Standing Committee on Ethics and Conflict of Interest for Senators. This motion shall be deemed adopted without debate or vote, and a similar motion shall be moved for any substitutions in the membership of the committee.”;

21. in rule 14-1(1), by replacing the words “Leader or Deputy Leader of the Government” by the words “Leader or Representative of the Government, or Deputy Leader or Legislative Deputy of the Government”;
22. in rule 16-1(8), by replacing the words “Leader or Deputy Leader of the Government” by the words “Leader or Representative of the Government, or Deputy Leader or Legislative Deputy of the Government”, both times they appear; and
23. in Appendix I:
 - (a) in the definition of “Critic of a bill”, by replacing the words “Leader or Deputy Leader of the Government” by the words “Leader or Representative of the Government, or Deputy Leader or Legislative Deputy of the Government”;
 - (b) by replacing the definition of “Deputy Leader of the Government” by the following:

“Deputy Leader or Legislative Deputy of the Government
The Senator who acts as the second to the Leader or Representative of the Government and who is normally responsible for the management of Government business on the floor of the Senate. The Deputy Leader or Legislative Deputy is also generally responsible for negotiating the daily agenda of business with the Opposition and other recognized parties and recognized parliamentary groups. In the absence of the Deputy Leader or Legislative Deputy, the Government Leader or Government Representative may designate another Senator to perform the role. The full title is “Deputy Leader of the Government in the Senate” or “Legislative Deputy to the Government Representative in the Senate”. (*Leader adjoint ou coordonnateur législatif du gouvernement*)”;
 - (c) in the definition of “Evening suspension”, by replacing the words “between 6 and 8 p.m.” by the words “between 7 and 8 p.m.”;

(d) in the definition of “Government Business”, by replacing the words “Leader of the Government or the Deputy Leader” by the words “Leader or Representative of the Government, or the Deputy Leader or Legislative Deputy of the Government”;

(e) by replacing the definition of “Government Leader” by the following:

“Government Leader

See “Leader or Representative of the Government”. (*Leader du gouvernement*)”;

(f) by replacing the definition of “Government Whip” by the following:

“Government Whip or Liaison

The Senator responsible for ensuring the presence of an adequate number of Senators of the Government party in the Senate for purposes such as quorum and the taking of votes, and to whom the Leader or Representative of the Government normally delegates responsibility for managing the substitution of Government members on committees as appropriate. The Government Whip or Liaison may be responsible for outreach on Government Business in the Senate. (*Whip ou agent de liaison du gouvernement*)”;

(g) by replacing the definition of “Leader of the Government, or Government Leader” by the following:

“Leader or Representative of the Government

The Senator who acts as the head of the Senators belonging to the Government party, or who is appointed by the Government to represent the Government in the Senate without affiliation to a Government party. In modern practice, the Leader or Representative of the Government is normally sworn in as a member of the King’s Privy Council for Canada and can be a member of Cabinet. The full title is “Leader of the Government in the Senate” or “Government Representative in the Senate”. (*Leader ou représentant du gouvernement*)”;

(h) by replacing the definition of “Ordinary procedure for determining the duration of bells” by the following:

“Ordinary procedure for determining duration of bells

The Speaker asks the Government Whip or Liaison, the Opposition Whip, and the whips or liaisons of the three largest recognized parties or recognized parliamentary groups, other than, if applicable, the recognized parties or recognized parliamentary groups to which either the Government Whip or Liaison, or the Opposition Whip belongs, if there is an agreement on the length of time, not to exceed 60 minutes, the bells shall ring. With leave of the Senate, this agreement constitutes an order to sound the bells for the agreed length of time, but in the absence of either agreement or leave, the bells ring

for 60 minutes. In some cases provided for in the Rules, this procedure is not followed, with the bells ringing for shorter periods of time. (*Procédure ordinaire pour déterminer la durée de la sonnerie*);

- (i) in the definition of “Public bill”, under “Bill”, by replacing the words “(introduced by a Cabinet Minister or in a Minister’s name) or a non-Government bill (one introduced by a Senator who is not a Cabinet Minister)” by the words “(introduced by a Cabinet Minister, in a Minister’s name, or by or on behalf of the Leader or Representative of the Government if that Senator is not a minister) or a non-Government bill (one that is not a Government bill)”;

- (j) by replacing the definition of “Senator who is a minister” by the following:

“Senator who is a minister

A Senator who is a member of the Cabinet. The Leader or Representative of the Government is generally sworn in as a member of the King’s Privy Council for Canada and may be a member of Cabinet. (*Sénateur-ministre*);

- (k) in the definition of “Sponsor of a bill”, by replacing the words “the sponsor will typically be a government member” by the words “the sponsor is designated by the Leader or Representative of the Government”; and

- (l) by adding the following new definitions in alphabetical order:

(i) **“Deputy Leader or Deputy Facilitator**

The Senator who acts as the second to the leader or facilitator of a recognized party or recognized parliamentary group, other than, if applicable, the recognized parties or recognized parliamentary groups to which either the Leader or Representative of the Government, or the Leader of the Opposition belongs. (*Leader adjoint ou facilitateur adjoint*);

(ii) **“Government Liaison**

See “Government Whip or Liaison”. (*Agent de liaison du gouvernement*);

(iii) **“Government Representative**

See “Leader or Representative of the Government”. (*Représentant du gouvernement*);

(iv) **“Leader of the Government**

See “Leader or Representative of the Government”. (*Leader du gouvernement*);

(v) **“Legislative Deputy of the Government**

See “Deputy Leader or Legislative Deputy of the Government”. (*Coordonateur législatif du gouvernement*); and

(vi) **“Representative of the Government**

See “Leader or Representative of the Government”. (*Représentant du gouvernement*);

That all cross references and lists of exceptions in the Rules be updated as required by these changes, but otherwise remain unchanged;

That, in relation to the amendments to current rules 4-9 and 4-10, provided for in point 5 above:

1. new rule 4-9(5) not apply to any written question submitted before the adoption of this motion, so that only written questions submitted after the adoption of this motion are counted as if subject to that provision;
2. the provisions of the new rules have effect from the time of the adoption of this motion in relation to questions arising from that time forward, subject to point 3 below; and
3. the provisions of the new rules relating to the 60-day period for answering written questions, tabling, and a failure to respond or provide an explanation take effect, in relation to written questions submitted before the adoption of this motion, on the date that is six months after the adoption of this motion as if that were the date on which these questions were submitted, provided that if the current session ends before the expiration of this six month period, these elements of the new rules take effect on the last day of the current session; and

That, within 30 days that the Senate sits after the adoption of this motion, the Standing Committee on Ethics and Conflict of Interest for Senators present a report to the Senate proposing changes to the *Ethics and Conflict of Interest Code for Senators* to take account of the amendments to rule 12-26(1) provided for in point 20 above.

• (1710)

[English]

Motion agreed to on the following division:

YEAS
THE HONOURABLE SENATORS

Al Zaibak
Arnot
Aucoin
Audette
Black
Boniface
Burey

Lankin
Loffreda
MacAdam
Massicotte
McBean
McNair
Mégie

Busson
 Cardozo
 Clement
 Cordy
 Cotter
 Coyle
 Cuzner
 Dalphond
 Dasko
 Deacon (*Nova Scotia*)
 Deacon (*Ontario*)
 Dean
 Downe
 Forest
 Francis
 Galvez
 Gerba
 Gignac
 Gold
 Greene
 Greenwood
 Harder
 Jaffer
 Kingston

Miville-Dechêne
 Moncion
 Moodie
 Omidvar
 Osler
 Oudar
 Pate
 Patterson
 Petitclerc
 Petten
 Prosper
 Quinn
 Ravalia
 Ringuette
 Robinson
 Ross
 Saint-Germain
 Simons
 Smith
 Sorensen
 Tannas
 Varone
 Verner
 White

Klyne
 Kutcher
 LaBoucane-Benson

Woo
 Yussuff—67

NAYS

THE HONOURABLE SENATORS

Ataullahjan
 Batters
 Carignan
 Housakos
 MacDonald
 Marshall
 Martin

Oh
 Plett
 Poirier
 Richards
 Seidman
 Wells—13

ABSTENTIONS

THE HONOURABLE SENATORS

Brazeau

McCallum—2

(At 5:22 p.m., pursuant to rule 9-9 and the order adopted by the Senate on September 21, 2022, the Senate adjourned until 2 p.m., tomorrow.)

CONTENTS

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

	PAGE	PAGE
SENATORS' STATEMENTS		
Artwork and Heritage Advisory Working Group		
Hon. Andrew Cardozo	6219	
Battle of the Atlantic		
Hon. Jane MacAdam	6219	
Visitors in the Gallery		
The Hon. the Speaker	6220	
Asian Heritage Month		
Hon. Yonah Martin	6220	
National Vision Health Month		
Hon. Sharon Burey	6220	
Visitors in the Gallery		
The Hon. the Speaker	6221	
Mental Health Week		
Hon. Marie-Françoise Mégie	6221	
<hr/>		
ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS		
Citizenship Act		
Immigration and Refugee Protection Act (Bill S-235)		
Bill to Amend—Twentieth Report of Social Affairs, Science and Technology Committee Presented		
Hon. Ratna Omidvar	6221	
Budget Implementation Bill, 2024, No. 1 (Bill C-69)		
Notice of Motion to Authorize Certain Committees to Study Subject Matter		
Hon. Marc Gold	6222	
Adjournment		
Notice of Motion		
Hon. Patti LaBoucane-Benson	6222	
<hr/>		
QUESTION PERIOD		
Privy Council Office		
Senate Appointments		
Hon. Donald Neil Plett	6223	
Hon. Marc Gold	6223	
Canadian Heritage		
Canadian Broadcasting Corporation		
Hon. Leo Housakos	6223	
Hon. Marc Gold	6223	
Public Services and Procurement		
Canada Post		
Hon. Tony Loffreda	6224	
Hon. Marc Gold	6224	
<hr/>		
Finance		
Recovery of COVID-19 Support Payments		
Hon. Kim Pate	6224	
Hon. Marc Gold	6224	
Agriculture and Agri-Food		
Challenges Faced by Farmers		
Hon. Robert Black	6225	
Hon. Marc Gold	6225	
Environment and Climate Change		
Federal Contaminated Sites		
Hon. Judy A. White	6225	
Hon. Marc Gold	6225	
Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation		
Affordable Housing		
Hon. Yonah Martin	6225	
Hon. Marc Gold	6226	
Health		
Medical Assistance in Dying		
Hon. Donald Neil Plett	6226	
Hon. Marc Gold	6226	
Innovation, Science and Economic Development		
Net Zero Accelerator Initiative		
Hon. Mary Coyle	6226	
Hon. Marc Gold	6227	
Veterans Affairs		
Processing of Disability Benefits Applications		
Hon. Rebecca Patterson	6227	
Hon. Marc Gold	6227	
Canadian Heritage		
Canadian Broadcasting Corporation		
Hon. Leo Housakos	6227	
Hon. Marc Gold	6228	
Public Safety		
Foreign Interference		
Hon. Donald Neil Plett	6228	
Hon. Marc Gold	6228	
<hr/>		
ORDERS OF THE DAY		
The Late Right Honourable Brian Mulroney, P.C., C.C., G.O.Q.		
Inquiry—Debate Continued		
Hon. Marty Deacon	6228	
Parliament of Canada Act (Bill S-202)		
Bill to Amend—Message from Commons—Motion for Concurrence in Commons Amendments—Debate Adjourned		
Hon. Andrew Cardozo	6230	
Hon. Leo Housakos	6231	

CONTENTS

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

	PAGE		PAGE
Criminal Records Act (Bill S-212)		Rules, Procedures and the Rights of Parliament	
Bill to Amend—Sixteenth Report of Legal and Constitutional Affairs Committee—Debate Continued		Motion to Amend the <i>Rules of the Senate</i> Adopted	6233
Hon. Brian Francis	6231		
Hon. Michael L. MacDonald	6232		