



DEBATES OF THE SENATE

1st SESSION



44th PARLIAMENT



VOLUME 153



NUMBER 24

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Thursday, March 3, 2022

The Honourable GEORGE J. FUREY,
Speaker

CONTENTS

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

Publications Centre: Kim Laughren, National Press Building, Room 926, Tel. 343-550-5002

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

THE SENATE

Thursday, March 3, 2022

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

Prayers.

SENATORS' STATEMENTS

EXPRESSION OF THANKS

Hon. Diane F. Griffin: Honourable senators, I would like to take this three-minute senator's statement to thank many people. That's all I want to do. I would like to thank the kind people for the kind remarks I received yesterday. That was very nice of you. You were very creative.

I've made a lot of friends in this chamber, and we're going to stay in touch. There is a number of us who will go golfing: Senator Oh, when he comes to Prince Edward Island, and for five years now Jane Cordy and I have been trying to golf together. This year we're definitely going to do it.

I would like to, first of all, thank my staff. As we all know, they do yeoman's service for us, and we couldn't do what we do here without their help: Lyle Skinner, Terri McGarry, Joanne Shields and formerly Sylvie Bédard who used to work for me. The first three still do. They've been great people with whom to work.

It has been a real honour to serve in this house. When summoned, I was thrilled beyond words, to tell the truth. At that time, there were fewer than 1,000 people who had ever been appointed to the Senate. It's a little over 1,000 now with some new senators.

Over that time, I've had three seatmates. Senator Dean and I were sworn in at the same time and were seatmates. Then the late Senator Elaine McCoy, and more recently Senator Scott Tannas and I were seatmates. I keep shrinking in stature with each in comparison.

I mentioned that I have friends throughout this chamber. There are a lot of people in this chamber who have been mentors to me, and others when we came in. That is greatly appreciated.

I especially want to thank my husband, Kevin, and my daughter Sharleen. Without their support, it would be very difficult to be where I am. They've helped me immeasurably, as you can imagine.

So what's next for Senator Griffin, soon to be a has-been? There will be a lot of golfing. It's going to be a great summer. My membership is already paid up at Fox Meadow Golf Course. Senator Kutcher and I have cards to play all of the eastern courses this year: he and his wife, my brother and I. Senator Seidman is talking about coming to Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland sometime, so I'll get her into birdwatching in a big way. She'll have to bring her own binoculars, and if she doesn't have them I have a guest pair. She'll be all set.

So birdwatching, Texas hold 'em poker, land conservation and a little bit of skiing are next for me. It has been an honour to be here. Thank you everybody.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

WORLD ENGINEERING DAY FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Hon. Rosa Galvez: Thank you, Your Honour. I want to send Senator Griffin a big hug and say that I will miss seeing her in this chamber.

[*Translation*]

Dear colleagues, tomorrow, Friday, March 4, we celebrate World Engineering Day for Sustainable Development. Proclaimed in 2019 by UNESCO, the purpose of this day is to raise awareness of the role of engineering in modern life, which is essential to mitigate the impact of climate change and advance sustainable development.

This year, we highlight the role of engineering in building back wiser. The entire planet is facing two crises of historic proportions at the same time: the COVID-19 public health crisis and the climate crisis caused by fossil fuels. Engineers have had an extremely important role to play in overcoming these crises and achieving a better balance between nature and humans, and their role will become even more important over time. From developing new, more efficient technology to deploying infrastructure that can withstand the new climate reality, engineers have opportunities to restore well-being and improve everyone's quality of life.

[*English*]

As you know, colleagues, I am an engineer and I have spent my entire career teaching the next generation of engineers. These are the people already helping us build cleaner and more resilient societies. They understand the challenges we face.

Extreme weather and rapid alterations to Canada's climate are risks to both public safety and the reliability of Canada's infrastructure. The disruption and cost to Canada's economy when infrastructure is damaged or destroyed by extreme weather events is growing and becoming more frequent across Canada, with engineers having a significant role to play in addressing climate change issues. The engineering community is coming together to protect present and future generations. Please join me, on World Engineering Day for Sustainable Development, in recognizing their exceptional work here in Canada and across the world.

Thank you, *meegwetch*.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

UKRAINE—RUSSIA'S ACTIONS

Hon. Patricia Bovey: Honourable senators, the consequences of Russia's invasion of Ukraine at home and throughout the Ukrainian diaspora are horrific. The strength, will and tenacity of the people of Ukraine in defending their country, culture and history is inspiring.

Headlines document the cultural devastation. *The Art Newspaper's* special introduction on Wednesday, March 2, 2022, stated:

We are shaken and deeply concerned by the latest events unfolding in Ukraine. . . . We feel that, at times like these, a means of cultural dialogue is especially valuable.

• (1410)

Colleagues, that cultural dialogue is multifold, domestically in museums, publications, concert halls, and theatres and through international cultural diplomacy.

Other headlines report, "Russian missile strike hits Holocaust memorial site in Kyiv." *ARTnews* on February 28 noting ". . . the country's art scene will be impacted," reported the burning of the Ivankiv Museum of Local History. Fifty miles north of Kyiv, it housed works by Ukrainian folk artist Maria Prymachenko, who died in 1997. She was of the stature of Nova Scotia's Maud Lewis.

Artist Pavlo Makov and his curators were forced to cease work on Ukraine's Venice Biennale pavilion. Musicians have laid down their instruments and picked up rifles. The *Los Angeles Times* marked this destruction of Ukraine's cultural heritage "an unfolding . . . catastrophe."

Destroying artworks, archeological sites and historical monuments is likened to attacking fundamental principles of international peace and security.

Russian artists are protesting their government's actions by pulling out of the prestigious Venice Biennale. Russian musicians are posting billboards. Visual artists, writers and publishers are vociferously speaking out.

Global cultural boycotts of Russian exhibitions, concerts and publications are increasing. Ireland, for instance, cancelled all Russian performances, including dance and music by Russian composers and choreographers. Russian art exhibitions are being cancelled worldwide.

Decrying the devastation, Artnet News asked that countries share stories of successful Ukrainian cultural exchanges. Senator LaBoucane-Benson discussed the deep cultural connections between Ukrainian Canadians and First Nations. I herald Winnipeg's cultural exchanges, including those at Oseredok, Winnipeg's Ukrainian museum, and the Winnipeg Art Gallery's Ukrainian exhibitions. When I was director, we borrowed major historical and modern works from Ukraine. Our staff worked there with Ukrainian counterparts. That exhibition's significance is even greater now, as are the publication's articles and reproductions documenting the depth and development of Ukraine's visual art.

Colleagues, my heart and soul are with all Ukrainians. I call for the protection of the arts and cultural institutions which preserve their unique heritage. Thank you.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC GAMES 2022

CANADIAN ATHLETES

Hon. Victor Oh: Honourable senators, I rise today to congratulate our athletes on their outstanding performance in the Olympic Winter Games. I know Canadians are all feeling the weight of current affairs, from the pandemic to the convoy protest and, merely days ago, the world faced the horror of Putin's illegal and unprovoked invasion of a free and democratic neighbouring country.

These are, to say the very least, challenging times. Personally, I felt the Olympics were a moment of reprieve for all of us, a time to forget the ever-present struggles and to lose ourselves in the magic of sport. We cheered, our children dreamed and we watched in awe of the ability of athletes from around the world. It was the proudest of moments to see 26 Canadians take the podium to receive their hard-earned medals. To the entire Olympic team, Canada is proud and congratulates you on your remarkable achievements.

But, senators, I would like to remind you that there is more Olympic spirit on the horizon. On March 4, the 2022 Paralympic Winter Games will begin. This will be yet another opportunity to cheer on our athletes and admire the remarkable ability of Paralympic Games' athletes.

As most will know, this chamber is home to a Paralympian, Senator Chantal Petitclerc, who has 21 medals to her credit. Her story and good deeds continue to be an inspiration to our young athletes.

Colleagues, I would be remiss if I didn't also mention our Special Olympians and their Kazan World Winter Games. Each Special Olympics are very important pillars in our communities. They foster physical fitness through competitive sports, further social and life skills for children and adults with intellectual disabilities; yet another example of how sports can reach us, our life and community.

On the eve of the Paralympic Games, I would like to wish the best of luck to our Canadian Paralympians. Thank you.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

UKRAINE

Hon. Marilou McPhedran: Honourable senators, just a quick clarification for those who have been wondering about the bruises on my face. I did not walk into a door. I spent a lot of time in a dental chair this week.

Colleagues, about two hours ago, I received a call from Senator David Wells, who offered me his statement time for today, because he knows of my work in solidarity with Ukrainian parliamentarians and other human rights defenders.

As a non-affiliated senator, it's close to impossible to get such an opportunity, and I thank Senator Wells for this generous gesture. Today, with gratitude, I'm going to try to share with you some direct messages from Ukrainian women parliamentarians.

As many here know, after the Euromaidan, or Revolution of Dignity, that erupted in 2013 over the government rejection of a European Union trade agreement, and concerns of corruption and weakening ties to Europe, then-president Yanukovich fled Ukraine. Shortly thereafter, Russia seized the Crimean Peninsula. Women were leaders in the Euromaidan Revolution and made some notable gains in the political sphere and security sector, including gender quotas for elections.

Senators active in interparliamentary associations such as IPU and OSCE know that Ukraine has one of the youngest parliaments in the world and is often represented by young parliamentarians, and often they are impressive, articulate women. About two weeks ago at the UN in New York, the Inter-Parliamentary Union held its parliamentary hearing in person at about the same time as the OSCE held its similar event online. Attending both was MP Alona Shkrum — with a master's in law from Cambridge, by the way — who returned to her country knowing that Russia was going to invade.

About an hour ago, I spoke with my colleague Darcia for an update from a call that Manitobans Dr. Kawser Ahmed and lawyers Darcia and Gary Senft had with MP Sophia Fedyna in her home city of Lviv, under siege.

Sophia calls upon Canada to ensure there is a no-fly zone over Ukraine and to increase humanitarian aid, especially medical aid and medical supplies. There are no tourniquets to be had right now in Ukraine. Women MPs like Sophia are carrying AK-47s, while other Ukrainians — unarmed — are kneeling in front of tanks, blocking them from their villages.

Honourable colleagues, we are in dark days that are getting darker. This war against Ukraine as well as ongoing crises in Afghanistan, Myanmar, China and Yemen are grinding out victim after victim and grinding down democracies the world over. Please, let's remember the brave, principled actions we take today are essential to build a future for all. Thank you, *meegwetch*.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Raymonde Gagné (Legislative Deputy to the Government Representative in the Senate): My statement this afternoon will address two topics. First, I want to highlight the courageous determination that we are witnessing every day from Ukraine's leaders and citizens. They have given new meaning to the word "heroism." Their resistance reminds the world that democracy cannot be taken for granted. As a Manitoba senator, I

represent a province that has been home to a large Ukrainian diaspora since the beginning of the 21st century. On their behalf and along with all Canadians, we stand united in solidarity.

MICHELLE SMITH

Hon. Raymonde Gagné (Legislative Deputy to the Government Representative in the Senate): I also rise today to congratulate Michelle Smith, this year's winner of the Ramon John Hnatyshyn Award for Voluntarism in the Performing Arts.

Ms. Smith is a dedicated, generous, creative and tireless volunteer. Through her active involvement with and support for many francophone communities and arts organizations, she has made an indelible contribution to the cultural and linguistic vitality of her community.

I would like to read from her biography, which was included in the notice announcing her nomination:

A native of Sainte-Anne-des-Chênes, Michelle Smith has volunteered notably with Théâtre Cercle Molière (TCM), Canada's oldest theatre company, which attracts more than 10,000 patrons every year. As a member of its fundraising committee, she helped raise over \$2 million to build a new theatre centre Subsequently, as chair of the board, she spearheaded the establishment of an endowment fund that currently exceeds \$1 million and provides TCM with a stable annual income.

• (1420)

Among other achievements, she helped establish the Maison Gabrielle-Roy (restoration of the beloved author's childhood home), and has done volunteer fundraising for Francfonds (Manitoba's Francophone community foundation) and Le 100 Nons (an organization dedicated to training and promoting francophone music artists). . . .

She also supports the Dead of Winter choir (formerly Camerata Nova), the Manitoba Chamber Orchestra, the Prairie Theatre Exchange, the Royal Winnipeg Ballet and the Manitoba Opera, among others. She is also a member of Les blés au vent community choir.

She is the co-author of *Les Manitobaines engagées*, an anthology of autobiographies by Francophone women, published in 2021 to commemorate the centennial of women's suffrage in Manitoba.

I am proud to acknowledge the award won by Michelle Smith, and I congratulate her once again.

[English]

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

BILL RESPECTING CERTAIN MEASURES RELATED TO COVID-19

FOURTH REPORT OF SOCIAL AFFAIRS, SCIENCE AND
TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE PRESENTED

Hon. Ratna Omidvar, Chair of the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology, presented the following report:

Thursday, March 3, 2022

The Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology has the honour to present its

FOURTH REPORT

Your committee, to which was referred Bill C-10, An Act respecting certain measures related to COVID-19, has, in obedience to the order of reference of Tuesday, March 1, 2022, examined the said bill and now reports the same without amendment but with certain observations, which are appended to this report.

Respectfully submitted,

RATNA OMIDVAR

Chair

(For text of observations, see today's Journals of the Senate, p. 325.)

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

(On motion of Senator Gold, bill placed on the Orders of the Day for third reading at the next sitting of the Senate.)

ABORIGINAL PEOPLES

MOTION TO AFFECT COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP ADOPTED

Hon. Marc Gold (Government Representative in the Senate): Honourable senators, with leave of the Senate and notwithstanding rule 5-5(j), I move:

That, notwithstanding any provision of the Rules or previous order, the Honourable Senator Tannas replace the Honourable Senator LaBoucane-Benson as a member of the Standing Senate Committee on Aboriginal Peoples.

The Hon. the Speaker: Is leave granted, honourable senators?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

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

Hon. Senators: Question.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to.)

ETHICS AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST FOR SENATORS

MOTION TO AFFECT COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP ADOPTED

Hon. Marc Gold (Government Representative in the Senate): Honourable senators, with leave of the Senate and notwithstanding rule 5-5(j), I move:

That, notwithstanding any provision of the Rules or previous order, the Honourable Senator Carignan P.C., replace the Honourable Senator Patterson as a member of the Standing Committee on Ethics and Conflict of Interest for Senators.

The Hon. the Speaker: Is leave granted, honourable senators?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

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

Hon. Senators: Question.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to.)

BUSINESS OF THE SENATE

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, pursuant to the order adopted by the Senate on December 7, 2021, Question Period will begin at 3 p.m.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

EMERGENCIES ACT

APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE— MESSAGE FROM COMMONS

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I have the honour to inform the Senate that a message has been received from the House of Commons which reads as follows:

Wednesday, March 2, 2022

EXTRACT, —

That,

- (a) pursuant to subsection 62(1) of the Emergencies Act, a special joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons be appointed to review the exercise of powers and the performance of duties and functions pursuant to the declaration of emergency that was in effect from Monday, February 14, 2022, to Wednesday, February 23, 2022, including the provisions as specified in subsections 62(5) and (6) of the act;
- (b) the committee be composed of four members of the Senate and seven members of the House of Commons, including three members of the House of Commons from the governing party, two members of the House of Commons from the official opposition, one member from the Bloc Québécois and one member from the New Democratic Party, with three Chairs of which the two House Co-Chairs shall be from the Bloc Québécois and the New Democratic Party and the Senate Co-Chair shall be determined by the Senate;
- (c) in addition to the Co-Chairs, the committee shall elect two vice-chairs from the House, of whom the first vice-chair shall be from the governing party and the second vice-chair shall be from the official opposition party;
- (d) the House of Commons members be named by their respective whip by depositing with the Clerk of the House the list of their members to serve on the committee no later than the day following the adoption of this order;
- (e) the quorum of the committee be seven members whenever a vote, resolution or other decision is taken, so long as both Houses and one member of the governing party in the House, one from the opposition in the House and one member of the Senate are represented, and that the Joint Chairs be authorized to hold meetings, to receive evidence and authorize the printing thereof, whenever five members are present, so long as both Houses and one member of the governing party in the House, one member from the opposition in the House and one member of the Senate are represented;
- (f) changes to the membership of the committee, on the part of the House of Commons, be effective immediately after notification by the relevant whip has been filed with the Clerk of the House;
- (g) membership substitutions, on the part of the House of Commons, be permitted, if required, in the manner provided for in Standing Order 114(2) and may be filed with the clerk of the committee by email, provided that substitutes take the oath of secrecy pursuant to paragraph (h) of this order before participating in proceedings;
- (h) pursuant to subsection 62(3) of the act, every member and person employed in the work of the committee, which includes personnel who, in supporting the committee's work or a committee member's work, have access to the committee's proceedings or documents, shall take the oath of secrecy set out in the schedule of the act;
- (i) every meeting of the committee held to consider an order or regulation referred to it pursuant to subsection 61(2) of the act shall be held in camera pursuant to subsection 62(4) of the act, and that the evidence and documents received by the committee related to these meetings shall not be made public;
- (j) Co-Chairs shall have the ability to fully participate, including to move motions and to vote on all items before the committee, and any vote resulting in a tie vote shall mean that the item is negated;
- (k) all documents deposited pursuant to the act shall be referred to the committee, and documents referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights since February 16, 2022, in accordance with this act be instead referred to this special joint committee;
- (l) until the committee ceases to exist or Thursday, June 23, 2022, whichever is earlier,
 - (i) where applicable, the provisions contained in paragraph (r) of the order adopted on Thursday, November 25, 2021, except for those listed in subparagraphs (r)(iii), (iv) and (vi), shall apply to the committee, and the committee shall hold meetings in person only should this be necessary to consider any matter referred to it pursuant to subsection 61(2) of the act,
 - (ii) members, senators, and departmental and parliamentary officials appearing as witnesses before the committee may do so in person, as may any witness appearing with respect to any matter referred to it pursuant to subsection 61(2) of the act,

- (iii) when more than one motion is proposed for the election of the House vice-chairs, any motion received after the initial one shall be taken as a notice of motion and such motions shall be put to the committee seriatim until one is adopted;

(m) the committee have the power to:

- (i) sit during sittings and adjournments of the House,
- (ii) report from time to time, including pursuant to the provisions included in subsection 62(6) of the act, to send for persons, papers and records, and to print such papers and evidence as may be ordered by the committee,
- (iii) retain the services of expert, professional, technical and clerical staff, including legal counsel,
- (iv) appoint, from among its members such subcommittees as may be deemed appropriate and to delegate to such subcommittees, all or any of its powers, except the power to report to the Senate and House of Commons,
- (v) authorize video and audio broadcasting of any or all of its public proceedings and that they be made available to the public via the Parliament of Canada's websites; and

That a message be sent to the Senate requesting that House to unite with this House for the above purpose and to select, if the Senate deems advisable, members to act on the proposed special joint committee.

ATTEST

Charles Robert

The Clerk of the House of Commons

• (1430)

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

Hon. Marc Gold (Government Representative in the Senate): Honourable senators, with leave of the Senate, I move that the message be considered later this day.

The Hon. the Speaker: Is leave granted, honourable senators?

[The Hon. the Speaker]

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

(On motion of Senator Gold, message placed on the Orders of the Day for consideration later this day.)

OLD AGE SECURITY ACT

BILL TO AMEND—THIRD READING—MOTION IN
AMENDMENT NEGATIVED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Cordy, seconded by the Honourable Senator Dalphond, for the third reading of Bill C-12, An Act to amend the Old Age Security Act (Guaranteed Income Supplement).

And on the motion in amendment of the Honourable Senator Patterson, seconded by the Honourable Senator Quinn:

That Bill C-12 be not now read a third time, but that it be amended in clause 1, on page 1, by replacing lines 4 and 5 with the following:

“1 (1) Subparagraph (c)(i.1) of the definition *income* in section 2 of the *Old Age Security Act* is replaced by the following:

(i.1) the amount of the payment under the program referred to in section 275 of the *Budget Implementation Act, 2021, No. 1,*

(2) The definition *income* in section 2 of the Act is amended by adding the fol-”.

The Hon. the Speaker: Senator Cordy, when we left this item yesterday, you were answering questions. Do you wish to continue to answer questions?

Hon. Jane Cordy: No, I don't, thank you Speaker. I think I answered most of the questions that could have possibly been asked on the eight-line bill.

Hon. Stan Kutcher: Honourable senators, I rise today to speak to the amendment. I strongly disagree with the need for this amendment and cannot support it. We are all tired of this pandemic and all frustrated by how this government seems to move slowly and, at times, so ineptly to deal with the pressing issues of the day. We are also rightly concerned with the need to ensure that our parliamentary role in giving thoughtful consideration to government-sponsored legislation not be sidelined.

We are also aware that during this pandemic crisis, actions were taken that in hindsight could have been better planned, better executed and much better communicated.

On Bill C-12, let's be clear. We have been told that if it does not receive Royal Assent before March 4 — that is tomorrow — those seniors who are living in the most precarious situations will not receive funds that can mean the difference between heating their home and putting food on their table. This is because that is the drop-dead date that has to be met to allow the wheels of bureaucracy to grind forward. To miss this date is to throw a spanner intentionally into the works.

Mr. Groen, Senior Assistant Deputy Minister, in testimony at the Social Affairs Committee, stated:

... there's no error in Bill C-12. There's no issue whatsoever with Bill C-12. March 4 is important. Because of the pause that happens every year with the shift over from one tax year to the next, currently we are not processing anyone's GIS applications, and we cannot do that until the feed is turned back on, and we are unable to turn that feed back on until we know where the legislation is going. Literally, tens of thousands of seniors every week would be negatively impacted if this legislation is not passed by March 4.

During our Social Affairs Committee study of Bill C-12, we heard about the terrible hardships this would cause. Every single witness from every single organization that spoke to us — CanAge, Income Security Advocacy Centre, Campaign 2000, Réseau FADOQ and CARP — told us clearly that if we did not pass Bill C-12 in time for it to receive Royal Assent by March 4, about 80,000 seniors — and I'm going to change the word "seniors" to "elders" because our Indigenous colleagues use the word "elders," and it better captures the esteem we should be holding these people in. So I'm not going to use "seniors" anymore. I'm going to use the word "elders." These elders from across all of Canada would be sorely and negatively affected.

Honestly, there is not enough time for us to amend this bill and have it receive Royal Assent by March 4 — tomorrow.

Let's put the plight of these elders into stark reality. Let's look at the numbers. An elder who is eligible for GIS payments must make less than \$19,500 per year. Colleagues, that is what most of us in this chamber make in six weeks. GIS payments are at most around \$950 a month. If you make between \$19,440 and \$19,463.99 annually, your monthly GIS payment is 68 cents — not enough for a coffee at Tim's. If you make less than \$24 — that's \$24 — you get the full payment: \$959 a month.

As we know, prices for life's necessities have been rapidly rising, and yesterday the Bank of Canada raised the interest rate. What was already a financially precarious position for so many will become increasingly so. In case we are not aware, the average price for a one-bedroom apartment in Vancouver is about \$2,000 per month — that's \$24,000 per year. Toronto is not far behind that. Indeed, in my home city of Halifax it is about \$1,500 a month. That's \$18,000 per year. We can all do the math.

Who are these most vulnerable elders who have used their hands to build the Canada that we are privileged to live in today?

• (1440)

Most are women. Many are people of colour. Many are living with disabilities. Many would have been on the front lines providing their services to us in this chamber during this pandemic. Do we honestly want to deny them the amount of money that can mean the difference between meeting rent payments or homelessness? The amount of money that can mean the difference between buying fruits and vegetables or going without? The amount of money that may be the difference between taking a bus to do your shopping or schlepping for many kilometres to do so?

The drafting error this proposed amendment is trying to address is known and has been well acknowledged by the minister and senior bureaucrats. We have been assured that it will be addressed, and we need to follow up to make sure this occurs. There are remedies that can be put into place that do not put the passage of Bill C-12 in jeopardy. Bill C-12 is not the place to fix this problem for which an administrative workaround currently exists. If we support this amendment, we could inadvertently enact unjust harms on our most vulnerable elders. I do not believe that any of us want that. We must lead with compassion.

I will be voting against this amendment of Bill C-12 and in support of the bill in its original state that passed the other place unanimously.

I hope that honourable senators will do the same.

Thank you. *Wela'liog and d'akuju.*

The Hon. the Speaker: Are honourable senators ready for the question on the motion in amendment?

An Hon. Senator: Question.

The Hon. the Speaker: If you are opposed to the motion, please say "no."

An Hon. Senator: No.

The Hon. the Speaker: I hear a no. The amendment is defeated.

(Motion in amendment of the Honourable Senator Patterson negated.)

BILL TO AMEND—THIRD READING

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Cordy, seconded by the Honourable Senator Dalphond, for the third reading of Bill C-12, An Act to amend the Old Age Security Act (Guaranteed Income Supplement).

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

An Hon. Senator: Question.

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

Some Hon. Senators: Agreed.

An Hon. Senator: On division.

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

THE ESTIMATES, 2022-23

NATIONAL FINANCE COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO STUDY MAIN ESTIMATES

Hon. Raymonde Gagné (Legislative Deputy to the Government Representative in the Senate), pursuant to notice of March 1, 2022, moved:

That the Standing Senate Committee on National Finance be authorized to examine and report upon the expenditures set out in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2023; and

That, for the purpose of this study, the committee have the power to meet, even though the Senate may then be sitting or adjourned, and that rules 12-18(1) and 12-18(2) be suspended in relation thereto.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to.)

EMERGENCIES ACT

APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE— MESSAGE FROM COMMONS— MOTION—DEBATE

The Senate proceeded to consideration of the message from the House of Commons:

Wednesday, March 2, 2022

EXTRACT, —

That,

- (a) pursuant to subsection 62(1) of the Emergencies Act, a special joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons be appointed to review the exercise of powers and the performance of duties and functions pursuant to the declaration of emergency that was in effect from Monday, February 14, 2022, to Wednesday, February 23, 2022, including the provisions as specified in subsections 62(5) and (6) of the act;

- (b) the committee be composed of four members of the Senate and seven members of the House of Commons, including three members of the House of Commons from the governing party, two members of the House of Commons from the official opposition, one member from the Bloc Québécois and one member from the New Democratic Party, with three Chairs of which the two House Co-Chairs shall be from the Bloc Québécois and the New Democratic Party and the Senate Co-Chair shall be determined by the Senate;
- (c) in addition to the Co-Chairs, the committee shall elect two vice-chairs from the House, of whom the first vice-chair shall be from the governing party and the second vice-chair shall be from the official opposition party;
- (d) the House of Commons members be named by their respective whip by depositing with the Clerk of the House the list of their members to serve on the committee no later than the day following the adoption of this order;
- (e) the quorum of the committee be seven members whenever a vote, resolution or other decision is taken, so long as both Houses and one member of the governing party in the House, one from the opposition in the House and one member of the Senate are represented, and that the Joint Chairs be authorized to hold meetings, to receive evidence and authorize the printing thereof, whenever five members are present, so long as both Houses and one member of the governing party in the House, one member from the opposition in the House and one member of the Senate are represented;
- (f) changes to the membership of the committee, on the part of the House of Commons, be effective immediately after notification by the relevant whip has been filed with the Clerk of the House;
- (g) membership substitutions, on the part of the House of Commons, be permitted, if required, in the manner provided for in Standing Order 114(2) and may be filed with the clerk of the committee by email, provided that substitutes take the oath of secrecy pursuant to paragraph (h) of this order before participating in proceedings;
- (h) pursuant to subsection 62(3) of the act, every member and person employed in the work of the committee, which includes personnel who, in supporting the committee's work or a committee member's work, have access to the committee's proceedings or documents, shall take the oath of secrecy set out in the schedule of the act;
- (i) every meeting of the committee held to consider an order or regulation referred to it pursuant to subsection 61(2) of the act shall be held in camera

- pursuant to subsection 62(4) of the act, and that the evidence and documents received by the committee related to these meetings shall not be made public;
- (j) Co-Chairs shall have the ability to fully participate, including to move motions and to vote on all items before the committee, and any vote resulting in a tie vote shall mean that the item is negated;
- (k) all documents deposited pursuant to the act shall be referred to the committee, and documents referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights since February 16, 2022, in accordance with this act be instead referred to this special joint committee;
- (l) until the committee ceases to exist or Thursday, June 23, 2022, whichever is earlier,
- (i) where applicable, the provisions contained in paragraph (r) of the order adopted on Thursday, November 25, 2021, except for those listed in subparagraphs (r)(iii), (iv) and (vi), shall apply to the committee, and the committee shall hold meetings in person only should this be necessary to consider any matter referred to it pursuant to subsection 61(2) of the act,
- (ii) members, senators, and departmental and parliamentary officials appearing as witnesses before the committee may do so in person, as may any witness appearing with respect to any matter referred to it pursuant to subsection 61(2) of the act,
- (iii) when more than one motion is proposed for the election of the House vice-chairs, any motion received after the initial one shall be taken as a notice of motion and such motions shall be put to the committee seriatim until one is adopted;
- (m) the committee have the power to:
- (i) sit during sittings and adjournments of the House,
- (ii) report from time to time, including pursuant to the provisions included in subsection 62(6) of the act, to send for persons, papers and records, and to print such papers and evidence as may be ordered by the committee,
- (iii) retain the services of expert, professional, technical and clerical staff, including legal counsel,
- (iv) appoint, from among its members such subcommittees as may be deemed appropriate and to delegate to such subcommittees, all or any of its powers, except the power to report to the Senate and House of Commons,

- (v) authorize video and audio broadcasting of any or all of its public proceedings and that they be made available to the public via the Parliament of Canada's websites; and

That a message be sent to the Senate requesting that House to unite with this House for the above purpose and to select, if the Senate deems advisable, members to act on the proposed special joint committee.

ATTEST

Charles Robert

The Clerk of the House of Commons

Hon. Marc Gold (Government Representative in the Senate) moved:

That:

- (a) pursuant to subsection 62(1) of the *Emergencies Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. 22, a special joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons be established to review the exercise of powers and the performance of duties and functions pursuant to a declaration of emergency that was in effect from Monday, February 14, 2022, to Wednesday, February 23, 2022, including the provisions as specified in subsections 62(5) and (6) of the act;
- (b) the committee be composed of four members of the Senate, including one senator from the Opposition, one senator from the Independent Senators Group, one senator from the Progressive Senate Group, and one senator from the Canadian Senators Group, and seven members of the House of Commons, including three members of the House of Commons from the governing party, two members of the House of Commons from the official opposition, one member from the Bloc Québécois and one member from the New Democratic Party, with three chairs, of which the Senate chair shall be a senator from the Independent Senators Group and the two House chairs shall be from the Bloc Québécois and the New Democratic Party;
- (c) in addition to the chairs, the committee shall elect two vice-chairs from the House, of whom the first vice-chair shall be from the governing party and the second vice-chair shall be from the official opposition party;
- (d) the four senators to be members of the committee be named by means of a notice signed by their respective leader or facilitator (or their respective designates), and filed with the Clerk of the Senate no later than 5:00 p.m. on the day after this motion is adopted, failing which, the leader or facilitator of any party or group identified in paragraph (b) who has not filed the name of a senator with the Clerk of the Senate, shall be deemed to be the senator named to

the committee, with the names of the senators named as members being recorded in the *Journals of the Senate*;

- (e) the quorum of the committee be seven members whenever a vote, resolution or other decision is taken, so long as one member of the Senate, one member of the governing party in the House of Commons and one member from the opposition in the House of Commons are present, and the chairs be authorized to hold meetings, to receive evidence and authorize the publishing thereof, whenever five members are present, so long as one member of the Senate, one member of the governing party in the House of Commons and one member from the opposition in the House of Commons are present;
- (f) changes to the membership of the committee on the part of the Senate be made in accordance with rule 12-5 of the *Rules of the Senate*, provided that any new members or participating senators take the oath of secrecy pursuant to paragraph (g) of this order before participating in proceedings;
- (g) pursuant to subsection 62(3) of the act, every member and person employed in the work of the committee, which includes personnel who, in supporting the committee's work or a committee member's work, have access to the committee's proceedings or documents, take the oath of secrecy as set out in the schedule of the act;
- (h) every meeting of the committee held to consider an order or regulation referred to it pursuant to subsection 61(2) of the act be held in camera, pursuant to subsection 62(4) of the same act, and the evidence and documents received by the committee related to these meetings not be made public;
- (i) for greater certainty, the chairs may move motions and vote on all items before the committee, and any vote resulting in a tie vote shall mean that the item is negatived;
- (j) all documents tabled in the Senate pursuant to the act since February 21, 2022, be referred to the committee;
- (k) until the committee ceases to exist or on Thursday, June 23, 2022, whichever is earlier,
 - (i) where applicable, the provisions contained in paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of the order adopted by the Senate on February 10, 2022, respecting senators on standing joint committees, shall apply to senators on this committee, and the committee shall hold meetings in person where necessary to consider any matter referred to it pursuant to subsection 61(2) of the act; and
 - (ii) senators, members and departmental and parliamentary officials appearing as witnesses before the committee may do so in person, as

may any witness appearing with respect to any matter referred to it pursuant to subsection 61(2) of the act;

- (l) the committee have the power to:
 - (i) meet during sittings and adjournments of the Senate;
 - (ii) report from time to time, including pursuant to the provisions included in subsection 62(6) of the act, to send for persons, papers and records, and to publish such papers and evidence as may be ordered by the committee;
 - (iii) retain the services of expert, professional, technical and clerical staff, including legal counsel;
 - (iv) appoint, from among its members such subcommittees as may be deemed appropriate and to delegate to such subcommittees all or any of its powers, except the power to report to the Senate and House of Commons; and
 - (v) authorize video and audio broadcasting of any or all of its public proceedings and to make them available to the public via the Parliament of Canada's websites; and
- (m) a report of the committee may be deposited with the Clerk of the Senate at any time the Senate stands adjourned, and that any report so deposited may be deposited electronically, with the report being deemed to have been presented or tabled in the Senate; and

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

• (1450)

Hon. Donald Neil Plett (Leader of the Opposition): I'd like to move the adjournment of the debate.

The Hon. the Speaker: It is moved by the Honourable Senator Plett, seconded by the Honourable Senator Seidman, that further debate be adjourned to the next sitting of the Senate.

Any honourable senators who are opposed to the motion will please say "no."

Some Hon. Senators: No.

The Hon. the Speaker: I hear a "no."

Motion is defeated. On debate.

I see two senators rising now.

And two honourable senators having risen:

The Hon. the Speaker: Do we have an agreement between the whip and the Government Liaison for a bell?

Senator Plett: One hour.

The Hon. the Speaker: There will be a one-hour bell. Normally, the vote would be in one hour, but we have a previous order that notwithstanding any of the rules, that the Question Period take place at three o'clock. Therefore, Question Period will take place at three o'clock and then the balance of the one hour for the bell will commence after Question Period. So the vote will actually take place at 4:52 p.m.

Just to be clear, honourable senators, we have an order that the Question Period will take place at three o'clock; and the balance of the bell for this particular vote will carry us to 4:52, so the vote will take place at 4:52. I recommend, honourable senators, for the remaining five minutes that the Senate suspend to await the arrival of the minister.

[Translation]

POINT OF ORDER—SPEAKER'S RULING RESERVED

Hon. Lucie Moncion: I rise on a point of order. You said that the motion was adopted, but then you went back on the decision because two senators rose. Since you had already made the decision, may I know why we are reversing course?

[English]

The Hon. the Speaker: You make a good point Senator Moncion, but we had not moved on to the other item, and there was some confusion as to what was happening, so I reverted back and recognized the two senators standing to be fair to what was going on. There was obviously confusion. You make a good point, and it would have been far more difficult for me to make that adjustment had we moved on. Thank you for raising that.

Hon. Donald Neil Plett (Leader of the Opposition): Your Honour, thank you for that, but the reason there was confusion is sometimes you say "all those in favour" and you hear a no, and then you say all those opposed. You didn't do that. Again, I appreciate you gave us the opportunity — but in order to not have something silly like we just had here on something where we're trying to collaborate, and we have a point of order on something like this, in the future, Your Honour, maybe we could have you do both — all those in favour and all those opposed — so we are not in confusion as to whether or not we should stand.

The Hon. the Speaker: Point taken. I will take that under advisement. I don't think there is any need to make a ruling on it. Thank you for raising it. Senator Moncion, did you have anything else?

[Translation]

Senator Moncion: I would just like to say that my point of order was not silly, because things were moving according to the usual order. In my view, you did not make a mistake, but I accept that you went back on your decision. However, I have a problem with my point of order being called silly. I feel that it is inappropriate language that diminishes my role as a senator who pays attention to what happens in this chamber.

[English]

Senator Plett: I apologize to Senator Moncion for hurting her feelings.

The Hon. the Speaker: I understood the comments made by Senator Plett as referring to the general state of affairs and asking that we have a voice call whenever there is any sense of confusion. I didn't take it as an insult to you, Senator Moncion.

The Senate will suspend for two or three minutes to await the arrival of the minister.

(The sitting of the Senate was suspended.)

(The sitting of the Senate was resumed.)

• (1500)

QUESTION PERIOD

(Pursuant to the order adopted by the Senate on December 7, 2021, to receive a Minister of the Crown, the Honourable Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change, appeared before honourable senators during Question Period.)

BUSINESS OF THE SENATE

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, we welcome today the Honourable Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of the Environment and Climate Change, to answer questions relating to his ministerial responsibilities. Pursuant to the order adopted by the Senate on December 7, 2021, senators do not need to stand. Questions are limited to one minute and responses to one-and-a-half minutes. The reading clerk will stand 10 seconds before the expiry of these times. Question Period will last one hour.

MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE

BAY DU NORD DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Hon. David M. Wells (Acting Leader of the Opposition): Welcome, minister. Minister, the Bay du Nord offshore petroleum development project is vital to the economy and future of Newfoundland and Labrador. This project will produce 200,000 barrels of oil per day and has an initial lifespan of 30 years with the first production targeted in 2028. The construction phase will employ thousands of specialized workers and this will put billions of dollars into the economy of Newfoundland and Labrador and Canada.

Minister, the Impact Assessment Agency of Canada was created and touted by your government as a way forward for future environmental impact assessments and to make decisions based on science. This was the essence of Bill C-69 passed in 2019 in a previous session of Parliament. The Bay du Nord project has been assessed for almost four years. The agency has recommended the project for approval and they stated that it “. . . is not likely to cause significant adverse . . . effects”

The project proponent has committed to being a world-leading, ESG-focused producer for this project and will have some of the lowest emissions of any energy project in the world. My question is simple: Will the government commit to following science and not politics and approve the Bay du Nord project as recommended by the Impact Assessment Agency, as the deadline, which is this Sunday, approaches?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change: Thank you, senator. As you pointed out, the Impact Assessment Agency has submitted to me, the minister, its recommendations. I would like to correct one thing you said. As you probably know, this project was evaluated under the Harper government impact assessment, also referred to as CEAA 2012, and not under the new and improved regime that we’ve put in place with Bill C-69. That being said, it is being reviewed by me and the cabinet.

I would like to say that our government has been unwavering in our commitment to support energy workers in Canada and to work with Newfoundland and Labrador specifically. For example, we could talk about the Lower Churchill Project, which will provide Newfoundlanders and Labradorians with clean energy for decades to come. To our investment in offshore emission reduction fund, to help offshore workers and businesses lower their emissions from their operation —

Senator Wells: My question is simple. Will this be approved as per science, not as per politics? I was hoping to get an answer to that question, whether it was “yes” or “no.”

I have a supplementary question for this, minister: While Canada and much of the world is correctly closing its ports and markets to Russian oil and gas, do you agree that this is an ideal opportunity to promote responsibly produced Canadian oil and gas, including the Bay du Nord project to world markets?

Mr. Guilbeault: Thank you for the question. I think there are a number of things we can do to help our European colleagues that are going through this period of crisis and, more specifically, the people and the government of Ukraine. We’re doing just that.

There is clearly a crisis in Ukraine, which doesn’t mean that other crises are necessarily erased by it, such as the climate crisis. The world is moving toward a more decarbonized world and Canada is aligned with the world on that. We will continue to move toward decarbonization, but we will also help our European and Ukrainian friends.

[Senator Wells]

2030 EMISSIONS REDUCTION PLAN

Hon. Mary Coyle: Welcome to the Senate, Minister Guilbeault.

• (1510)

Minister, the Net-Zero Emissions Accountability Act was passed by both houses last June. It called for the 2030 Emissions Reduction Plan and the establishment of the Canadian Net-Zero Advisory Body. Could you tell us if we can expect the 2030 Emissions Reduction Plan this month? Would you be able to mention any highlights? Also, could you tell us how you see the Net-Zero Advisory Body working with the planned just transition advisory body?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change: Thank you for the question, senator. I am obligated by law to table the emissions reduction plan by the end of the month, so it will be done. The answer to your first question is yes.

The Net-Zero Advisory Body is a very important group helping the government to lay the path toward our net-zero society in 2050. It plays a very important role. I have had several meetings with them since I’ve been nominated Environment Minister. They play an exceedingly important role. We have been engaging with them in the elaboration of the emissions reduction plan. Unfortunately, since it’s not public yet, I can’t comment on specific elements of the plan. You will have to be patient for just a few more weeks.

The Hon. the Speaker: Just to remind you, honourable senators, there are no supplementary questions when we have a minister for Question Period, except the one supplementary question that is given to the Leader of the Opposition.

Senator Coyle: It is not in addition to what I asked. I just want an answer to what I asked.

The Hon. the Speaker: I’m sorry, Senator Coyle. You asked your question. You got your answer, and there are no supplementary questions.

[Translation]

CHALLENGES IN THE FIGHT AGAINST CLIMATE CHANGE

Hon. Paul J. Massicotte: Welcome to the Senate, minister. As you know very well, 30 years ago, Canada was a global leader in managing climate change. Now, after the constant failures by all governments, we are the worst country in the G7. In a global context, last week, the IPCC once again sounded the alarm that we are reaching a point of no return. What are we to do, minister? Yes, I know you are a new minister and we have a new law, but after all these failures, how can we have confidence that, ultimately, we will be able to properly manage the enormous challenge of climate change?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change: Thank you for your question, senator. I want to start by pointing out that we do not have the worst record in the G7. According to Energy Policy Tracker, an independent international NGO, our economic recovery plan is the greenest among all G7 countries in relation to investments, not in relative terms, but in absolute terms, and it ranks second in the G20. That said, Canada has a lot of work to do to combat climate change.

Since we came to power . . . Why didn't all the previous governments meet their targets? The answer is simple. None of these governments set themselves up to meet their targets. Since 2016, we have made significant investments, to the tune of \$100 billion, and we have adopted a series of policies and regulations that will help us meet our targets, such as creating the carbon tax and reducing emissions of methane, which is a very powerful greenhouse gas. We are committed to regulating vehicle emissions. All of these measures will help us meet our targets.

Senator Massicotte: Thank you.

[English]

COLLABORATION WITH INDIGENOUS GROUPS

Hon. Marty Klyne: Minister, your mandate letter reflects the importance of partnering with Indigenous nations to fight climate change, conserve wildlife and safeguard freshwater. The Indigenous Guardians program is one such successful example.

I look forward to your establishment of a Canada water agency, especially as Saskatchewan has expertise in freshwater infrastructure and related agricultural issues. The First Nations University of Canada, the University of Regina and the University of Saskatchewan also present opportunities to blend Western science and traditional knowledge toward innovative solutions in managing freshwater resources. Could you please comment on the value of Indigenous-led stewardship and the need to continue to work collaboratively with the Indigenous partners in the long term to protect our environment?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change: Thank you very much for the question, senator. As you probably know, I was Heritage Minister before becoming Environment Minister and, as such, I was responsible for co-implementing the Indigenous Languages Act with Métis, First Nations and the Inuit people. Our government has increased funding for Indigenous languages 25 times compared to what it was before we came into power in 2015.

I also co-developed with Indigenous leadership the proposal that became the bill that created the first-ever National Day for Truth and Reconciliation.

The same goes for the environment. You talked about the Indigenous Guardians program. I believe it is a great success. Frankly, there's no doubt in my mind that we cannot move forward in creating new protected areas in Canada without full engagement at the table with Indigenous people. In fact, last

week, for the first time in the history of our country, we signed an MOU with the Nunatsiavut Government — involved from the get-go — to look into the creation of a new protected area.

Historically, when we've done that, we started working on new protected areas and then, somewhere along the way, we said it would be nice to engage with First Nations or Indigenous people. Last week, for the first time ever, we did it from start. That will be our model going forward.

MIGRATORY BIRDS REGULATIONS

Hon. Diane F. Griffin: Minister, proposed changes to the Migratory Birds Regulations have been on your desk for quite some time. Changes are really needed because there has not been a lot of change from the first time they were promulgated over 105 years ago. When might we see these changes enacted? Thank you.

Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change: Thank you, senator. I would like to specify that I'm in my fourth month on the job, but I think you meant the desks of a succession of environment ministers. It is in my mandate letter. The team and I at Environment and Climate Change Canada have started working to modernize this piece of legislation. I'm confident that you and others who care greatly about this issue will be able to see something in the near future.

CARBON TAX

Hon. Denise Batters: Minister, last year my home province of Saskatchewan submitted its own proposal to your Trudeau government to replace the federal carbon tax. Saskatchewan's proposal would give our province control over its own carbon pricing, while cutting emissions in the province. Your government rejected this plan, even though it was similar to the one previously proposed by New Brunswick, which the Trudeau government accepted. Saskatchewan's Premier Moe has called this decision, "arbitrary and political." Saskatchewan has reapplied, but your federal government says there will be no provincial carbon-pricing system decision until at least 2023.

So, Minister, the people of Saskatchewan want to know, why is there a double standard on the carbon tax? Why is this Trudeau government once again giving Saskatchewan the short end of the stick?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change: Thank you for your question, senator. I would beg to differ with the characterization of how we are moving forward on carbon pricing in this country. We have, in fact, given a lot of latitude to provinces and territories. Of revenues raised through the application of the carbon-pricing system, 100% is being recycled in the province or territory where those revenues are generated. In fact, we're sending back, including to the people of your province, more money than households are having to pay through the carbon-pricing system.

Provinces can have their own system as long as they are equivalent. That is a very important element. If they're not equivalent, if they're not stringent enough, then the federal system applies. Were the Province of Saskatchewan willing to put something on the table that would be as stringent, they could have their own system. Certainly, New Brunswick and Ontario will have to do better, because in 2023 we are putting more stringent regulations in place to ensure that the system is more robust.

NUCLEAR ENERGY DEVELOPMENT

Hon. Salma Atallahjan: Minister, most of the emphasis in your mandate letter is on what you will get rid of to combat climate change. Yet, there is precious little on what you will replace it with.

• (1520)

One of the best ways to get the electricity grid to net zero by 2035 is through nuclear power, an abundant and carbon-free energy source. Yet, in your climate plan I see no indication of what your government is investing in this energy source. While your plan clearly identifies close to \$1 billion and more for wind and solar, all that nuclear gets is a mention of an action plan for small modular reactors.

Minister, why is nuclear power — a stable and safe source of carbon-free energy — such a low priority for the Trudeau government?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change: Thank you for your question. I would like to correct something you said. The federal government does not subsidize the production of wind energy or solar energy. Currently, we do subsidize the production of fossil fuels in this country, but we don't directly subsidize the production of renewable energies.

The government is encouraging research in and development of nuclear technology. We have to look at all non-emitting technologies in order to fight climate change. If nuclear energy can perform, on a cost basis, with other forms of non-emitting technologies, then there will be a place for it. The federal government does not develop energy projects. Energy projects are developed by provinces and territories, not by the federal government.

[Translation]

FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS' CLIMATE POLICY

Hon. Rosa Galvez: Minister, your mandate letter asks you to work with the President of the Treasury Board on the application of a climate lens to ensure climate adaptation and mitigation considerations are integrated throughout federal government decision making. I was pleased to see that because it was one of the recommendations I made in my white paper on a clean and just recovery. Infrastructure Canada already has a climate lens, but it applies only to projects that are part of clean infrastructure programs. It should apply to all projects and all policies.

[Mr. Guilbeault]

Can you tell us what that climate lens will look like and what factors it will consider as part of government policy analysis? When can we expect the policy to be implemented in all government departments and agencies?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change: Thank you, senator. That's an excellent question. You're right, the government has begun to include the climate assessment piece in all our policies and decisions. We're in the process of doing that all the way up to the cabinet level. We are currently developing the guidelines and the approach for implementing this principle, which we're already using in some cases and some departments, but we want this to be whole of government. I hope that, over the next few months, we'll be able to tell Canadians more about how we're going to apply this principle to everything the government does.

SEVENTEEN SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS OF THE 2030 AGENDA

Hon. Renée Dupuis: Thank you for joining us today, minister. Subclause 2(1) of Bill S-5, which you just introduced in the Senate, proposes adding the following to the preamble of the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, and I quote:

Whereas the Government of Canada recognizes that every individual in Canada has a right to a healthy environment as provided under this Act;

Towards Canada's 2030 Agenda National Strategy, released in 2021, states that the UN's 17 sustainable development goals for the year 2030 should be implemented, and I quote, "... in an integrated manner that recognizes how the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development are mutually reinforcing ..."

These 17 principles recognize, for the first time, that human rights are intrinsically linked to sustainable development to ensure a healthy environment. Minister, why didn't you add a reference to the 17 principles of sustainable development for the year 2030 —

[English]

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, let me remind senators that I've been asked to adhere strictly to the timelines because we have a long list of senators who want to ask the minister questions. I've been strict with the minister and I'm trying to be strict with the questions as well. When I interrupt you, please stop so I can go to the minister for his answer.

My apologies, minister.

[Translation]

Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change: Thank you, senator. As a matter of fact, what we are proposing to do by incorporating the principle of the right to a healthy environment into the Canadian Environmental Protection Act lines up perfectly with the United Nations development goals for 2030. Once the bill is passed, we will set out how this principle of the right to a healthy environment will be incorporated into all of our acts and regulations and how we will be able to deploy this over the next few years. That is exactly what we are working on doing, and even though we may not be referring directly to the 17 goals, this responds to the intent of your question. That is what we are working on.

OIL AND GAS PRODUCTION AND NET-ZERO EMISSIONS

Hon. Clément Gignac: Welcome to the Senate, minister. I am very pleased to see you leading this department, given your background.

That being said, because of what is happening in Ukraine, people are re-evaluating Russia as a reliable supplier of oil and gas. I agree with the comments recently made by the Premier of Alberta, Jason Kenney, when he said that the world needs more energy to come from liberal democracies. How can Canada successfully achieve its energy transition and target net-zero emissions by 2050, while also responding to this global demand to become a reliable producer? Thank you.

Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change: I thank the honourable senator for his question. I would like to refer you to the most recent report of the International Energy Agency, released at the end of 2021. It presents scenarios — you are very familiar with such things, Senator Gignac — that tell us that essentially, according to forecasts, global oil production will peak in 2028 and then drop 4% a year until 2050.

We currently live in a world where we produce about 90 million barrels of oil per day. In 2050, we will be producing only 25 million per day, so there will be a substantial decrease in both production and consumption. Why? We are electrifying our transportation and electricity generation sectors. We are working with businesses in the oil and gas, cement, aluminum and steel sectors to help them decarbonize and reduce their dependence on fossil fuels. This is happening in Canada and also in other parts of the world, like Europe, the U.S., South Korea, China and India. This idea that we will need more oil in the future goes against the scenario envisioned by global experts.

[English]

NUCLEAR ENERGY DEVELOPMENT

Hon. Pamela Wallin: The international consensus, minister, is clear — including experts such as the International Energy Agency and even your own colleagues, such as Minister O'Regan — that the path to net zero before 2050 must include the full range of energy solutions, including nuclear. You assert that Ottawa has no role and that only markets develop sources,

but we all know that the federal government does have a role in recognizing, funding and ensuring the positive green impact from nuclear.

Minister, you have publicly and vociferously opposed nuclear power most of your life. Is that still your belief?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change: Thank you, senator. I think I answered that question earlier when I said that my government is supporting research and development in various non-emitting sectors, including nuclear. As I said, governments do not decide which technologies are going to make it or not make it on the market. Markets decide which technologies are going to make it.

We are supporting a whole range of new technologies in terms of research and development, but we are not subsidizing the production of said energy. This is done by provinces and territories in terms of development. But we are putting in place a framework to ensure that non-emitting technologies play a more important role in our energy portfolio, and that's what we're doing.

• (1530)

[Translation]

LIQUEFIED NATURAL GAS

Hon. Pierre-Hugues Boisvenu: Welcome, minister. Your mandate letter requires you to work closely with the Minister of Natural Resources and his department in a number of areas, including energy sector emissions. On Monday, in the other place, Minister Wilkinson was asked whether Canada would help European democracies replace Russian gas with our own natural gas.

He replied, and I quote:

We are working very closely with our colleagues in the United States and in Europe to not only address short-term energy volatility but also to explore long-term energy options.

Minister, how do you see Canada's liquefied natural gas exports to Europe fitting into our economic, environmental and national security priorities? Is this something you would support, especially in light of the conflict between Russia and Ukraine?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change: Thank you, senator. I want to say right off the bat that I completely agree with the answer my colleague, the Minister of Natural Resources, gave.

I'm sure you're aware that there is just one liquefied natural gas terminal being built at this time, and it's on the West Coast. This project will probably take two years to complete. There is no other project at the construction, approval or environmental assessment phases, nor anything else. This does not mean that we can't help our European colleagues in other ways, and that's what the Minister of Natural Resources and I are working on right now with the members of our team. We've had a number of conversations with our colleagues in Europe.

I remind you that even the President of the European Commission said two days ago that the solution to overcoming their dependence on Russian oil and gas is adopting renewable energy, clean technology and hydrogen. Canada has a significant role to play when it comes to biomass. Even in Europe, they can clearly see that fossil fuels are not the future. The future is clean technology and renewable energy.

[English]

CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION INITIATIVES

Hon. Mary Jane McCallum: Honourable senators and minister, my home community of Barren Lands First Nation and 16 other Manitoba First Nations are connected to the provincial highway system by a winter road network that is open for only a few short weeks each year.

This once-a-year lifeline is essential for shipping truck loads of fuel, housing and construction materials, food and dry goods that must last until next year's winter road season. Climate change is resulting in the winter roads opening later and closing earlier each year with the winter roads this year not opening until mid-February and expected to close by March 15.

Will the minister please tell northern Manitoba First Nations what concrete action the minister is taking, as per your mandate letter, alongside the Indigenous Services Canada and Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada ministers to work in partnership with First Nations to chart collaborative strategies to adapt to the impacts of climate change?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change: Thank you for the question, senator. In fact, that work has already started. We are working on building the first-ever National Adaptation Strategy. It's not a federal adaptation strategy. It's a National Adaptation Strategy. We had five tables of experts last year that were looking at various elements of adaptations such as infrastructure, health and emergency response. These tables were not led by the federal government. We were there, but they were led by experts from across the country. Since the beginning of the year, we started engaging with Indigenous communities, with provinces and territories as well as with municipalities and a whole range of other stakeholders so we can build in more resilience and be better prepared to face the impacts of climate change, which you rightly pointed out are happening two to three times faster in the North than elsewhere on the planet.

Senator McCallum: Thank you.

[Mr. Guilbeault]

COLLABORATION WITH ARTISTS AND THE CREATIVE SECTOR

Hon. Patricia Bovey: Welcome, and thank you, minister.

Honourable senators, we know the arts' roles, impacts and voices are intrinsic throughout society, the environment and climate change being no exception.

Canada's first environmental artist, in my view, was Emily Carr, heralded throughout the decades for her 1930s and early 1940s important paintings of clear-cuts. Today, artists continue to draw attention to dire environmental concerns while providing positive solutions, actions and partnerships.

Minister, tying your former role as Heritage Minister to your current one as Minister of Environment and Climate Change, how will you engage Canada's creative sector in your efforts for Canada to meet its climate targets? Will you assist artists and arts organizations financially in bringing those measures forward?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change: Thank you. We have spoken about this in the past. I couldn't agree with you more. You may remember that as Heritage Minister, for the first time ever, I created two advisory bodies to the Minister of Heritage, one being with artists and arts organizations to see how the federal government can work with the arts and culture sector across the country, both to help Canadians better understand environmental issues, climate change and sustainability and also to work in partnership with these organizations to help them reduce their environmental and carbon footprint. So that work has started.

Environment Canada will also be part of helping those organizations make the transition and work with them so their voices can help us reach more and more Canadians on these important issues.

[Translation]

IMPACT OF INFLATION ON OIL PRICES

Hon. Jean-Guy Dagenais: Minister, as you know, the war in Ukraine has highlighted the fact that oil will not be disappearing tomorrow and certainly not within the next 10 years.

The need is there, and Canada is missing out on economic opportunities for Alberta, Newfoundland and Quebec. You know very well that the prices that companies are paying for oil will be passed on to consumers. You seem to be forgetting that oil has uses beyond fuel for vehicles. What will you do to address inflation, given that you're unfortunately strongly against the idea of the oil sector having any kind of autonomy?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change: Thank you, senator. I wouldn't say we're against the idea of autonomy for the energy sector. In fact, we're working on strengthening our country's energy autonomy. As I said to one of your colleagues earlier, I'm not the one saying that oil production will peak in 2028. That's from the International Energy Agency, which many consider to be one of the most credible organizations in this area. I could mention the report by our energy regulator, which says Canada's oil production will peak in 2032, not 2028.

I agree with you that we are going to keep using oil for quite some time. However, what seems very clear according to the experts is that oil production will decrease year after year. We are currently decarbonizing the transportation and electricity generation sectors. We'll have a net-zero electricity grid by 2035. We are working with companies in the aluminum sector to produce aluminum with virtually no GHG emissions. We are working with steel companies too. As a result, our need for fossil fuels will shrink over time.

[English]

PARKS CANADA REAL ESTATE ASSETS

Hon. Rose-May Poirier: Honourable senators, my question concerns the conditions of Parks Canada real estate assets including buildings, forts and bridges. An answer received this morning to a written question on the Order Paper states:

Based on 2021 asset data, 26 per cent of Parks Canada's assets are in good condition; 43 per cent are in fair condition, and 31 per cent are in poor or very poor condition.

As of September 2018, a report found that the cost to fix accessibility issues for disabled visitors was about \$428 million. The answer received today disputed this figure but also admitted that Parks Canada doesn't track its investments that support accessibility.

Minister, do you have a plan to repair Parks Canada real estate assets and to improve accessibility for all visitors?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change: Thank you, senator. These are excellent questions. In fact, we are very seized with the situation of Parks Canada's infrastructure. We are working with the Department of Finance to chart a path forward to address these issues as well as the issue of accessibility, which is a very important issue for me and my government as well.

• (1540)

[Translation]

CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION INITIATIVES

Hon. Bernadette Clement: Good afternoon, minister.

[English]

My question involves municipalities. As we have seen in the last number of years, cities and municipalities are often the first responders in terms of crisis; crisis which often is related to climate change and has impact on critical infrastructure often owned and operated by municipalities.

What plans do you have to make sure that municipalities are full partners from the outset of these emergencies? If you could speak around full, clear communications with municipalities, that would be greatly appreciated.

Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change: Thank you, senator, for your question. I was talking earlier about the National Adaptation Strategy, and there is no doubt in my mind that we can't do that without municipalities at the table. In fact, just two weeks ago, I was having a meeting specifically on that with the Canadian Federation of Municipalities. We have already started engaging with them on that, but we want them to be at the table for the elaboration of that National Adaptation Strategy.

We have already started investing in adaptation measures with municipalities. I will give the example of an investment that Infrastructure Canada made for the creation of a new urban park on the West Island of Montreal. Obviously, it's a park, but one of the interesting features of that park is that it will help with flood mitigation during the spring in that part of the island of Montreal, where we have recurring floods year after year. The park has an adaptation and preparedness element embedded in it. Projects like that are becoming more and more common, and we're doing those with municipalities.

Senator Clement: Thank you.

ATLANTIC LOOP

Hon. Terry M. Mercer: Good afternoon, minister. Thank you for being here.

Your mandate letter specifically states that you shall:

Support efforts to advance the Atlantic Loop initiative to connect surplus clean power to regions transitioning away from coal and to help transform how we power our economy and communities.

According to a recent news report, it appears that the federal government is not yet ready to decide how to proceed with investing in this project. The Atlantic Loop, or Maritime Link, is not a new idea and has been around for a while. Your mandate letter indicates that you should be advancing its support.

Minister, if the federal government appears to support the project and the four Atlantic premiers are all for it, why is it not going forward? What's the holdup?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change: Thank you, senator. I haven't seen this particular news article you are referring to, but I would vehemently dispute its findings, because the Atlantic Loop is a priority for our government. We are engaged with the Atlantic provinces on the project. I myself have had a number of meetings with the Atlantic ministers and with people who are in charge within the government of advancing this project, working with the natural resources minister and the infrastructure minister.

We can't help the Atlantic provinces decarbonize their electricity sector without the Atlantic Loop. It just can't happen. Nova Scotia still relies on coal for 60 percent of its electricity. How do we help them get off coal? The Atlantic Loop.

We are hard at work, and I am confident that we will see progress soon on this very important file.

CARBON TAX

Hon. Dennis Glen Patterson: Welcome, minister. Nunavut residents are keenly aware of the impacts of climate change and the need to transition from a wholly diesel-dependent territory to one with alternative energy options, although sadly, we've made minuscule progress on that.

When your government introduced the carbon tax, I raised the alarm that this would negatively impact Nunavut in particular. While your government has, thankfully, exempted fuel for intra-territorial flights from the carbon tax, the sad reality is that Nunavut is solely dependent on cargo flights originating from southern Canada to provide essential goods such as fresh produce. We have no road or rail connections. We already face the highest cost of living in the country, and we are particularly vulnerable to even slight fluctuations in price.

Will your government also include an exemption for jet fuel for flights originating in southern Canada and not just flights originating in the territories?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change: Thank you, senator. We designed the carbon pricing system to be sensitive to the particular needs of Northern residents. We return all the carbon pricing revenue to the Government of Nunavut to use as they see fit, including helping defray the cost of living. The federal pricing system does not apply to flights within the territory, nor does it apply to diesel that is used for power in remote communities.

We have ongoing discussions with the Government of Nunavut, as well as the governments of the other territories, to ensure that the measures we're putting in place to fight climate change are not adversely impacting them.

[Senator Mercer]

TRANSPORT OF OIL

Hon. Michael L. MacDonald: Minister, in 2015, in response to a request from the Quebec government, Enbridge's Line 9B was reversed to provide an increased supply of oil to Montreal's refineries. The volume went from 12% to almost 50% of required supply. Much of the other 50% comes through the Gulf of St. Lawrence, but now the endangered right whale is migrating to the Gulf of St. Lawrence, where large tankers ply the waters.

Given this development and remembering the rail tragedy at Lac-Mégantic, wouldn't complete delivery of all oil to Montreal refineries by pipeline be in the best interests of both safety and conservation? If you don't agree, what alternatives do you propose to address these unnecessary vulnerabilities?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change: Thank you, senator. As I said earlier, Quebec imports less and less of its oil from foreign nations and relies more and more on Canadian oil, but as I explained to some of your colleagues, we are heading into a world where we will gradually reduce our dependency on fossil fuels. That has already started happening in Canada. It is not happening everywhere, but it is happening in many nations around the world.

This is a problem that will solve itself over time by us investing in alternatives and in clean technologies to ensure people have access to safe, reliable sources of energy as we decarbonize our transportation, electricity, and oil and gas sectors.

ENVIRONMENTAL TRANSITION ACTION PLAN

Hon. Hassan Yussuff: Welcome, minister, and thank you for being here.

As you know, to meet our net-zero objectives by 2050, it will require some transition measures across the country. Communities are deeply impacted. When can workers in communities expect a just transition legislation tabled by your government?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change: Thank you, senator. I salute the work that you did on coal, to work with communities and workers as we transition away from coal.

As you know, this is not part of my mandate letter, but it is part of many of my cabinet colleagues' mandate letters. Even though it's not in my mandate letter, I have engaged with them on that, and I think you will see significant progress on that in the coming months.

[Translation]

CANADIAN ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACT, 1999

Hon. Pierre J. Dalfond: Good afternoon, minister, and welcome to the Senate.

[English]

My question relates to Bill S-5, the changes to the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, that was introduced in the Senate this week.

The 2021 Liberal election platform pledged to phase out toxicity testing on animals by 2035. However, Bill S-5 only mentions reducing animal testing in its preamble.

I understand that this is a practice which is used on close to 100,000 animals per year. Is the government open to strengthening the bill on this subject?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change: Thank you, senator. As a legislator, I'm always open to making my bills better, and I would invite you or any member of the Senate to come forward with proposals to improve and strengthen the bill as it moves forward.

I should also say that this is the first part of modernization that we want to do with the Canadian Environmental Protection Act. There are other elements that we want to bring forward at a later date. We thought there are so many changes that need to happen, we couldn't do them all at once. This is the first stage, but I welcome your proposals to improve the bill, senator.

• (1550)

CLIMATE CHANGE EDUCATION

Hon. Frances Lankin: Welcome, minister, and thank you for being here.

The problem with being at the end of the list is that two questions I wanted to ask have already been asked. Regardless, let me go to a strange place. This is about provincial jurisdiction, school curriculum and what Canada and the federal government can do to influence curriculum-setting at the school board and provincial levels.

We know there is a lot of good work going on educating around the environment and climate change, particularly in elementary schools. There is less at the secondary level, and we know that children lose their zeal for environmental consciousness and change as they age. I believe we need to get into the secondary schools, but I think it needs to be a pan-Canadian initiative with provincial partnerships.

Could you tell us whether there is anything going on with respect to that? Might it be an idea that a group of us can work with you on?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change: Thank you, senator. I am very seized with the issue of helping Canadians of all ages better understand sustainability and the issue of climate change.

As you rightly point out, education is a provincial jurisdiction, which doesn't preclude us from talking to provinces and territories about things like communicating about environmental issues. In fact, we support initiatives that are not necessarily directly through the educational system but that are done by organizations which they themselves operate within the confines of the educational systems. Those are around environment and climate change education.

So this is an important thing. In fact, there is a tremendous body of science around the communications on environmental issues and how to communicate on climate change. We are working with some of those experts to improve our own communications at the federal level, and we'll be encouraging our colleagues in the provinces and territories to do the same.

DORMANT OIL AND GAS WELLS

Hon. Paula Simons: Minister, in January, the Parliamentary Budget Officer tabled a report that examined the probable cost of cleaning up orphan wells in Western Canada and whether the government had allotted enough funds for the cleanup. The PBO found that \$556 million in federal funds had been allocated to Alberta but that those funds had gone primarily to 10 large oil and gas companies, all of which were quite solvent and able to do their own cleanup. In fact, almost one fifth of the monies — more than \$102 million — went to one oil giant, Canadian Natural Resources Limited, a company that just posted net earnings of \$7.7 billion and dividends of \$2.2 billion.

I asked the Parliamentary Budget Office whether the subsidy had led to the accelerated cleanup of any inactive wells, and the answer appeared to be that no one knew. Then I asked whether any of that \$556 million had actually gone to cleaning up orphan wells, and I was told that not one single orphan well in Alberta had been cleaned up with this grant money.

I will ask you what I asked Senator Gold the other day: What exactly did we get for the \$102.5 million we gave to CNRL?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change: Unfortunately, this program is not one that was developed or operated by Environment and Climate Change Canada but by Natural Resources Canada. I would be happy to talk to my colleague Minister Wilkinson to ask him to provide you with the information that you seek, but I don't have that information.

ENVIRONMENTAL TRANSITION ACTION PLAN

Hon. Mary Coyle: This is the second half of my question. Thank you for this.

You mentioned, minister, that we will expect and definitely see the delivery of our 2030 emissions reduction plan by the end of this month, and that's terrific. You have mentioned how the Net-Zero Advisory Body has been helpful in providing some guidance to government.

We are also expecting some time this year, I believe, a "just transition" plan, and along with that "just transition" plan, there will also be a "just transition advisory body." My question, which probably I condensed too much, is this: How do you see the relationship between the Net-Zero Advisory Body and the "just transition advisory body?"

Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change: I think there were three questions in your first question, and I got two out of three, which is not so bad as an average.

We created the Net-Zero Advisory Body as an independent organization to advise us and to tell us if they think we're doing a good job or where we need to improve. They had a lot of liberty in terms of with whom they wished to engage. For example, they started working closely with the Canadian Climate Institute.

The short answer is that I don't know, but I have regular conversations with them, and the next time I meet with them, I can certainly encourage them to reach out to the "just transition" body once it's created.

NUCLEAR ENERGY DEVELOPMENT

Hon. Salma Atallahjan: Minister, your climate plan heralds the expertise Canada has long had in nuclear energy and small, modular reactors, or SMRs, in particular. It also talks about working with the European Union and the U.K. to explore the advancement of the safe and secure zero-emission technology. Now, more than ever, that would seem to be an urgent matter.

Minister, have you explored with the European countries that depend upon Russia for energy the export of Canadian small, modular reactor expertise and technology to reduce and even eliminate that dependency? If not, then why not?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change: As you know, energy is not within Environment and Climate Change but within Natural Resources Canada.

That being said, we have ongoing conversations with our European friends and colleagues to see how we can help them as they transition quickly away from Russian oil and gas. As you may know, we don't have right now an SMR Canadian technology that is up and running. There's research and development happening, but that technology is not ready to be

deployed commercially and it therefore cannot be exported to other countries. But the federal government is subsidizing research and development in that sector.

If you want more specific information, you should address your question to the Minister of Natural Resources.

JEANNE D'ARC BASIN EXPLORATION DRILLING PROJECT

Hon. David M. Wells (Acting Leader of the Opposition): Minister, there are 8 trillion cubic feet of proven gas reserves in the Jeanne d'Arc Basin off the coast of Newfoundland and Labrador. One trillion cubic feet of gas replaces 170 million barrels of oil.

There is a company in Newfoundland and Labrador that is proposing to produce and sell 3 trillion cubic feet of this liquefied natural gas, which is over 500 million barrels of oil to be replaced.

This partnership includes the Miawpukek First Nation on the Conne River, the project requires no drilling and it will use 100% renewable energy to liquify the gas for transport to Europe and markets around the world. In fact, for any Canadian energy product, this location is the shortest route to the key markets of Europe. Phase one of the project is estimated to cost \$5.5 billion and take up to seven years.

Minister Guilbeault, are these Canadian investors wasting their time and their money?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change: Thank you for the question. I don't think I insinuated in any way that was the case. Companies are free to develop the projects they think will be beneficial for them and their clients.

We have specific processes as to how this gets done in Canada, including new and improved impact assessment and public consultation processes. I imagine that once the project is ready, it will be submitted for environmental impact assessment and public consultation to Environment and Climate Change Canada. To my knowledge, this project hasn't, but I can check with the department. If it has, I'm not familiar with it.

CARBON CAPTURE TAX CREDIT

Hon. Pierre J. Dalfond: Mr. Minister, this is an easy question.

I understand that the government seems to view carbon capture, storage and utilization technologies as an important part of an overall plan to achieve net-zero emissions by 2050. However, in January, more than 400 climate scientists and other academics asked the government to reconsider that approach and to create tax credits for these facilities.

Minister, do you think a tax credit is an important incentive to efficiently reduce the carbon footprint, or is it another subsidy to oil and gas at a time of soaring revenues?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change: Thank you for that question. I saw that letter from those scientists and experts. I know and respect many of them.

That being said, we are going to need this technology, not just for the oil and gas sector, but for the cement sector and probably for the steel sector because we will not be able to reduce our emissions fast enough to avoid global average temperatures from surpassing 1.5 degrees Celsius compared to pre-industrial levels.

• (1600)

Maybe if we had started not just in Canada but everywhere around the world — and a few countries did — but if we collectively had started tackling climate change 25, 30 years ago, like some of us have been calling for, maybe we wouldn't need it, but we are going to need it. I do not think, and no one thinks that the federal government alone should invest in that technology.

We've committed to have a just transition, meaning that we are going to work with every region of this country, every sector, to help them decarbonize their operations. It includes steel. It includes cement. It also includes oil and gas. We're not going to abandon the sector and say, well, you deal with this on your own while we're ready and willing to help all the other sectors.

[*Translation*]

CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION INITIATIVES

Hon. René Cormier: In my region, Atlantic Canada, we are very concerned about soil erosion and its impact on ports and shipping. How is your department working with Transport Canada and Public Safety Canada to support small ports, especially in regions like the Acadian Peninsula, so that this infrastructure can adapt to climate change?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change: Thank you for your question, senator. Erosion is obviously linked to rising sea levels, which is one of the most obvious and well-documented impacts of climate change.

We are working with the Department of Transport and with Infrastructure Canada to develop Canada's first national climate change adaptation plan, which includes a section specifically on infrastructure.

Solutions do exist, and sometimes they fall within the federal government's jurisdiction, sometimes that of the provinces or municipalities. That is why we want to work with all levels of government and other interested parties who have some knowledge of the issue in order to move towards adaptation.

It is clear that when it comes to climate change adaptation, the federal government can't do everything. That's why we need to work in partnership, as we are doing with the B.C. government. After the floods in that province, we created a joint committee made up of several departments, from both levels of government, that are responsible for matters related to transport, infrastructure, the environment and natural resources.

We are hoping to replicate this across the country, so that Canada is better prepared to deal with the impacts of climate change.

[*English*]

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, the time for Question Period has expired. I'm sure all senators would like to join me in thanking Minister Guilbeault for being with us today. We look forward to seeing you again sometime in the near future, minister. Thank you.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

DELAYED ANSWERS TO ORAL QUESTIONS

(*For text of Delayed Answers, see Appendix.*)

ORDERS OF THE DAY

BUSINESS OF THE SENATE

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, before calling for the resumption of the bells, I call upon Senator Plett.

Hon. Donald Neil Plett (Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, we did call for an adjournment earlier. There was clearly some scrambling going on all morning. It hadn't been finished when Senator Gold presented his motion.

I saw there was only one avenue open for us at that time, and that was to call for a bell so that we could continue talking about the things we had been talking about. That happened very quickly after we suspended.

Your honour, if it's all right with the chamber, if the chamber would give me leave, I would withdraw the motion to adjourn and would be happy to continue debate and, hopefully, be able to hear from Senator Gold.

EMERGENCIES ACT

APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE—MESSAGE FROM COMMONS—MOTION IN MODIFICATION ADOPTED

On the Order:

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

That:

- (a) pursuant to subsection 62(1) of the *Emergencies Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. 22, a special joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons be established to review the exercise of powers and the performance of duties and functions pursuant to a declaration of emergency that was in effect from Monday, February 14, 2022, to Wednesday, February 23, 2022, including the provisions as specified in subsections 62(5) and (6) of the act;
- (b) the committee be composed of four members of the Senate, including one senator from the Opposition, one senator from the Independent Senators Group, one senator from the Progressive Senate Group, and one senator from the Canadian Senators Group, and seven members of the House of Commons, including three members of the House of Commons from the governing party, two members of the House of Commons from the official opposition, one member from the Bloc Québécois and one member from the New Democratic Party, with three chairs, of which the Senate chair shall be a senator from the Independent Senators Group and the two House chairs shall be from the Bloc Québécois and the New Democratic Party;
- (c) in addition to the chairs, the committee shall elect two vice-chairs from the House, of whom the first vice-chair shall be from the governing party and the second vice-chair shall be from the official opposition party;
- (d) the four senators to be members of the committee be named by means of a notice signed by their respective leader or facilitator (or their respective designates), and filed with the Clerk of the Senate no later than 5:00 p.m. on the day after this motion is adopted, failing which, the leader or facilitator of any party or group identified in paragraph (b) who has not filed the name of a senator with the Clerk of the Senate, shall be deemed to be the senator named to the committee, with the names of the senators named as members being recorded in the *Journals of the Senate*;
- (e) the quorum of the committee be seven members whenever a vote, resolution or other decision is taken, so long as one member of the Senate, one member of the governing party in the House of Commons and

one member from the opposition in the House of Commons are present, and the chairs be authorized to hold meetings, to receive evidence and authorize the publishing thereof, whenever five members are present, so long as one member of the Senate, one member of the governing party in the House of Commons and one member from the opposition in the House of Commons are present;

- (f) changes to the membership of the committee on the part of the Senate be made in accordance with rule 12-5 of the *Rules of the Senate*, provided that any new members or participating senators take the oath of secrecy pursuant to paragraph (g) of this order before participating in proceedings;
- (g) pursuant to subsection 62(3) of the act, every member and person employed in the work of the committee, which includes personnel who, in supporting the committee's work or a committee member's work, have access to the committee's proceedings or documents, take the oath of secrecy as set out in the schedule of the act;
- (h) every meeting of the committee held to consider an order or regulation referred to it pursuant to subsection 61(2) of the act be held in camera, pursuant to subsection 62(4) of the same act, and the evidence and documents received by the committee related to these meetings not be made public;
- (i) for greater certainty, the chairs may move motions and vote on all items before the committee, and any vote resulting in a tie vote shall mean that the item is negated;
- (j) all documents tabled in the Senate pursuant to the act since February 21, 2022, be referred to the committee;
- (k) until the committee ceases to exist or on Thursday, June 23, 2022, whichever is earlier,
 - (i) where applicable, the provisions contained in paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of the order adopted by the Senate on February 10, 2022, respecting senators on standing joint committees, shall apply to senators on this committee, and the committee shall hold meetings in person where necessary to consider any matter referred to it pursuant to subsection 61(2) of the act; and
 - (ii) senators, members and departmental and parliamentary officials appearing as witnesses before the committee may do so in person, as may any witness appearing with respect to any matter referred to it pursuant to subsection 61(2) of the act;
- (l) the committee have the power to:
 - (i) meet during sittings and adjournments of the Senate;

- (ii) report from time to time, including pursuant to the provisions included in subsection 62(6) of the act, to send for persons, papers and records, and to publish such papers and evidence as may be ordered by the committee;
- (iii) retain the services of expert, professional, technical and clerical staff, including legal counsel;
- (iv) appoint, from among its members such subcommittees as may be deemed appropriate and to delegate to such subcommittees all or any of its powers, except the power to report to the Senate and House of Commons; and
- (v) authorize video and audio broadcasting of any or all of its public proceedings and to make them available to the public via the Parliament of Canada's websites; and
- (m) a report of the committee may be deposited with the Clerk of the Senate at any time the Senate stands adjourned, and that any report so deposited may be deposited electronically, with the report being deemed to have been presented or tabled in the Senate; and
- (c) in addition to the chairs, the committee shall elect two vice-chairs from the House, of whom the first vice-chair shall be from the governing party and the second vice-chair shall be from the official opposition party, and one deputy chair from the Senate who shall be from the Opposition;
- (d) the four senators to be members of the committee be named by means of a notice signed by their respective leader or facilitator (or their respective designates), and filed with the Clerk of the Senate no later than 5:00 p.m. on the day after this motion is adopted, failing which, the leader or facilitator of any party or group identified in paragraph (b) who has not filed the name of a senator with the Clerk of the Senate, shall be deemed to be the senator named to the committee, with the names of the senators named as members being recorded in the *Journals of the Senate*;
- (e) the quorum of the committee be seven members whenever a vote, resolution or other decision is taken, so long as one member of the Senate, one member of the governing party in the House of Commons and one member from the opposition in the House of Commons are present, and the chairs be authorized to hold meetings, to receive evidence and authorize the publishing thereof, whenever five members are present, so long as one member of the Senate, one member of the governing party in the House of Commons and one member from the opposition in the House of Commons are present;

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

Hon. Marc Gold (Government Representative in the Senate): Honourable senators, pursuant to rule 5-10(1), I ask leave of the Senate to modify the motion so that it reads as follows:

That:

- (a) pursuant to subsection 62(1) of the *Emergencies Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. 22, a special joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons be established to review the exercise of powers and the performance of duties and functions pursuant to a declaration of emergency that was in effect from Monday, February 14, 2022, to Wednesday, February 23, 2022, including the provisions as specified in subsections 62(5) and (6) of the act;
- (b) the committee be composed of four members of the Senate, including one senator from the Opposition, one senator from the Independent Senators Group, one senator from the Progressive Senate Group, and one senator from the Canadian Senators Group, and seven members of the House of Commons, including three members of the House of Commons from the governing party, two members of the House of Commons from the official opposition, one member from the Bloc Québécois and one member from the New Democratic Party, with three chairs, of which the Senate chair shall be a senator from the Independent Senators Group and the two House chairs shall be from the Bloc Québécois and the New Democratic Party;
- (f) changes to the membership of the committee on the part of the Senate be made in accordance with rule 12-5 of the *Rules of the Senate*, provided that any new members or participating senators take the oath of secrecy pursuant to paragraph (g) of this order before participating in proceedings;
- (g) pursuant to subsection 62(3) of the act, every member and person employed in the work of the committee, which includes personnel who, in supporting the committee's work or a committee member's work, have access to the committee's proceedings or documents, take the oath of secrecy as set out in the schedule of the act;
- (h) every meeting of the committee held to consider an order or regulation referred to it pursuant to subsection 61(2) of the act be held in camera, pursuant to subsection 62(4) of the same act, and the evidence and documents received by the committee related to these meetings not be made public;
- (i) for greater certainty, the chairs may move motions and vote on all items before the committee, and any vote resulting in a tie vote shall mean that the item is negated;
- (j) all documents tabled in the Senate pursuant to the act since February 21, 2022, be referred to the committee;

- (k) until the committee ceases to exist or on Thursday, June 23, 2022, whichever is earlier,
- (i) where applicable, the provisions contained in paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of the order adopted by the Senate on February 10, 2022, respecting senators on standing joint committees, shall apply to senators on this committee, and the committee shall hold meetings in person where necessary to consider any matter referred to it pursuant to subsection 61(2) of the act; and
 - (ii) senators, members and departmental and parliamentary officials appearing as witnesses before the committee may do so in person, as may any witness appearing with respect to any matter referred to it pursuant to subsection 61(2) of the act;
- (l) the committee have the power to:
- (i) meet during sittings and adjournments of the Senate;
 - (ii) report from time to time, including pursuant to the provisions included in subsection 62(6) of the act, to send for persons, papers and records, and to publish such papers and evidence as may be ordered by the committee;
 - (iii) retain the services of expert, professional, technical and clerical staff, including legal counsel;
 - (iv) appoint, from among its members such subcommittees as may be deemed appropriate and to delegate to such subcommittees all or any of its powers, except the power to report to the Senate and House of Commons; and
 - (v) authorize video and audio broadcasting of any or all of its public proceedings and to make them available to the public via the Parliament of Canada's websites; and
- (m) a report of the committee may be deposited with the Clerk of the Senate at any time the Senate stands adjourned, and that any report so deposited may be deposited electronically, with the report being deemed to have been presented or tabled in the Senate; and

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

The Hon. the Speaker: Is leave granted, honourable senators?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Senator Gold: Honourable senators, I rise today to speak to the motion before you regarding the joint parliamentary review committee that is mandated under section 62(1) of the Emergencies Act which states that a special joint committee of

the Senate and the House of Commons be established to review “the exercise of powers and the performance of duties and functions pursuant to a declaration of emergency”

The motion before you mirrors the one passed in the other place Wednesday evening. It is self-explanatory. It lays out the membership of the joint committee as it pertains to the Senate.

The invocation of the Emergencies Act on February 14 — for the first time in Canadian history since the inception of the act in 1988 — was historic. As the invocation of the Emergencies Act was historic, so too is the establishment of the joint parliamentary review committee to study and assess the circumstances surrounding the invocation of the act.

Because the committee is required to report to both houses of Parliament within seven sitting days after the revocation of the declaration by the Governor-in-Council, it now falls on the Senate to adopt a corresponding motion as was passed by the other place.

I ask honourable colleagues to adopt the motion expeditiously so that the committee can get to work and perform its due diligence for Canadians.

The motion that was passed in the other place lays out the parameters and makeup of the committee. When the Emergencies Act was debated in the Senate in 1988, there was a worry that the government and the House of Commons would move to include piecemeal Senate representation. What if, it was argued by honourable senators, the House of Commons chose to include only one senator? This would be unfair to the Senate.

Today, in 2022, I'm very pleased to see that the government proposed to the house a fair and proportionate Senate representation of four out of 11 members on this important committee, including a co-chair. I was even more pleased to see the House endorse our chamber's role with votes in support coming from three of the four parties in the House.

The motion before you provides for the fair and proportionate representation of senators from each party or group in the chamber. It is designed to uphold the basic principles of group equity and fairness by ensuring that all Senate groups have the opportunity to select a senator.

As a reflection of the principle of proportionality, the motion provides that the senators selected from the Independent Senators Group will occupy the position of Senate co-chair. The Government Representative Office in the Senate will not be seeking a seat on the committee.

As some may argue that the literal wording of the Emergencies Act, section 62(2) — which states:

The Parliamentary Review Committee shall include at least one member of the House of Commons from each party that has a recognized membership of twelve or more persons in that House and at least one senator from each party in the Senate that is represented on the committee by a member of the House of Commons.

— precludes the appointment of non-politically affiliated senators.

In advance of any argument to that effect from honourable colleagues, let me quote the Honourable Senator Perrin Beatty, then Minister of Defence, in his testimony in front of the Senate committee studying the Emergencies Act legislation in 1988.

In response to a question put by former senator John Benjamin Stewart, Minister Beatty stated:

Senator, in designing this particular provision of the bill, we did not attempt to fix what would be the absolute number of members from the House of Commons, for that matter. We did try to provide that there would be representation from each of the political parties in the House of Commons. It would also be possible, presumably, that representation of the Senate might involve independent senators. One would hope that reasonableness would apply in any case where the two houses are called together to meet with one another.

In many elements of parliamentary and constitutional procedure in the past we have resisted setting up very rigid structures which are not capable of being adapted to particular circumstances. I do not think it is unreasonable to expect there would be goodwill in a national crisis or that reasonableness would apply.

• (1610)

Colleagues, we have a duty to Canadians to see to it that the Joint Parliamentary Committee charged with reviewing and studying the rationale and merit of the government's invocation of the Emergencies Act on February 14 is constituted as quickly as possible. Each caucus and group can nominate one of its own without influence or dictum by the government. Senate members of the committee will undoubtedly bring experience, insight and wisdom to the committee's deliberations.

The invocation of the Emergencies Act requires, by law, examination. The intent of the motion before you is to safeguard the plurality and diversity of voices. Former Minister Beatty himself, 34 years ago, went so far as to predict that independent senators would have seats on this committee if and when the need for its composition should ever transpire.

Colleagues, there is now a need, and I ask that this motion be approved so that the work may begin. Thank you very much.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Donald Neil Plett (Leader of the Opposition): Your Honour, I want to start off by thanking the Government Representative in the Senate for his collaboration today. I want to thank Senators Saint-Germain, Cordy and Tannas for agreeing to what Senator Gold now put into his amendment. It's great when we can work together and make deals, and I believe that we have done that. I believe that the Senate, during this time over the last week, has shown the absolute need for this chamber. I would say that this chamber did a much better job on the Emergencies Act than they did in the other place.

I believe overall the collaboration here is much better than it is in the other place, and so I thank all honourable senators. I believe that the reason the Prime Minister came to his senses and revoked the Emergencies Act was because of the debate going on here in the Senate. I believe that cooler heads prevailed, and they saw the senselessness of having an Emergencies Act when there was no emergency.

However, we are tasked, as Senator Gold says, with studying this as a committee. We can say all we want that this is the way it should be — that this is the way a committee should be struck. When the act was struck, we did not have the kind of a Senate that we do now. We had a Senate that was basically made up of two political parties: the Conservative Party of Canada and the Liberal Party of Canada.

When they struck the Act, saying that there needed to be a senator in the chamber from all parties that were being represented in the House of Commons, they believed those would be the Conservative Party of Canada and the Liberal Party of Canada. It doesn't matter what we say about the Senate now. That is what they believed at that time because that is the type of a Senate that we had.

So we now have a different type of a Senate, and we just simply decide to interpret what these people back in the 1980s wrote. Be that as it may, we live in — as they say — new and interesting times.

I'm always troubled when our government leader here refers to how they voted in the other house and always forgets to talk about the numbers of votes and the debates.

The fact of the matter is that the Conservative house leader in the other place came forward with a very, very reasonable amendment to what the government was proposing. The government had proposed that the two smallest groups in the house take the co-chairs. They did it for one reason and one reason only. They were trying to exclude the Conservative Party of Canada from being one of the co-chairs there. It was evident. Nobody can deny that. They did a good job of that. They browbeat Jagmeet Singh as the Prime Minister did with his threat of a confidence vote. Here again is something the leader failed to mention when he talked about how the other house had voted. He failed to mention that a minority Parliament threatened an election if another group would not support his demands.

Last night, the other place voted down our house leader's amendment. Not with all the parties; with two parties. The Bloc — bless them for it — were given a co-chair position by the governing party, and they were willing to give up that co-chair position because they thought the right thing would be that the Conservatives have at least one co-chair. They were prepared to give up their co-chair position so that the Conservatives in the Senate could then have the co-chair.

For the Bloc to give that up obviously took a little bit of doing. That isn't being mentioned here. What isn't being mentioned here is that we have a government in the other house that is trying to take away the rights of a party that got more votes in the last election and in the election before than any other party. Yet, they're not supposed to have a co-chair position. Why? Because the government is afraid of what is going to come forward if all

of sudden the Conservatives have too many people and too much power in a committee, which they should have as the official opposition.

Let me tell you, colleagues, we are going to accept this motion — this amendment — on division, but we will accept what Senator Gold has brought forward because I really believe Senator Gold has done his job in trying to reach an amicable solution. I appreciate him for that. As I said, I appreciate the three other leaders collaborating and saying they agree that we should have that.

I do not believe we're getting what we should be getting, but listen, you don't always get what you think you should be getting or what's fair. In this case, that is my belief.

I don't want the words that I am saying here about the other place to be a reflection of what I believe in this place. I believe we did a good job. I believe we did a great job on both sides of the debate. I listened to senators on both sides of the debate, and we had good arguments here. At the end of the day — as I said — I believe the Prime Minister was reading the tea leaves and said, "I'm better off withdrawing this before I get 45 or 46 senators all of sudden voting the wrong way in the Senate." We're going to take credit for that. Whatever you say, you can't take that credit away from us.

I can stand here and say it's us. I can stand here and say it was Senator Wells's speech or my speech that turned the tide, and we'll take credit. We're politicians. Justin Trudeau can come along and tell us why he actually did it. Until he does, we'll take the credit, colleagues.

Having said that, thank you Senators Gold, Saint-Germain, Cordy and Tannas for your collaboration here today. I think it goes a long way in showing how we want to work together, but I do not want anybody to believe that for one second I accept what the Liberal Party of Canada and the government tried to do in that other place and, as a matter of fact, got away with it.

On that note, I do apologize to you, Senator Gold, that I cannot vote in favour. However, we will allow this to go on division.

Thank you very much, colleagues.

The Hon. the Speaker: Senator Gold, do you have a question?

Senator Gold: Would the senator take a question.

Senator Plett: Certainly.

Senator Gold: I'm going to frame this in the form of a question, though there is a comment buried in it, so I'll try to use my skills. Senator Plett, we are all entitled to our beliefs as to what might have motivated the Prime Minister and the cabinet to conclude that the emergency was over. Would you not agree that the statements that I've made in this chamber and advice is equally, if not more, plausible, might I suggest, that in fact as I advised the chamber, that the government, having monitored on a regular basis the evolution of things, taking advice as it did from security and police experts and consultation with the cabinet, in fact, came to that conclusion that the emergency was no longer

needed independent of the debate? And, in fact, I can say that the government remained confident that, in fact, the Senate would have ultimately approved it.

• (1620)

But would you not agree that that is a plausible explanation for why, as I had said, the government took the decision that it did?

Senator Plett: Let me answer that this way, Senator Gold. I made a speech in the Senate that was one hour and 27 minutes long. When I was done, I walked upstairs, because I actually thought maybe I had earned a drink. I broke my doctor's orders, as I thought I deserved something. As I was sitting in my office, after speaking here for one hour and 27 minutes, as I was sitting in my third-floor office, and as Senator Wells was here continuing the debate, that was when CBC mentioned that the Prime Minister was about to have a news conference. As I was sitting there enjoying my drink, his entourage, his protest, his convoy, drove by my window. The timing, Senator Gold, was impeccable.

Senator Gold, I have received no less than 8,000 messages, addressed to me personally, thanking the Conservative caucus for killing this. I will take their word.

The Hon. the Speaker: Senator McPhedran, did you wish to ask a question or enter debate?

Hon. Marilou McPhedran: I wanted to ask Senator Plett if he would be willing to accept a question? Thank you.

On the theme of you don't always get what you want, my question is: Do you interpret, in particular, Senator Gold's reference to the former Minister Beatty, at the time of the act, and whether you interpret the current situation as excluding any possibility of an independent, non-affiliated senator to be considered for membership on this committee?

Senator Plett: Senator McPhedran, I cannot possibly think that Perrin Beatty wanted anybody but Conservatives and Liberals on this committee ever, regardless of what has been said here. So as I said, we all have opinions, and the rights to them. As I said in my speech, and I was quoting somebody, but I will defend to the death your right to have that opinion. I have mine.

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

Hon. Senators: Question.

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

Some Hon. Senators: Agreed.

An Hon. Senator: On division.

(Motion as modified agreed to, on division.)

[Translation]

ROYAL ASSENT

The Hon. the Speaker informed the Senate that the following communication had been received:

RIDEAU HALL

March 3, 2022

Mr. Speaker,

I have the honour to inform you that the Right Honourable Mary May Simon, Governor General of Canada, signified royal assent by written declaration to the bill listed in the Schedule to this letter on the 3rd day of March, 2022, at 3:43 p.m.

Yours sincerely,

Ian McCowan

Secretary to the Governor General and Herald Chancellor

The Honourable
The Speaker of the Senate
Ottawa

Bill Assented to Thursday, March 3, 2022:

An Act to amend the Old Age Security Act (Guaranteed Income Supplement) (*Bill C-12, Chapter 1, 2022*)

[English]

FOOD DAY IN CANADA BILL

SECOND READING

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Black, seconded by the Honourable Senator Griffin, for the second reading of Bill S-227, An Act to establish Food Day in Canada.

Hon. Rose-May Poirier: I will continue from where I left off.

With Bill S-227, An Act to establish Food Day in Canada, as proposed by Senator Black, we are celebrating our local food, but it is also an occasion to strengthen our bonds with our neighbours.

We are encouraging you to support your local food markets, your local farmers, because they are integral to our communities. What better way to spend a Saturday morning picking up fresh produce for the week, a prepared meal for the day and, by doing so, supporting your community.

It is important to strengthen the bond between farmers and Canadians, because when we need them, they are there for us. And so, to show our appreciation for what they do for us, a day like the one Senator Black is proposing is an excellent way to say thank you to them. In a time where we as a society are trying to be greener and more environmentally friendly, supporting local food is one way that we can also support our local environment.

According to a study by the Columbia Climate School, buying local food could reduce the average consumer's greenhouse gas emissions by 4% to 5%. But more importantly, according to the same study, small farmers already adopt environmentally friendly practices. They often rebuild crop and insect diversity, use less pesticides, enrich the soil with cover crops and, most importantly, produce tastier food.

Finally, I want to share a bit more about the local in my community. By living on New Brunswick's east coast, our local food is more from fishing, as we have a lot of fishing communities. So on the first day of the lobster fishery in the spring, a lot of people gather at the wharf to see the boats off for the first time in the season. Around Mother's Day weekend, the tradition is to have lobster; it coincides with the first harvest. At the centre of this tradition in my community is the lobster. It is one of the many examples of how food brings people together. It creates bonds between us and gives a strong sense of belonging.

• (1630)

Honourable senators, local food keeps local land in production, local money in our community, often costs less and builds community relationships. Let's take a moment to recognize the crucial contribution local farms make to our communities and have a food day every year to thank and support them. I support this bill and urge senators to send it to the committee for further study. Thank you.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to and bill read second time.)

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

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

(On motion of Senator Griffin, for Senator Black, bill referred to the Standing Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.)

**EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT
EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE REGULATIONS**

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. Diane F. Griffin moved second reading of Bill S-236, An Act to amend the Employment Insurance Act and the Employment Insurance Regulations (Prince Edward Island).

She said: Honourable senators, I rise today to speak to Bill S-236, An Act to amend the Employment Insurance Act and the Employment Insurance Regulations (Prince Edward Island). This will be the very last time I speak to a bill in this chamber during my tenure as a senator. This bill serves as a coda for my Prince Edward Island advocacy but, more importantly, it serves as an opportunity for senators to champion a cause for Canada's smallest province.

Last spring, I spoke to Senator Gold's inquiry on the 2021 federal budget to bring the Senate's attention to the flawed policy of two Employment Insurance regions in Prince Edward Island. The 2021 Budget Implementation Act entrenched in statute this unnecessary division of my province. Since 2015, the vast majority of Islanders have repeatedly called for change under the simple mantra of "one island, one zone."

The division of P.E.I. into two economic zones creates a fundamental unfairness for workers, especially those who live in the Charlottetown zone but work outside the capital region. For example, this February, workers who lived in the capital region had a minimum of 14 weeks of benefits, while those who lived in the non-capital region had 20. Many folks who work for the same company will have widely different benefits simply because of an arbitrary dividing line of where they live.

Senators, I am thankful for your collective support last spring, and especially to Senator Mockler in his capacity as the chair of the National Finance Committee for inviting the mayors of Charlottetown, Stratford and Cornwall to speak to this issue during the committee's pre-study of the BIA. In a sign of bicameral advocacy, our proceedings inspired Green Party MP Elizabeth May to move an amendment to the House of Commons Finance Committee to unify Prince Edward Island into one EI economic region. Although Elizabeth May's efforts did not secure sufficient votes to pass, the entire episode brought new information to light.

The government provided several reasons why it could not support the amendment to the BIA last year. The first was Employment and Social Development Canada's antiquated computer systems, which operate the EI program. At the time, officials indicated that it was not possible for the EI system to have a single EI zone for seasonal workers and two zones for regular EI applicants. Further, in the ministerial briefing binder, the government said that due to temporary COVID measures

artificially increasing unemployment rates, a change in the spring of 2021 was not warranted as the two regions were de facto temporarily the same.

Honourable senators, those temporary measures have expired and this bill would solve the computer system issue by amending both the Employment Insurance Act and the regulations at the same time. It would further prevent the federal cabinet from making regulatory changes to P.E.I.'s EI zone without future parliamentary approval.

For over seven years, the federal government has promised Islanders a return to one EI zone, and this change has often been premised under the framework of a larger review of the EI system. Most recently, ESDC indicated in December 2021 that the review is ongoing, but there was no mention of changing the EI regions.

In a June 2021 report, the House of Commons Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities, chaired by Charlottetown MP Sean Casey, issued a separate recommendation that ESDC, "reinstate a single Employment Insurance Economic Region for Prince Edward Island within 12 months." Eight months have now passed with no response from the government.

Honourable senators, in the best of times it is difficult for matters impacting P.E.I. to be satisfactorily elevated for a decision at the federal cabinet level. I only have to remind you of the ongoing pleas by both farmers and the Government of Prince Edward Island for more direct involvement by the federal government in ending Canada's self-imposed P.E.I. potato export ban. As is often the case, the ever-growing House of Commons gradually lessens the influence of P.E.I.'s four members of Parliament.

Local politics also frustrates a return to one EI zone. P.E.I.'s westernmost riding of Egmont is the only riding exclusively outside of the Charlottetown zone. It is understandable for any MP of any political stripe representing Egmont to defend the status quo, as it could result in a reduction of benefits for their constituents. This lack of unanimity of Island MPs has complicated a return to one zone. Cabinet does not wish to cause political turmoil and thus far has not taken action despite multiple electoral promises to do so.

• (1640)

This issue may not be the most important issue facing the country; however, it is important to the renter in Charlottetown, to the recent immigrant in Cornwall and to the seasonal worker who lives in Stratford but works at a fish plant outside of the area. Therefore, this issue is important to me.

Why is this bill before us in the Senate? As stated much earlier today by Senator Plett, the Senate is free from the day-to-day burden of electoral considerations. We can examine the return to one Employment Insurance, or EI, zone in more detail in committee and amend the bill to ensure a proper coming-into-force alignment with Economic and Social Development Canada computer systems. If the Senate chooses to send this bill to the House of Commons, it will, for the first time, force the other

place to consider the idea of one EI zone for Prince Edward Island via an up-down vote, without the need to balance other national priorities.

I strongly support Senator Pate's goal to have Prince Edward Island serve as a pilot for guaranteed livable income. But until that day arrives, EI is very much the social safety net of Islanders — not by choice, but by necessity. Consequently, there is a moral obligation to do what we can in Parliament to ensure that Employment Insurance is fair for all Islanders.

Honourable senators, as I mentioned earlier today, it is a privilege to have served with you over the last five and a third years. It is my hope that Bill S-236 can serve as a reminder of this important P.E.I. issue long after my retirement.

Prince Edward Island is the smallest province, but it is also an equal partner in Confederation. I encourage any of you in this chamber to help champion this important provincial cause, with the goal of sending the bill to the House of Commons. It is a way for the Senate to serve one of its constitutional roles of giving a voice to regional interests, especially for regions with smaller populations. Thank you.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Pat Duncan: Will Senator Griffin take a question?

Senator Griffin: Most certainly.

Senator Duncan: Thank you, Senator Griffin, for your incredible service to Prince Edward Island and to this chamber. We so appreciate your contribution and all that you have done, and we would like to thank you and your family.

Also being from a small part of the country, your arguments today truly resonate with me. The unfairness of the situation strikes me as untenable in our country. It further strengthens Senator Downe's argument about decentralization so that the individuals who are creating programs have an appreciation of the country, and perhaps one size does not fit all.

Without causing any undue delay, my question, Senator Griffin, is this: How can we help you? To whom are you assigning the task of taking this forward?

Senator Griffin: That is one of the things I have not assigned as yet. Many other things have been hived off. But there will be discussions. Are you volunteering, perhaps?

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: You have to ask a question, not answer it.

Senator Duncan: I will ask a question. If Senator Griffin would care to devolve that responsibility, it would be an honour and a privilege.

Senator Griffin: In answer to that question, I accept. That would be wonderful. Thank you so much.

Hon. Kim Pate: Would Senator Griffin take another question?

Senator Griffin: Certainly.

Senator Pate: Thank you very much. Before I ask my question — which you sort of answered, but sometimes I can be a bit slow, so I will make sure I clearly understood — I want to take this opportunity to say a few words.

In addition to your golfing, birdwatching and hosting of incredible dinners of goose and lobster, to your incredible collegiality and your kind and generous offers for all of us to come and visit — which, as you know, I have taken you up on several times — I want to thank you for the incredible work you have done historically in P.E.I. When I visited there, I realized that it was you who had developed all of this recycling that led the country in many ways and led many of the environmental initiatives. That was fantastic, and then to see the work you have done in your local community, but also provincially, regionally and now nationally. It has been such a privilege and honour to be your colleague for the last five years, and I know I share that sentiment with everyone else in this place.

I wanted to confirm, just to be clear. You're very keen, I think, and my question is this: Are you hoping that Charlottetown and P.E.I. will now be the birthplace of yet another incredible national rollout that could be a plan for the country and one that illustrates the brilliance of Prince Edward Island to have led the way in demanding a guaranteed livable basic income?

Senator Griffin: Thank you for the question. Yes. The premier and the legislature have unanimously endorsed the concept of elimination of poverty by working in collaboration with the federal government to institute a guaranteed livable income. Prince Edward Island would be the test spot to run it out, work out the kinks and then — to use a Senator Deacon phrase — scale it up to the rest of the country.

(On motion of Senator Wells, debate adjourned.)

[*Translation*]

CRIMINAL CODE CANADIAN VICTIMS BILL OF RIGHTS

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. Pierre-Hugues Boisvenu moved second reading of Bill S-238, An Act to amend the Criminal Code and the Canadian Victims Bill of Rights (information about the victim).

He said: Honourable senators, my thoughts are with the families of victims of crime as I rise today to speak at second reading stage of Bill S-238, An Act to amend the Criminal Code and the Canadian Victims Bill of Rights (information about the victim).

This bill, which I introduced in the last Parliament, is more important than ever, because it honours the memory of the victims and ensures respect for their families.

This bill bears the name of a victim of domestic violence who perished at the hands of her husband, as so many women in Canada do. Her name was Véronique Barbe, and this bill is dedicated to her memory and the memory of far too many victims of crime.

I would have liked to show you her photo today, but the Senate Rules do not allow me to do so. It is very important to put a face to a victim, because unfortunately, they are often forgotten too quickly.

Véronique Barbe was a 41-year-old woman, a mother whose life tragically ended on September 14, 2017, when she was killed by her husband at their home in Saint-Eustache, in Québec. I also want to pay tribute to Yvon Lacasse, who was also brutally murdered by this same murderer during his deadly rampage.

According to her mother Claudette and her father Pierre, Véronique Barbe was a smiling, happy and loving woman. She loved life and shared her happiness and love with her children, who were always her top priority.

• (1650)

According to her mother, Véronique was a caring mother who spoiled her children, as her mother told me, and a ray of sunshine to the whole family. Her sense of humour enlivened family meals.

Unfortunately, like many women in Canada, Véronique was a victim of domestic abuse and found herself unwillingly trapped in a downward spiral for many years, dominated by a violent spouse. She had previously taken steps to contact the police, seven years before she was murdered. In 2010, she began reporting what was happening to her, including the episodes of violence. These serious incidents of physical and psychological abuse should have been taken seriously by the authorities at the time. Despite her cries for help, our criminal justice system failed to offer her assistance, protection or freedom from this toxic relationship.

In Quebec, 26 women were murdered in 2021, and the vast majority of these murders were committed in a context of domestic violence. This is the highest number since 2008. According to a preliminary report from the Canadian Femicide Observatory for Justice and Accountability, 160 women were killed in Canada in 2020, half of them in a domestic violence context. I want to reiterate that it is essential and urgent that the Senate study and quickly pass my Bill S-205, which seeks to combat the scourge of domestic violence. The preliminary data on femicides in 2021 clearly show that this number will be greatly surpassed.

Coming back to the case of Véronique Barbe, the murderer has since been convicted and is currently incarcerated. However, showing no respect for the memory of Véronique and her family, this coward continued to post images of himself and Véronique,

his victim, on his Facebook page, despite the family's many attempts to get the web giant to permanently shut down his account.

Facebook denied the family's many requests without explanation. Facebook did not respect the principles of the Canadian Victims Bill of Rights, which is a supra-constitutional law in Canada. It took a lot of media pressure to get the murderer's profile taken down for good and to get Facebook to apologize to the family. I want to thank *Le Journal de Montréal* for also denouncing Facebook for its lack of cooperation and for helping the family prevail over this web giant. Apologies do not go far enough to ease the pain of Véronique's family, who had to fight hard to get that Facebook account shut down out of respect for their daughter. It was outrageous for the murderer to do this, and it was a serious failure on the part of Facebook.

I would like to quote a statement made by Véronique's mother about this bill. She said:

It was very hard on the family to see photos of Véronique with her murderer on social media, but with Senator Boisvenu's help, we managed to close his account on Facebook with this long-awaited bill. I am grateful that it is named in honour of Véronique. Victims of crime and their families have the right to expect respect for any information and images pertaining to them.

I also heard from a father in Montreal who lived through a terrible family tragedy almost two years ago. This man lost his 11-year-old daughter, who was murdered, sadly. This bill is also dedicated to the memory of that girl. The man's second daughter, just five years old, was almost killed, and she'll be traumatized for life by these tragic events that should never have happened. The girls' mother, who was found not criminally responsible for these crimes, still has a Facebook profile and still posts pictures of her murdered daughter, which causes the father much suffering and rage.

I would like to share a moving statement he sent me, which is addressed to this house. He said:

Today, I just want to share what my two daughters mean to me. They have been my everything since the day they were born. They were and will always be my greatest pride and my most wonderful accomplishment. I've never made anything as beautiful, as good, as wonderful or as important. In other words, my life revolved exclusively around my two girls, and they are the ones who truly taught me to love and to give unconditionally. I also want to say that I somehow found enough strength — and love — inside me to take care of myself and my youngest daughter, who is still in shock, and to keep doing what I've always done for my girls: defend and protect them. That's why I have spoken to the media numerous times to condemn the sharing of photos of my daughters on social media sites . . . of the accused and her family.

For many people, posting pictures of their children on social media sites like Facebook is totally normal. But for me, for us victims, the fact that pictures are being posted of my two daughters, especially the one who was killed, is intolerable, hurtful, painful and even revolting, since I believe, in

addition to the flagrant lack of respect towards the memory, the life and the legacy of my deceased daughter, that the images of my two daughters, who are minors and victims of an extremely violent criminal act, should remain private and do not belong in the public sphere. . . . That being said, nearly two years after the tragedy, I still want to fight to protect the dignity, the image, the memory, as well as the integrity of my daughter who was killed, to speak only of her, because I miss her so much. . . . I therefore ask you today, very humbly, to pass Senator Boisvenu's bill, since it aims, first and foremost, to truly protect the dignity, memory and images of all victims of crime in Canada, by prohibiting and criminalizing the dissemination of their images and information on social media by criminals. As for my youngest, who survived, I keep telling her every day, "I love you."

It is in this context and at the request of these two families that I decided to introduce this bill to amend the Criminal Code and the Canadian Victims Bill of Rights in order to reinforce the right to better protection for victims and families in similar situations. The Association des familles de personnes assassinées ou disparues believes that this is an important bill that will guarantee the dignity and protect the memory of victims who are ruthlessly murdered.

This bill amends the Victims Bill of Rights by adding a paragraph to section 11, entitled "Privacy," which would require the criminal justice system to take measures to prohibit an offender from posting any images or information about their victim on the internet and on social media. This reinforcement will be included in the section on the right to protection in the Victims Bill of Rights. This bill also amends the Criminal Code to prohibit any offender or accused from posting images or information about their victim or keeping existing images of their victim on social media either during legal proceedings or after being convicted.

An accused or offender who is ordered to comply with such a ban or who commits to complying will be at risk of being indicted on new charges if they fail to comply. The burden will be on the accused or offender to remove any information, images or videos about the victim they may have posted. That way, the participation and collaboration of social media networks such as Facebook or other sites such as YouTube will no longer be required. This will undeniably be a major advantage for achieving the desired effect, because we all know that it is nearly impossible for victims and their families to get these social media networks to cooperate in taking down offensive content, despite existing internal policies on content distribution.

The changes to the Criminal Code will revolve around the addition of a section to every stage set out in the Criminal Code with respect to an accused's legal proceedings, including the issuance of an undertaking to appear by police, an interim release while awaiting trial ordered by a justice, detention pending a bail hearing, or detention during legal proceedings.

I believe that this new provision does not violate the constitutional protections afforded by the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and that a certain number of rulings along these lines

have already been made by the courts. These rulings have made it possible to impose restrictions on the freedom of expression of the accused to ensure safety and privacy for the victim.

• (1700)

I plan on doing the same with the Criminal Code section governing offenders convicted of a criminal offence, in particular for probation orders, conditional sentences and detention sentences. This new section also applies to everything concerning 810 orders, such as the general order, fear of forced marriage or marriage under the age of 16 years, fear of a sexual offence or where there is fear of serious personal injury.

To conclude, there is also a provision for a person found not criminally responsible. In that case, a review board is established and a hearing is held to determine the safety risk that the offender may represent and to impose conditions. I am of the opinion that the provision I am proposing must also be added to this section of the Criminal Code. I remind senators that the second case I mentioned in my speech involved a mother who was found not criminally responsible for the murder of her daughter.

Honourable senators, I would like to take this opportunity, as I did in my previous speech, to talk to you about the importance of improving the Canadian Victims Bill of Rights. As you know, I was the co-founder of the bill, which was passed nearly seven years ago in June 2015. For victims of crime, the Canadian Victims Bill of Rights is, first and foremost, a recognition of their rights within the criminal justice system. Let's not forget that this bill of rights is supra-constitutional and consists of four pillars based on four fundamental rights that actors in the criminal justice system have an obligation to uphold: the right to information, the right to participation, the right to protection and the right to restitution.

This bill that I am speaking to today is the only one in the past six and a half years that seeks to amend the Canadian Victims Bill of Rights to improve and enhance it. Unfortunately, according to the many accounts that I hear every week, this bill of rights is all too often applied inappropriately and not complied with, as in the example I shared about Facebook. It is therefore urgent that Parliament undertake the five-year review of the legislation and get victims to actively participate in this legislative exercise. I spoke to Minister David Lametti about this during a private meeting we had this morning.

Bill S-238 reminds us that we have a Victims Bill of Rights that has the force of law in Canada and applies equally regardless of gender, religion or community. Legislators like us must use it more, respect it more, and the Senate of Canada must ensure it is applied across the country out of respect for all victims of crime and their families.

Esteemed colleagues, I know you care about protecting and respecting victims' rights. That is why I invite and urge you to take part in improving the bill of rights by amending it every time you feel victims' rights were not respected. Victims should not have to fight hard, over and over, when there is already a tool that should keep victims and their loved ones from being re-victimized.

This morning, I also reminded the minister that it is unacceptable that victims and their families, like the ones in Portapique, do not have access to a government-appointed ombudsman. I think this situation sends a very negative message and shows that the government lacks empathy for victims and their families. Contrast that with the correctional investigator position, which has never been vacant for more than 24 hours.

In closing, honourable senators, in memory of Véronique Barbe, in memory of the young girl who lost her life at the tender age of 11, and in memory of the many other families of victims you may know, I ask you to pass the bill at second reading so it can be sent to the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs for prompt consideration.

Thank you.

(On motion of Senator Duncan, debate adjourned.)

[English]

INTERNAL ECONOMY, BUDGETS AND ADMINISTRATION

SECOND REPORT OF COMMITTEE—DEBATE ADJOURNED

The Senate proceeded to consideration of the second report of the Standing Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration, entitled *Senate Budget 2022-23*, presented in the Senate on February 24, 2022.

Hon. Sabi Marwah moved the adoption of the report.

He said: Honourable senators, this report deals with the Senate's budget for 2022-23. In summary, the anticipated budget is \$121.8 million, which is \$6.2 million or 5.4% over the 2021-22 budget. However, this includes \$2.6 million related to retroactive salary economic increases and \$800,000 for the reinstatement of committee budgets to pre-pandemic levels. Without these two large items, the year-over-year increase is much lower at 2.5%.

As background on the process of arriving at the budget, it is based on the recommendations of the Subcommittee on the Senate Estimates. The subcommittee is comprised of Senator Moncion, chair; Senator Marshall, deputy chair; and Senators Bovey, Saint-Germain and Tannas. I thank them for the substantial time and effort they have spent on reviewing the budget.

The members of the subcommittee met with the Senate Administration, the executive committee and the majority of directors on many occasions. Detailed presentations were made by the directorates to the subcommittee. The members had the opportunity to discuss and question funding requirements throughout the process.

Throughout its consideration of the Main Estimates, the committee took into consideration not only changes in the Senate but also the effects of the pandemic on the Senate's operations. The committee was also very mindful of the Canadian economic environment and the importance of balancing operational needs with proper stewardship of public funds.

As a result, the Main Estimates have been prepared with prudence to ensure that the level of Senate spending remains stable without compromising service to senators.

Moving to the details of expenditures, I would remind senators that there are two parts to the budget. One is statutory funding, and the other is the voted funding.

The statutory portion deals with money allocated by legislation. This includes senators' basic and additional allowances and pensions, senators' travel and living expenses, telecommunications and employee benefit plans. Any shortfalls in these categories at the end of the year are covered by the Treasury Board. Conversely, surpluses are automatically returned to the Treasury Board as they cannot be reassigned.

The second part of the budget is a voted budget which is for the workings of the Senate. They cover senators' office budgets and Senate administration. Moving briefly to the numbers, the total amount of the statutory budget is \$37.3 million, an increase of \$0.8 million or 2.2% from last year.

The main reason for the small increase is the senators' basic and additional allowances and pensions, which are increasing by around \$568,000 to reflect the increases that have been in place since April 1, 2021, and approved by legislation.

The other major increases are the living expenses budget, increased by \$101,000, and the contribution of the employee benefit plan, which rose by \$165,000. These were partly offset by the telecommunications budget, which was reduced by \$32,000 thanks to a collective effort to reduce the number of land lines.

Moving to the second part of the voted budget, this portion is \$84.5 million, an increase of \$5.5 million, or 6.9% over the previous year. As mentioned earlier, while this looks large, it includes retroactive salary increases from 2019 to 2021 of \$2.6 million and the reinstatement of the committee budgets to pre-pandemic levels.

Excluding these two large items, the year-over-year increase is much lower at \$2 million, or 2.6%.

The major components of the voted budget are: the overall senators' offices budget, which increased by \$484,000, or 2%; the Senate committees budget, which rose by \$810,000 to the funding levels that existed before the pandemic; the International and Inter-Parliamentary Affairs Directorate, which increased by \$329,000 to cover the cost of the fourth annual session of the *Assemblée Parlementaire de la Francophonie*; and an increase of \$176,000 for the Indigenous Youth Internship Program, which is expected to begin for the first time in the upcoming year.

• (1710)

Finally, the administration rose by \$3.6 million primarily due to four major items: \$2.6 million for retroactive economic increases from prior years; \$360,000 for nonrecurring savings that were achieved in 2021-22; new funding requests of \$521,000 mainly for additional software licences and operational expenses including in IT; and \$145,000 mainly to cover position reclassifications.

From a staffing standpoint, the budget includes a net increase of 6.5 positions. This is from 3.3 additional full-time equivalents for the International Aboriginal Youth Internships initiative and 3.2 positions for administration.

To conclude, I would once again like to thank the committee for their extensive work. They deserve a lot of credit.

A lot of credit also goes to Senate Administration and the executive committee, they approached the budget in a very thoughtful and prudent manner. I recommend that we adopt the report.

Thank you, colleagues.

[Translation]

Hon. Diane Bellemare: I have a question for Senator Marwah. I would like to hear your thoughts on some of the figures. I was a bit surprised when I looked at the tables.

Before that, however, I would like to hear your thoughts on the size of the International and Interparliamentary Affairs budget compared to the Senate committees budget. I thought the Senate Committees Directorate budget was larger than the International and Interparliamentary Affairs budget.

Can you briefly explain the substance of those differences? That is my first question.

[English]

Senator Marwah: Thank you for the question, Senator Bellemare. On the Senate committee budgets, they are exactly at the level they were pre-pandemic and that's \$2.3 million. Those are the numbers and the increases because, as I mentioned, we are taking back the committee budgets to pre-pandemic levels, assuming that committees will be able to operate fully and be functional for the balance of the year.

On the international and parliamentary affairs, keep in mind that those numbers are not just conferences, they include a whole bunch of other items, such as our share of the Senate of the IIA activities. As you know, we take 30% and the total cost is around \$1.4 million.

Then we have ongoing employees, around 10 employees, for a total cost of \$1.2 million, the contributions to parliamentary associations of around half a million. And then, of course, we have the additional conference this year of the Assemblée Parlementaire de la Francophonie of \$328,000 which is going to take place, approved by Internal Economy Committee, in October of last year.

Those are the major items in comparison of the two categories, senator.

[Translation]

Senator Bellemare: May I ask you another question?

[English]

Senator Marwah: Absolutely.

[Translation]

Senator Bellemare: My second question is about the estimated impact of hybrid meetings on the Senate and committees. If I understand correctly, our hybrid meetings and the investment in these telecommunication procedures may have led to a reduction in expenses? Does this mean it is actually costing less, not more? I would like to hear your comments on that.

[English]

Senator Marwah: Thank you for the question. I would remind the senator that the numbers that you see are from budget to budget. There are no actuals in it. The savings take place in the actuals. And there are substantial savings both last year, the year before and we expect in the coming year.

That's why you see the numbers the way they are. The actuals are substantially lower than these numbers.

Senator Bellemare: So there is a delineation of expenditures going hybrid?

Senator Marwah: Absolutely.

Hon. Denise Batters: I have a question as well, if Senator Marwah —

Senator Marwah: Yes.

Senator Batters: Thank you. Senator Marwah, I may have missed this in your speech, but I did hear you say that Senate Administration costs had gone up in this particular budget \$3.6 million. I point out that, of course, is despite the fact that we have had two years of a pandemic.

Could you please explain in a little bit more detail what major parts of that Senate Administration increase were?

Senator Marwah: Absolutely, senator.

I will remind you again that this is really budget to budget. Really, the savings come in much lower from an actual expense. From a budget to budget, as I mentioned, there are three categories. First is the Senate had to absorb the retroactive salary increases that we had at the beginning of last year. Second, there's a nonrecurring saving that occurred last year but is not occurring this year because we expect we will be back to full functioning for the balance of the year.

There are some additional expenses this year, mainly for IT, and one existing position in legal affairs and one other position. Those are the three major reasons why it's gone up year over year from a budget standpoint.

Senator Batters: From a FTE standpoint, where are we at right now? How much from the full-time equivalent standard have we increased or decreased over the last couple of years, being as we've had a pandemic for those two years as well?

Senator Marwah: Thank you, senator, for that question. I think last year there was an increase of six FTEs and this year there another six, of which three were for the Indigenous youth program and another three for staffing, one for communications officer that was brought back hoping that we will be full in service. There is a parliamentary. There is one staff in legal and one other staff that I don't recall exactly what it was; 6.6 last year and 3 for administration this year.

Senator Batters: What sort of total FTEs for Senate Administration then would there be?

Senator Marwah: I don't have the total. I'll gladly get that for you.

Hon. Frances Lankin: Thank you to Senator Marwah for that report.

One of the things that we know is a real challenge right now, even if we do come back to more regular in-person sittings, is to handle the committee work to allow for a continuation of people participating virtually online.

There are a few different issues. We are short on committee clerks, and we face a shortage of both space and resource allocation, the technical ability and translators back up to full committee sittings twice a week.

I'm very concerned about this. There's work that we can't get to in terms of Senate studies because, of course, our first priority is government legislation and then private legislation and then studies.

This is what I was going to call you and talk to you about. I'll just put it to you now. Could you tell us how the Internal Economy Committee is looking at this issue and what your plans are to progress, by allowing us to return to a full suite of the work opportunities, including some of that being done virtually? Thank you.

Senator Marwah: Thank you, senator, for that question.

The historical choke pattern has been because of lack of translation capacity and translators to do that work. Hence why that's been really the biggest constraint so far. On the committee clerks, the issue has always been how temporary or permanent is the situation we are in.

If we assume that it's going to be this way for the next couple of years, perhaps it's worthwhile investing in additional staff. If we assume we're going to go back to normal sometime later this year, which seems kind of overkill. That's a dilemma that we're always in — how permanent is the situation we're in? If we find out the situation is going to be hybrid and this way for the balance of this year, then perhaps Internal Economy will have to look at it.

Senator Lankin: Thank you again for that answer.

As I move forward at what things might look like — and that's what you are hedging bets on because we don't know — there's been a lot of talk among senators in various settings including potentially in the Rules Committee. We look at committee

structures and mandates and things like that, that there may be a virtual opportunity that is with us forever or maybe only for committee hearings. There's a lot of talk. It would seem to me to be a desire. Maybe we need the conversation to look at what our work will look like even if we are able to come back to full sittings. I would ask you to turn your mind to that.

With respect to the shortage of translators, this is a very significant and somewhat out-of-our-control problem. However, it's not my original idea. Another senator in discussion has raised the possibility of looking at the potential of funding an interpreters program to train and graduate interpreters to come up into the Senate? This is a budget we're talking about and not actuals. There may be some savings through the pandemic time that could be put into that for a period of time to try to increase the supply that is available to us here in the Senate.

• (1720)

Is that something you would take under advisement and perhaps look at?

Senator Marwah: Thank you, senator. I would point out that we have invested in additional capacity, both in terms of translation and in the booths that you see — and with additional capacity with the House. We share this with the House of Commons. But in terms of having permanent funding and a solution, I'm not sure how much that would cost. I'll certainly have someone take a look at it.

(On motion of Senator Wells, debate adjourned.)

THE SENATE

MOTION TO RECOGNIZE THAT CLIMATE CHANGE IS AN URGENT CRISIS—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Galvez, seconded by the Honourable Senator Forest:

That the Senate of Canada recognize that:

- (a) climate change is an urgent crisis that requires an immediate and ambitious response;
- (b) human activity is unequivocally warming the atmosphere, ocean and land at an unprecedented pace, and is provoking weather and climate extremes in every region across the globe, including in the Arctic, which is warming at more than twice the global rate;
- (c) failure to address climate change is resulting in catastrophic consequences especially for Canadian youth, Indigenous Peoples and future generations; and
- (d) climate change is negatively impacting the health and safety of Canadians, and the financial stability of Canada;

That the Senate declare that Canada is in a national climate emergency which requires that Canada uphold its international commitments with respect to climate change and increase its climate action in line with the Paris Agreement's objective of holding global warming well below two degrees Celsius and pursuing efforts to keep global warming below 1.5 degrees Celsius; and

That the Senate commit to action on mitigation and adaptation in response to the climate emergency and that it consider this urgency for action while undertaking its parliamentary business.

Hon. Margaret Dawn Anderson: *Akana*, honourable senators. I rise today on Treaty 7 territory, the traditional territories of the Blackfoot Nations, including Siksika, Piikani, Kainai, the Tsuut'ina Nation, Stoney Nakoda First Nation and the Métis Nation Region 3 to speak to Motion No. 7 moved by Senator Galvez.

I rise today in support of this motion and to share how climate change affects the residents and communities within the Northwest Territories, or the N.W.T. We are on the forefront of climate-driven change and global warming. It severely threatens our people, culture, community, landscape, ecosystem and way of life.

According to Susan Nerberg, a science and environmental journalist:

For people living in the Arctic, climate change is hacking away at their foundation. It drives storm surges, washes out roads and clogs rivers with sediments. It produces sinkholes and triggers landslides capable of altering the topography and tilting houses. The climate crisis is even seen by some as a form of environmental racism — a problem created down south and suffered up north.

Although the N.W.T. is responsible for less than 0.2% of Canada's greenhouse gas emissions, some places in the N.W.T. have already experienced significant warming in mean air temperature. Since 1957, in the Beaufort Delta, the territory's northernmost region, Inuvik's average air temperature has warmed by 4.4 degrees Celsius, while in Hay River, located in the southern part of the territory, the average air temperature has warmed by 2.7 degrees Celsius. To provide context, the Paris Agreement, adopted by 196 parties at COP21 and entered into force on November 4, 2016, set a goal to limit global warming to 2 degrees Celsius. The North's temperatures are indicative of a larger global issue.

On June 22, 2020, I spoke about the experience of climate change in my home community of Tuktoyaktuk and the impact on community infrastructure. That spring the hamlet had relocated four privately owned homes inland from the point of Tuktoyaktuk because the shoreline was eroding under their piling foundations due to rising sea waters and permafrost melt. The relocation of four homes from the point is just the latest chapter in the lived experience of climate change in Tuktoyaktuk. In my lifetime, I have witnessed the loss of the community's curling rink, relocation of the community school and the RCMP detachment, as well as several metres of land loss around the perimeter of the community.

The one-kilometre sized island where my mother grew up and which, in my lifetime, always provided protection to the harbour of Tuktoyaktuk is also falling victim to erosion and rising water.

The Government of the Northwest Territories, or the GNWT, anticipates that further community infrastructure — including the landfill, several community buildings and cemeteries — will need to be relocated due to coastal erosion and sea level rise. This is not a simple task.

Coastline erosion is a divisive issue for my community. It is not simply a matter of relocating buildings and residences. Our cultural heritage, including our graveyard, is threatened by encroaching sea. The monetary costs of relocating them are difficult to weigh against the cultural costs of them washing away. There are also significant and legitimate concerns about the loss of historically important Inuit cultural sites. The GNWT is working to assess how erosion of the Arctic coast and glacial recession are affecting artifacts and key archeological sites. We are facing not just a loss of land and resources, but significant loss of our historical and cultural landmarks as well as a lifestyle which defines us. This loss is immeasurable.

According to the GNWT:

Infrastructure and processes that rely on weather, such as ice roads, building seasons, supply chains, and community access for residents are becoming unreliable.

This means the annual window of opportunity to get critical goods into communities is shrinking. This creates new challenges, financial implications and affects food supply, building seasons, fuel resupply and capital infrastructure.

Much of the N.W.T. is underlain by permafrost, and climate change is decreasing its thickness. As the layer of seasonal thaw in the ground increases, so too does the need for deeper piles to support infrastructure, raising building and maintenance costs. The vast majority of highways and municipal roads are constructed and surfaced with gravel. Permafrost thaw causes subsidence and sinkholes in the roads, which requires financial investment and maintenance to keep them safe and useable.

Near Fort Simpson, in the southern part of the N.W.T., discontinuous permafrost has decreased by 38% over the last 61 years. Permafrost thaw on hills has resulted in an increase in large landslides that are up to 40 hectares, with head walls up to 25 metres, resulting in sediment affecting streams and aquatic life.

These landslides are also occurring further north. In September 2017, I witnessed four landslides within hours while at the historical Inuvialuit site of Reindeer Station and along the Mackenzie River. The landslides not only uprooted trees, dumping them in the river, but also destroyed a historic cabin as well as channel markers along the river.

Events like these are occurring all over the territory. In the Gwich'in Settlement area, subsidence is outpacing our ability to map the occurrences. Subsidence and sinkholes on the Dempster Highway also affect the integrity of the highway connecting the N.W.T. to the Yukon. Slumps in lakes run the risk of connecting the lakes to rivers and draining them. Residents of Fort McPherson have observed this phenomenon in the lakes around their community.

The warming climate is disturbing habitats in the N.W.T., and invasive plants and animals have been observed in many communities. From *Into the Arctic*:

My eighty-two-year-old mother loved to fish. Regardless of the weather or season, she would set her net in the ice, or water just off the shore that lies within steps of her home. A tangible and vital connection to her past and our culture. My brother sets the net now and we follow in her footsteps. The same place, same net and same waters. There has been one notable difference, salmon, a fish once foreign to our nets and diet is now in our waters.

Cougars and magpies, species that have historically not been present in the N.W.T., have also been observed.

Warmer temperatures are making weather patterns less predictable, endangering traditional lifestyles and livelihoods. The number of days below freezing can be used as a measure of the season for travelling over ice. Historically, in Fort Simpson this is about 221 days. By the end of the century, it may decrease to only 176 days if nothing changes.

In the Beaufort Sea, a decrease of 8.3% in summer ice per decade, combined with rising sea levels, has accelerated coastal erosion and is impacting community infrastructure. Since 1968, the Beaufort Sea has experienced a total loss of 204,000 kilometres squared of sea ice. This is an area almost three times the land area of New Brunswick.

• (1730)

The GNWT notes that the loss of sea ice caused by the carbon emissions of industrialized nations destroys 30 square metres of Arctic sea ice annually.

As the Arctic sea ice melts, potential shipping lanes will open allowing for reduced transit times for global shipping. This is particularly relevant for shipping between Europe and East Asia, as it would allow shipping to occur throughout the Northwest Passage, rather than through the Suez Canal.

The N.W.T. is also experiencing more extreme weather during the summer months, making wildfire management more challenging. In 2014, 3.4 million hectares of boreal forest burned in the N.W.T. This is six times the normal amount and 2.5 million hectares more than annually burns in Canada. That same year the drought caused the Yellowknife hydroelectric facilities to run dry. Because Yellowknife is not connected to the grid, \$15 million in diesel fuel was burned to generate and provide power.

[Senator Anderson]

According to the GNWT, ecosystem modelling suggests that the boreal forest located in the southern Northwest Territories will be replaced with grasslands by the end of the century. This is attributed to climate changes, including drought, wildfires and insect infestation. Water levels have been recorded in the N.W.T. since 1939, with the highest water levels recorded in 2021. Although there have been historical flooding and high water levels in N.W.T. communities located near water bodies, the high water levels that we are seeing now are unprecedented.

In May 2021 extreme flooding led to the complete evacuation of Jean Marie River and displaced over 700 people in Fort Simpson, causing millions of dollars in damages. In Jean Marie River, the water levels rose so high and so quickly that the fuel tanks were uprooted, cell service disrupted, the power plant damaged, and the only access road to the community was cut off. The Canadian Rangers were deployed to help assist those affected by the flooding.

Another rare weather event occurred on June 29, 2021. A downburst, one of the first ever recorded in the N.W.T., ripped through and uprooted a patch of trees some 60 kilometres long and 9 kilometres wide when it struck the Dehcho region east of Fort Liard. It is believed that the wind speeds during the Dehcho storm reached up to 190 kilometres per hour.

On January 24, in a conversation with Brigadier-General Pascal Godbout, Commander of Joint Task Force (North) located in Yellowknife, Northwest Territories, I was apprised of Operation LENTUS. Operation LENTUS is the Canadian Armed Forces response to natural disasters in Canada. Brigadier-General Godbout noted that within the last year they have responded to three major events across the three northern territories: the floods in Jean Marie River, Yukon floods and the Iqaluit water crisis. He added that this is the first time in 15 years that Operation LENTUS has responded to requests and noted that these were unusual and reflective of the increased climate impacts we are seeing in the North.

Given that Joint Task Force (North) is responsible for emergency responses across the Northwest Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon, this poses an additional burden on their ability to serve the North and places an additional demand on the Canadian Armed Forces resources.

In the N.W.T., responding to climate changes means balancing adaptation to and mitigation of the significant impacts we are already seeing. With our population of 44,000, we will not be able to support the logistical and financial challenges of adapting and mitigating without a Northern-specific approach to climate change. This must also incorporate national and international advocacy and partnerships.

As Inuvialuit, we have survived epidemics, mass deaths, colonization, residential school, as well as relocation; yet, with climate change, the Inuvialuit are facing one of the greatest challenges of this century. I venture to say that this goes beyond the Inuvialuit. As a country, and collectively a world, we are facing the challenge of our lifetime.

In the words of Hans-Otto Pörtner, a co-chair of Working Group II of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, “Any further delay in concerted global action will miss a brief and rapidly closing window to secure a liveable future.”

My 16-year-old daughter wrote an assignment for her Canadian and World issues class with Ashbury College, and it was entitled “Tuktoyaktuk: Evidence and global climate change.” I share her words for two reasons. Firstly, it is telling that it is important and relevant to a teenager. At 16 years of age, I never wrote or thought about climate change. Secondly, I believe that her words are timely and valid. These words are as follows.

This issue in the Arctic transcends all boundaries. It is a global responsibility and given we created the problem; we must also create the solution.

The importance is not lost to her. It should not be lost to us as decision makers and as parliamentarians. I urge you to support this motion. *Quyanainni, mahsi'cho*, thank you.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

(On motion of Senator Duncan, debate adjourned.)

[*Translation*]

MOTION PERTAINING TO SECTION 55 OF THE
CONSTITUTION ACT, 1982, AS AMENDED—
DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion, as amended, of the Honourable Senator Dalphond, seconded by the Honourable Senator Cordy:

That the Senate:

1. recall that, despite the commitment found in section 55 of the *Constitution Act, 1982* to have a fully bilingual Constitution, as of today, of the 31 enactments that make up the Canadian Constitution, 22 are official only in their English version, including almost all of the *Constitution Act, 1867*; and
2. call upon the government to consider, in the context of the review of the *Official Languages Act*, the addition of a requirement to submit, every 12 months, a report detailing the efforts made to comply with section 55 of the *Constitution Act, 1982*.

Hon. Pierre-Hugues Boisvenu: Honourable senators, I rise today to support the motion presented in the Senate on November 25, 2021, by Senator Dalphond. First, this motion would have the Senate recall that section 55 of the Constitution Act, 1982 requires the Constitution to be fully written in both official languages, that is, in French and English. At present, this provision is not being respected. Of the 31 enactments that make up the Constitution, 22 have not yet been translated, including almost all of the Constitution Act, 1867.

Second, this motion seeks to include in the Official Languages Act a requirement for a review, every five years, of the efforts made by the Government of Canada to comply with section 55 of the Constitution.

The Constitution is the foundation of our federation. It is commonly known as the foundational text and sits at the very top of our hierarchy of norms. It provides subtle coordination of our institutions and always manages to balance each of their powers. The Fathers of Confederation worked hard on it, often at their peril, and a failure to respect the Constitutions or one of its provisions would be a betrayal of their efforts. The basic text of the Canadian Constitution came into force in 1867, after long negotiations among the four founding provinces: New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Ontario and Quebec. This foundational text, which was called the British North America Act at the time, is the bedrock on which the federation was built.

In 1969, the Parliament of Canada decided to enact the Official Languages Act for the first time, to officially recognize bilingualism within Canadian federal institutions. The repatriation of the Constitution in 1982 allowed Canada to definitively break from the United Kingdom and enshrine the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, which states the following in section 16:

English and French are the official languages of Canada and have equality of status and equal rights and privileges as to their use in all institutions of the Parliament and government of Canada.

In order to uphold section 16 of the Constitution and end the injustice toward francophone communities, section 55 of the Constitution reads as follows:

A French version of the portions of the Constitution of Canada referred to in the schedule shall be prepared by the Minister of Justice of Canada as expeditiously as possible and, when any portion thereof sufficient to warrant action being taken has been so prepared, it shall be put forward for enactment by proclamation issued by the Governor General under the Great Seal of Canada pursuant to the procedure then applicable to an amendment of the same provisions of the Constitution of Canada.

As Senator Dalphond said in his speech, section 55 is not currently being respected because only 9 of the 31 constitutional texts have an official translation in French.

• (1740)

In an October 2018 brief entitled “Access to Justice in French and English in the Context of Modernizing the Official Languages Act,” the Canadian Bar Association did a great job of explaining how harmful this failure to uphold section 55 is for francophone communities in Canada.

According to the report, francophone communities in Canada face a serious barrier to access to justice and defending the rule of law. The constitutional texts are not officially translated, and the unofficial translations do not have force of law. When courts render constitutional decisions in French, they refer to the unofficial French translations, which do not have the same legal or constitutional force as the wording in the official English version.

As a result, French-speaking jurists and litigants are at a disadvantage in the discussions on the interpretation of the constitutional texts that set out the fundamental principles of our rules-based state.

I would remind senators that Canada's history acknowledges three founding peoples: the British, the French and the Indigenous people, or rather, the Indigenous peoples.

These three peoples have contributed to the construction, culture and development of today's Canada. The province of Quebec and Canada's francophone minorities total 10 million people. The federal government must fulfill its duty to ensure that bilingualism is recognized, as enshrined in our Constitution, because by ignoring the importance of the French language, it is contributing to the rejection of national unity and dismissing the identity, culture and social mores of millions of French Canadians.

The Supreme Court of Canada stated the following in *Mahe v. Alberta*:

Language is more than a mere means of communication, it is part and parcel of the identity and culture of the people speaking it. It is the means by which individuals understand themselves and the world around them.

In his speech, Senator Dalphond pointed out that the first obligation imposed by section 55 of the Constitution, namely that of drafting an official translation of the constitutional texts as soon as possible, was fulfilled back in 1990.

Unfortunately, the implementation of this provision has been met with a series of failures and setbacks in the negotiations between the federal government and the provinces. It has now been more than 20 years since the federal government last resumed negotiations. That is how long it has been shirking its institutional obligation to uphold section 55 of the Canadian Constitution.

In closing, I fully support Senator Dalphond's motion. It is based on the second recommendation in the brief submitted by the Canadian Bar Association and proposes that the federal government include in the official languages bill, which it announced in the last Speech from the Throne and which should be introduced shortly in the other place, if it has not been already, a requirement that a report be submitted every five years detailing the efforts made to comply with section 55 of the Constitution Act, 1982.

[Senator Boisvenu]

I invite you, colleagues, to support Senator Dalphond's motion to have the Government of Canada do its homework and implement the provisions of our Constitution to ensure that the rights of francophone Canadians are finally respected. Thank you.

(On motion of Senator Wells, debate adjourned.)

[English]

MOTION TO ADOPT THE SENATE OF CANADA ENVIRONMENTAL AND SUSTAINABILITY POLICY STATEMENT—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Deacon (*Nova Scotia*), seconded by the Honourable Senator Kutcher:

That the Senate adopt the following *Environmental and Sustainability Policy Statement*, to replace the 1993 *Senate Environmental Policy*, adopted by the Standing Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration:

“SENATE OF CANADA ENVIRONMENTAL AND SUSTAINABILITY POLICY STATEMENT

OBJECTIVE

The Senate of Canada is committed to reducing the Senate's carbon footprint to net zero by 2030 and to implement sustainable practices in its operations. Achieving this goal requires a whole-of-organization approach which prioritizes reduction of outputs and utilizes standard-leading emission offsets. The road to net zero will include quantifiable regular reporting on progress towards target. These actions are to demonstrate leadership as an institution on climate action, to encourage accountability of federal institutions and to inform the legislative process.

PRINCIPLES

The Senate is committed to achieving its objective through adherence to the following principles:

1. **Serve as a model of environmental leadership** in accordance with the best practices of international, federal, provincial and municipal environmental laws, regulations, standards and guidelines where applicable;
2. **Integrate a robust accountability framework into the operating planning cycle.** This includes benchmarking, tracking and applying results-based management to achieve continuous improvement in environmental performance, in accordance with the best practices of accountability frameworks of internationally recognized standards. Progress should be reported publicly on a regular basis to the Standing Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration (CIBA).

3. **Require environmentally conscious acquisition of goods and services** that incorporates: the purchase of environmentally responsible products and services; the selection of innovative suppliers demonstrating environmentally sound business practices; and the setting of environmental requirements in requests for proposals.
4. **Reduce the environmental impact of activities** by using resources more efficiently, with a focus on the reduction of outputs throughout the Senate's operations.
5. **Incentivize and enhance environmental awareness throughout the Senate** through education and support, while recognizing and incorporating environmental actions undertaken by Senate employees and senators.
6. **Operate facilities and conduct activities of the Senate in a sustainable manner** with a view to preventing pollution and reducing waste. Consider environmental impacts and implications when planning projects and activities.
7. **Develop and implement tools that promote and integrate environmental considerations into day-to-day operations of the Senate** to encourage Senators and Senate employees to make environmentally friendly decisions within their activities and tasks.”;

That the Standing Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration examine the feasibility of implementing programs to establish:

- (a) an accountability framework and annual reporting cycle;
- (b) the promotion of climate-friendly transportation policies and reduced travel;
- (c) enhanced recycling and minimizing waste;
- (d) a digital-first approach and reduction in printing;
- (e) support from central agencies to allow the Senate to charge carbon offsets as part of operating a sustainable Senate; and
- (f) a process for senators and their offices to propose environmental and sustainability recommendations; and

That the Standing Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration acquire any necessary goods and services to examine the feasibility or to implement these recommendations.

Hon. Colin Deacon: Honourable senators, in Motion No. 7, Senator Anderson provided a powerful first-hand account of how climate change is affecting her territory. It is, for me, a very important context within which to provide the speech I'm about

to give. I'm thrilled to rise on debate to move that the Senate of Canada adopt a new environmental and sustainability policy statement. This is a call to action for our institution.

As you learned from Senator Griffin during her excellent speech on Tuesday evening, adoption of this motion will guide the Senate as it reduces its carbon emissions to net zero by 2030. This ambitious but achievable goal will enable the Senate to demonstrate leadership on climate action, encourage accountability of federal institutions and allow us to gain first-hand experience that will inform us in our legislative process as it relates to this existential issue.

Colleagues, I will elaborate on what exactly is being requested from this chamber and why adoption of this motion is needed for us to fulfill our unique parliamentary role. I will also outline a proposed road map or next steps if it is the will of this chamber to adopt this motion.

Before I begin, please allow me to briefly explain how we got here. Last May, the Standing Senate Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration, or CIBA, unanimously granted Senators Griffin, Carignan, Anderson and myself with the opportunity to form an Advisory Working Group on Environment and Sustainability. I will be referring to this working group as the AWG.

The AWG's order of reference was to examine and report on the existing Senate of Canada environmental policy, which dates from 1993, and to recommend short-, medium- and long-term actions. We were grateful to be provided with this important challenge, and the AWG members submitted a unanimous report last November. This report, with its 11 recommendations, was made public last Thursday and is now available on the CIBA website.

The report and the motion before you today resulted from a consultation that reached across our organization and beyond. To this end, please allow me to acknowledge the insights and the incredibly wise counsel provided by my three colleagues on the AWG and their tireless teams — a lot of work was put in on this, and I'm grateful for all the effort; the Senate Administration, from the leadership right through staff across each directorate helped enormously; the Library of Parliament analysts and specialists from Public Services and Procurement Canada.

Lastly, I need to acknowledge our dedicated Senate clerks, whose considerable wisdom helped us to navigate the constraints that can sometimes emerge from within the *Rules of the Senate*, as well as the steering committee and membership of CIBA who reviewed and supported the motion I am tabling here today.

I am grateful and honoured to present the product of these collective efforts that we are now asking the chamber to adopt. The AWG report informs the rationale behind the recommendation to adopt a new principles-based policy statement. This recommendation has the intention of replacing the 1993 policy of the Senate. We have proposed a principles-based policy statement rather than a policy. This policy statement is not prescriptive, but empowers each directorate, senator or staff member to do their part in enabling us to achieve our collective goal of net zero.

Our research has not identified any other national parliamentary body that has chosen to adopt a comparable target and plan. That is why it is important for this motion to be debated in and, I trust, adopted by this chamber so that CIBA will then be empowered with the authority to further examine and consider the range of recommendations in the AWG's report.

So that's the "what." Now I'd like to speak to the "why." Since the adoption of the current environmental policy of the Senate three decades ago, the Senate has advanced various initiatives aiming at reducing the environmental footprint of this institution. In addition to these efforts, the Senate has also been cooperating with Public Services and Procurement Canada as part of the Long Term Vision and Plan. That is why one of the AWG's first activities was to examine the actions taken by the Senate over the years in order to identify the current environmental and sustainability initiatives that might be under way across the Senate directorates.

The AWG also reviewed environmental policies and actions taken by other legislatures, both domestically and internationally. It was clear that a lot of efforts were undertaken by the Senate but, equally, that many complexities associated with achieving progress remained, in particular as it relates to our capacity to benchmark and systematically reduce our organization's carbon footprint in an effective and cost-efficient manner.

• (1750)

That is why we concluded that this new policy statement needed to enshrine a mandate for the Senate of Canada that shifts from a nice-to-have to a must-have commitment where a clear and auditable whole-of-organization commitment to sustainability is embraced.

It must also provide a principle-based policy statement designed to guide the formulation of specific policies across the Senate directorates and Senators' offices into the future. This would allow for flexibility, creativity and inclusivity in our implementation efforts.

Finally, we need to enshrine a robust accountability framework. The policy from 1993 had an accountability structure but was never integrated thoroughly into our operations. These new targets must be defined and reported on regularly and transparently.

Perhaps most importantly, what became clear to our working group was that the Senate of Canada must demonstrate leadership on this existential issue. Why? Because the road to net carbon neutrality is so challenging, that's why. If we do not act, how do we hold the government and its officials to account? None of us are fans of saying, "Do as I say, not as I do." That approach does not honour our important role and responsibilities. It doesn't provide us first-hand knowledge and credibility, which is something we need if we are going to effectively review the government's efforts and hold them to account.

Climate change is an intergenerational crisis with a rapidly closing window for action. Our children and grandchildren, and the world's children and grandchildren, are now being described as a vulnerable population. This is because we already know

what will happen to our planet if our generation doesn't just act, but unless and until we actually succeed in reversing climate change.

We have no greater responsibility.

The advisory working group, or AWG, members began our November 2021 report to the Committee of Internal Economy with a unanimous statement intended to drive this message home. I'd like to read it to you now:

Increasingly, we are experiencing the devastating effects of climate change. In 2021 alone, Canadians have seen a killer heat dome, catastrophic wildfires, drought conditions that have tested the resilience of even the strongest western grain farmers and cattle ranchers, and increasing levels of shoreline erosion and permafrost melt that are threatening northern communities. Election 2021 also saw every major federal political party acknowledge the existential risks created by climate change. The Senate of Canada has a responsibility to demonstrate leadership and action by committing to do its part in creating a more sustainable environment, while demonstrating the action necessary to hold other federal institutions to account for their efforts.

Colleagues, the Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development in the Auditor General's office submitted a report last year called *Lessons Learned from Canada's Record on Climate Change*. They identified as the first lesson that "stronger leadership and coordination are needed to drive progress towards commitments." We all know that little is accomplished in this world without it. In that light, the AWG concluded unanimously that in order for us to do our job, the Senate must demonstrate to the rest of Canada that progress can be made towards net zero. Additionally, how can we achieve our parliamentary responsibilities without more fully understanding the conditions necessary to actually achieve progress, versus our sadly too-frequent tradition of only announcing intentions? That's why the AWG believed that the Senate of Canada, like every organization in Canada, needs to become a net-carbon-neutral organization.

Now, I'm going to focus on three of the key outcomes we'll see by adopting this motion to give you sense of the road ahead. If adopted, the Internal Economy Committee would further examine the recommendations included in the AWG report to, first, secure external expert advice; second, empower the directorates of the Senate, senators and their staff; and third, integrate a robust accountability framework into Senate governance.

First, let me explain the need for us to secure external expertise. I mentioned that the AWG canvassed the Senate's directorates. Some fabulous ideas were brought forward. However, the organization does not have the expertise needed to assess which actions would produce the most effective and cost-efficient results. Like far too many organizations, the Senate does not currently have the capacity to measure its total carbon footprint and specific sources of emissions. Without data, we cannot begin our journey.

Let me give you an example of where data informed a complex cost-benefit challenge. The state of California recently announced their intention to ban the use of gas-powered leaf blowers. This is because the emissions produced by one leaf blower in one hour is equivalent to the emissions produced by a 2017 Toyota Camry travelling 1,700 kilometres. I would never have guessed that, not in a million years.

The Senate's path forward has to be investing in upfront costs to secure expert support to, first, measure and benchmark the emissions resulting from the Senate's current activities; second, glean insights to direct our efforts in an effective and cost-efficient manner; and third, track our reduction of those emissions over time. The AWG concluded that this approach will deliver the best return on investment. That's because this initiative isn't about spending more but spending smarter. Achieving our 2030 goal simply throwing more taxpayer money at the challenge will not be acceptable to any of us, and that approach won't help us to demonstrate that Canada can tackle the climate change crisis while improving our prosperity.

This motion includes a request that the Internal Economy Committee, as the Senate's management body, use its expertise to secure and manage this expert support. Additionally, we can learn from others as we've found at least one provincial legislative body that is working in a similar direction as us, that being the National Assembly of Quebec. They have made great progress, and I am certain there is much we can learn from their efforts. That's our first step as an institution.

Second, the AWG has recommended an approach that empowers the Senate directorates, senators and their staff. I'm going to offer a personal comment here. My experience is that the fastest-growing companies, those that are rapidly and continuously improving productivity, have a culture that invites incremental change from across their organizations. That buy-in and engagement are essential to identifying opportunities and successfully implementing solutions.

Third, I want to highlight the AWG's recommendation to integrate a robust accountability framework into the Senate's governance. This is the direction the Senate is already heading in establishing the Audit and Oversight Committee. We want to adopt world-leading standards of transparency and accountability, and we believe we can do that as we benchmark and track our progress towards net zero.

I think we all appreciate that the Senate will not be able to reduce its carbon output to zero. As a result, we must ensure that the Senate's carbon output reduction is achieved as cost effectively as possible. This will provide us with the resources to offset the balance of the output with carbon credits.

I want to wrap up by reinforcing the importance of our being ambitious in our timeline. Recently, in partnership with the Bank of Canada, the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions, or OSFI, released a report examining the economic risks associated with climate transition. One finding in particular is important when considering this motion. These two institutions with the primary responsibility of overseeing the stability of our financial system looked at the financial risks associated with two different approaches to confronting the climate crisis. The Bank of Canada and OSFI found that on our path to achieving net zero

by 2050, acting later with a shorter transition time to net zero introduces much more risk of financial and overall economic volatility. In short, the later we act, the higher the ultimate economic cost.

Additionally, the Office of the Auditor General stated, "Climate change is an intergenerational crisis with a rapidly closing window for action." I believe I am far from alone in agreeing with that powerful statement. Canada's future generations need our generation to act now.

Honourable senators, I hope that you will follow Senator Griffin's parting advice and support this motion, so we can pass it swiftly and begin the vital task ahead.

Thank you colleagues.

(On motion of Senator Wells, debate adjourned.)

[*Translation*]

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Honourable senators, it is now six o'clock. Pursuant to rule 3-3(1) and the order adopted on November 25, 2021, I am obliged to leave the chair until seven o'clock unless there is leave that the sitting continue.

Accordingly, the sitting is suspended until seven o'clock.

(The sitting of the Senate was suspended.)

(The sitting of the Senate was resumed.)

• (1900)

[*English*]

CONTRIBUTIONS AND IMPACTS OF MÉTIS, INUIT, AND FIRST NATIONS

INQUIRY—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the inquiry of the Honourable Senator Boyer, calling the attention of the Senate to the positive contributions and impacts that Métis, Inuit, and First Nations have made to Canada, and the world.

Hon. Mary Jane McCallum: Honourable senators, I rise today to speak to Inquiry No. 3, which calls the attention of the Senate to the positive contributions and impacts that Métis, Inuit and First Nations have made to Canada and to the world. I would like to thank our colleague Senator Boyer for introducing this inquiry, as it is of great importance that senators, and all Canadians, become familiar with the critical work done by the Indigenous peoples of Canada.

I am pleased to use this inquiry to highlight the work done by three strong, intelligent, resilient First Nations women who hail from my home region of Manitoba. The tireless work and effort put forth by these women have improved the lives of First Nations in Manitoba and beyond for many years. While I would love to have the ability to highlight many, many more Indigenous

women through this inquiry, I am sure you will find these three individuals very deserving of the following recognition and acknowledgment.

These three women, Dr. Catherine Cook, Dr. Marcia Anderson and Ms. Melanie Mackinnon, are leaders in the health field in Manitoba, specifically as it relates to First Nations' health. While the positive impacts these women have had on their communities is immeasurable and the hours of dedication they have put into their work is incalculable, they are each incredibly selfless and humble individuals. Most recently, they have been involved in different capacities in addressing, analyzing and responding to the impacts that the COVID-19 pandemic has had on First Nations in Manitoba.

Colleagues, as you may know, similar to the H1N1 pandemic, First Nations remain incredibly vulnerable to the impacts of such a virus. Due to the crowded and inadequate housing and community infrastructure; the lack of essentials, including access to clean water in some instances; and the other myriad social determinants of health, First Nations begin from a position of severe deficit as they face the same pandemic-related challenges as every other Canadian. It is through First Nations' strong leadership, spearheaded in part by women like Cathy, Melanie and Marcia, that has enabled First Nations to endure through the ongoing storm.

Of great importance, these women also work to identify and address gaps in programming and services that erode equity and lead to institutional racism. It is through the work of women like these that there exists cause for hope and optimism that these barriers can be detected and eradicated to make quality health care more equitable and culturally appropriate for all.

Honourable senators, the first woman I would like to acknowledge and recognize is Dr. Catherine L. Cook, MD, MSc, CCFP, FCFP. Dr. Cook is Métis and grew up in northern Manitoba. She received her undergraduate and postgraduate medical education at the University of Manitoba — her MD in 1987 and MSc in 2003 — and has been employed by the university since 1987. She is an Associate Professor in the Department of Community Health Sciences, Rady Faculty of Health Sciences. She most recently served as head of Ongomiizwin – Indigenous Institute of Health and Healing, and as Vice-Dean of Indigenous Health, Rady Faculty of Health Sciences. She was also provincial lead of Indigenous health at Shared Health until taking on the role of Vice-President Indigenous full-time in April 2020 with the University of Manitoba.

Dr. Cook has focused on Indigenous health as a priority in her career. She practised as a family physician in remote Northern nursing stations for several years before focusing on public health practice and, more recently, health administration and management. She has taken a leadership and operational role in the development and implementation of Indigenous health programs and services that focus on addressing the gaps and barriers to equitable access to quality health care for Indigenous people in Manitoba.

At Shared Health, Dr. Cook co-chaired the development of an Indigenous partnership strategy framework and the development of a health care system that recognizes and addresses the need for comprehensive quality health care for Indigenous people as close to home as possible.

At the university, Dr. Cook took a leadership role in the creation of Ongomiizwin — the Indigenous Institute of Health and Healing in the Rady Faculty of Health Sciences, which was officially approved by the Senate in 2017.

Dr. Cook serves on several national boards and committees, and has received many national and local awards, including the Inspire Award for Health 2020, the Calvin L. Gutkin Family Medicine Ambassador Award from the Canadian College of Family Physicians in 2020, the Dr. Thomas Dignan Award for Indigenous Health from the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada, the WXN Top 100 Women in Canada in 2017, the Health Administration Award from Doctors Manitoba and the May Cohen Award from the Association of Faculties of Medicine of Canada.

Dr. Cook has been a strong contributor to the University of Manitoba, both within her home faculty and across the university. Her insights have been widely sought after by governments, boards and agencies, and she has excelled as a leader, an adviser and a collaborator. She brings this stellar record to her new and important role, as well as her deep commitment both to the community and to the University of Manitoba.

Honourable senators, the next woman I would like to recognize is Dr. Marcia Anderson. Dr. Anderson is Cree-Anishinaabe and grew up in the north end of Winnipeg. Her family roots go to Peguis First Nation and Norway House Cree Nation in Manitoba. She practises both internal medicine and public health as a Medical Officer of Health with Indigenous Services Canada, Manitoba Region. Within this role, Dr. Anderson focuses on health equity; health public policy; and Indigenous health, specifically focusing on Indigenous youth health, healthy sexuality, harm reduction and partnerships with First Nations communities as well as urban Indigenous and community-based organizations.

As announced just this week by the University of Manitoba, Dr. Anderson has been appointed as Vice-Dean of Indigenous Health, Social Justice and Anti-Racism at the Rady Faculty of Health Sciences. This new portfolio includes her existing duties as Vice-Dean, Indigenous Health and will now also include the Office of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion, the Office of Community Engagement, and Social Accountability.

Dr. Anderson has served as Chair of the Indigenous Health Network of the Association of Faculties of Medicine of Canada and as the Chair of the National Consortium for Indigenous Medical Education. She has also served as Executive Director of Indigenous Academic Affairs in the Ongomiizwin — Indigenous Institute of Health and Healing.

Through her work with Ongomiizwin, Dr. Anderson has provided leadership to aspects of Indigenous student recruitment and retention; Indigenous health curriculum; Indigenous workforce development; safety of the work-learning

environment, including anti-racism across the Rady Faculty of Health Sciences. She also serves as the chair of the COVID-19 Health and Safety Committee and a member of the COVID-19 Steering Committee for the University of Manitoba.

• (1910)

Dr. Anderson was recognized for her contributions to Indigenous people's health with a National Aboriginal Achievement Award in March 2011. In 2016, she was recognized with a CBC Manitoba Future 40 award in the teaching and health care category. In 2018, she was named one of the 100 most powerful women in Canada by the Women's Executive Network. Dr. Anderson recently received the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons Dr. Thomas Dignan Indigenous Health Award.

Finally, honourable senators, I would also like to take time to recognize and acknowledge Ms. Melanie MacKinnon. Ms. MacKinnon is a Cree nurse and health care executive leader. She got her Bachelor of Nursing in 1996. She is a proud member of Misipawistik Cree Nation in Grand Rapids, Manitoba, with paternal roots in Pimicikamak Cree Nation and Wabowden, Manitoba.

Throughout the course of her 25-year career, she has served in many different roles within the health sector. As a senior health care administrator and advocate, her work has informed regional and national policy shifts and generated new program mandates that seek to improve and protect the health and well-being of the communities she serves.

Currently, Ms. MacKinnon has two principal positions. She is the executive director of Ongomiizwin Health Services and head of the Indigenous Institute of Health and Healing, Rady Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Manitoba. Also, she serves as a co-lead of the Manitoba First Nations COVID-19 Pandemic Response Coordination Team on behalf of the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs.

She is a published author and international speaker on organizational design and changing conventional culture to be culturally safe. With her peers, community and health leaders, she continues to advocate for the rights and equitable access to quality health and social programs and services for Indigenous peoples in Manitoba, Canada and around the world.

Her recent recognitions for dedicated service to Indigenous communities include: WXN Top 100 Most Powerful Women, 2021; the Circle of Excellence Award, First Nations and Inuit Health Branch, Manitoba Region, Indigenous Services Canada, 2021; the Co-Game Star 2021 National Hockey League Healthcare Heroes award, Winnipeg Jets; the co-recipient of the Dr. and Mrs. Ralph Campbell Outreach Award, the university's premier award in recognition of outstanding outreach activities by a member of the university; and the recipient of the 2021 Frontier Achievement Award, an award that recognizes former Frontier students for demonstrating commitment and excellence in their career and community.

Her mission to create space for Indigenous knowledge and rights in mainstream structures continues to be guided by her family, colleagues, mentors and elders, of whom she remains grateful.

Honourable senators, I cannot say enough about the quality and calibre of these three women. I am honoured to have had the opportunity to recognize them here today to the benefit of senators and all Canadians.

Their grace, determination and resilience are qualities that I admire deeply. I uphold and carry these women and countless others like them in the work that I do in the Senate. They, in part, are who I reference when I speak of "the collective Mary Jane." I would like to thank them from the bottom of my heart for not only what they mean to me but what they mean to all First Nations in Manitoba and beyond. They are proof positive, colleagues, of the power and capability that First Nations — and specifically First Nations women — can have in this great country when given the chance to thrive.

Kinanâskomitin. Thank you.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

(On motion of Senator Coyle, for Senator Duncan, debate adjourned.)

ABORIGINAL PEOPLES

COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO STUDY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S CONSTITUTIONAL, TREATY, POLITICAL AND LEGAL RESPONSIBILITIES TO FIRST NATIONS, INUIT AND MÉTIS PEOPLES AND REFER PAPERS AND EVIDENCE SINCE THE BEGINNING OF THE FIRST SESSION OF THE FORTY-SECOND PARLIAMENT

Hon. Brian Francis, pursuant to notice of February 21, 2022, moved:

That the Standing Senate Committee on Aboriginal Peoples be authorized to examine and report on the federal government's constitutional, treaty, political and legal responsibilities to First Nations, Inuit and Métis peoples and any other subject concerning Indigenous Peoples;

That the documents received, evidence heard and business accomplished by the committee since the beginning of the First Session of the Forty-second Parliament be referred to the committee; and

That the committee submit its final report no later than December 31, 2023, and that the committee retain all powers necessary to publicize its findings for 180 days after the tabling of the final report.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to.)

HUMAN RIGHTS

COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO STUDY ISSUES RELATING TO
HUMAN RIGHTS GENERALLY

Hon. Salma Ataullahjan, pursuant to notice of February 24, 2022, moved:

That the Standing Senate Committee on Human Rights, in accordance with rule 12-7(14), be authorized to examine and report on such issues as may arise from time to time relating to human rights generally; and

That the committee submit its final report to the Senate no later than June 12, 2025.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to.)

NATIONAL SECURITY AND DEFENCE

COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO MEET DURING
ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Hon. Tony Dean, pursuant to notice of March 1, 2022, moved:

That, pursuant to rule 12-18(2), for the remainder of this session, the Standing Senate Committee on National Security and Defence be authorized to meet at their approved meeting time as determined by the third report of the Committee of Selection, adopted by the Senate on December 7, 2021, on any Monday which immediately precedes a Tuesday when the Senate is scheduled to sit, even though the Senate may then be adjourned for a period exceeding a week.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to.)

[*Translation*]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

MOTION TO AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE TO MEET DURING
ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. René Cormier, pursuant to notice of March 2, 2022, moved:

That, pursuant to rule 12-18(2), for the remainder of this session, the Standing Senate Committee on Official Languages be authorized to meet at their approved meeting

time on any Monday which immediately precedes a Tuesday when the Senate is scheduled to sit, even though the Senate may then be adjourned for a period exceeding a week.

He said: Honourable senators, I move the motion standing in my name.

(On motion of Senator Wells, debate adjourned.)

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF THE SENATE

Hon. David M. Wells: Could we could go back to Motion No. 50? I misunderstood the question, and I didn't hear it very clearly. Perhaps it was because of your mask. I would like to adjourn that.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, Senator Wells is seeking leave to revert to Motion No. 50. If you are opposed to leave, please say no.

An Hon. Senator: No.

The Hon. the Speaker: I hear a no.

Senator Wells: Speaker, it's because I didn't hear you. I'm not asking to revert. It was mumbled and muffled in the speech because of the mask.

The Hon. the Speaker: I know, Senator Wells. But you'll have to ask for the indulgence of the chamber to go back because we have already moved on to other items.

I don't think it's an unreasonable request if you didn't understand what I was saying. I will ask again.

Senator Wells was unable to clearly understand what I was saying when we went through Motion No. 50. He's asking for leave to revert to Motion No. 50 so he can adjourn the motion rather than just have it stand.

If you are opposed to leave, please say no.

An Hon. Senator: No.

The Hon. the Speaker: I hear a no. I'm sorry, Senator Wells.

[*Translation*]

RULES, PROCEDURES AND THE RIGHTS OF PARLIAMENT

MOTION TO AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE TO MEET DURING
ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. Diane Bellemare, pursuant to notice of March 2, 2022, moved:

That, pursuant to rule 12-18(2), for the remainder of this session, the Standing Committee on Rules, Procedures and the Rights of Parliament be authorized to meet at their

approved meeting time as determined by the third report of the Committee of Selection, adopted by the Senate on December 7, 2021, on any Monday which immediately precedes a Tuesday when the Senate is scheduled to sit, even though the Senate may then be adjourned for a period exceeding a week.

She said: Honourable senators, I move the motion standing in my name.

(On motion of Senator Wells, debate adjourned.)

• (1920)

[English]

NET-ZERO EMISSIONS FUTURE

INQUIRY—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. Mary Coyle rose pursuant to notice of November 24, 2021:

That she will call the attention of the Senate to the importance of finding solutions to transition Canada's society, economy and resource use in pursuit of a fair, prosperous, sustainable and peaceful net-zero emissions future for our country and the planet.

She said: Honourable senators, I rise today to launch my second climate-related inquiry here in this chamber, on the unceded and unsundered territory of the Anishinaabe Algonquin Nation, to call attention of the Senate of Canada to the importance of finding solutions to transition Canada's society, economy and resource use in pursuit of a fair, prosperous, sustainable and peaceful net-zero emissions future for our country and our planet.

The purpose of this inquiry is to investigate, with your contributions, solutions to the most serious challenge and the most compelling opportunity facing our generation and our world today: climate change.

My intention is to first speak about why I am launching this inquiry. I plan to then briefly address the scope of the inquiry and what I hope all of you will contribute as we collectively move this forward. Finally, I will attempt to open up the investigation on one of the key solutions areas, the area of a just transition for people, workers and their communities.

Colleagues, when I sat down to craft the rather convoluted title of this inquiry, I chose each word with great care. When I included the word "peaceful" as a modifier for the net-zero emissions future we are striving for, I was thinking about both the international strife and the potential domestic upheaval that comes from people being seriously harmed and in some cases displaced by the dangerous effects of severe weather events caused by climate change. I was also focused on disruptions for workers, families, communities and whole regions of Canada as our economy undergoes the transformation to net zero.

Colleagues, my concern for a peaceful net-zero future has also been deepened given what we see so blatantly at work today: that powerful, well-networked and well-resourced disinformation machine that is accelerating the churning out of lies in Canada and in every region of the world.

We see that machine at work in Russia as Putin spins his propaganda to justify his brutal invasion of Ukraine. We saw and see that machine at work south of our border drawing millions of Americans into the lie that President Biden did not win the last election.

Colleagues, we see the power of that mendacity machine to influence significant numbers of our fellow Canadians who supported what became illegal blockades and the occupation of Ottawa and to bathe them in a toxic online stew of falsehoods about COVID-19; the efficacy of vaccines; Canada's Charter of Rights and Freedoms; Canada's system of government and how political change occurs within it; and the intentional conflation of the Emergencies Act with its long since mothballed predecessor, the War Measures Act.

Colleagues, shockingly that mostly online lie factory is even imploring people:

... to focus on Canada not on Ukraine. It's all a distraction because the real war, the war against your freedom, is happening right now in Canada.

Honourable colleagues, we know that there are people in Canada who are experiencing COVID fatigue. We know there are people who, for various reasons, are hesitant about or opposed to vaccines. We know there are people who disagree with wearing masks, capacity limits and vaccine mandates. And, of course, there are Canadians who have any number of grievances against the current government and its leadership.

Colleagues, I don't think anyone would argue that people have a right to hold these beliefs, values and opinions and that they have a right to peacefully demonstrate against any policies they don't agree with and to vote for a different party the next time we have an election if that is their choice. That is not the point. My concern is with the people who are vulnerable to being influenced and possibly incited to act in misinformed ways by these manipulative online perpetrators of false realities.

Colleagues, there were several brilliant articles on this theme in last week's *The Globe and Mail*, including Andrew Coyne's entitled "Our shared reality – and the knowledge that undergirds it – is being assaulted," and David Shribman's "From Trump to Putin, the Age of Disruption is now under way."

Colleagues, why do I raise this concern, and what does it have to do with me launching this climate solutions inquiry at this time? I raise it because we know there has been a history of misinformation and intentional disinformation on matters related to the climate crisis. We also know that the effective widespread promotion of lies can result in unleashing the dangerously explosive trinity of fear, anger and division.

Colleagues, what we need now more than ever is confidence in the evidence, and we need unity as we face the burning imperative to meet our climate commitments. Just this week, the IPCC released its latest report, which further underlined the urgency to act on climate.

Ko Barrett, IPCC vice-chair, said, “. . . every fraction of a degree of warming matters and every action helps.”

We need all hands on deck and all boats sailing as quickly as possible in the direction of net zero. We do not need any disinformation tsunamis to blow us off course and distract us from our urgent climate action.

Julia Langer, CEO of The Atmospheric Fund, states that we have to match eco-anxiety with eco-action.

Colleagues, a whole-of-society approach, one which is focused on solutions and practical action, and one which encourages the engagement of Canadians rather than stoking fear, alienation and division, is what we need now, and that requires leadership from many quarters. My hope for this inquiry is that we can demonstrate our Senate leadership role in this critical undertaking.

Colleagues, we know that the next stage of the transition to net zero will require governments, the private sector and civil society to act at a scope, scale and speed that is unprecedented.

We know that governments have a central and essential role to play in establishing the right conditions for meeting our climate targets. Governments can adjust or create new regulations. They can employ the tax system. They can make strategic investments. They can provide industrial incentives and they can take measures to ensure that no one is left behind.

Honourable colleagues, with the launch of this inquiry, it is my intention today to set the table with places for every senator who would like to contribute to this climate solutions feast. As we fill this metaphorical inquiry table with climate solutions, some of you might be interested in speaking to comprehensive pathways or road maps to net-zero greenhouse gas emissions.

Some colleagues will be keen to focus on adaptation and resiliency solutions. Others could sharpen their pencils and examine the costs of the required climate action or look at the economic opportunities side of the ledger.

Some will want to focus on the role that Indigenous peoples can and should play in determining, developing, implementing and benefiting from climate solutions. Colleagues will have important northern, coastal, regional, provincial and municipal perspectives to bring to the table. Colleagues will have something to offer on the critical area of the energy transition; on coal, oil and gas, clean fuels, wind, solar, hydro, hydrogen, nuclear, geothermal, tidal; on battery technology, strategic

minerals, carbon capture; on energy and electricity distribution systems; on the potency of efficiency solutions of all types; and on the role of artificial intelligence.

Given our Canadian advantage, some colleagues will have contributions in the area of nature-based solutions: our forests, oceans, grasslands, soils and the importance of agriculture to our net-zero future; decarbonization of industry, of transportation of all types, of buildings and the innovation drivers required to make it all happen; the power and the role of the private finance sector in the net-zero equation; carbon pricing and how it relates to other incentives and disincentives.

Certain colleagues will want to probe global matters: global competitiveness and business and trade opportunities, supports and investments in developing countries, climate migration and refugee solutions as well as the importance of global alliances.

With all eyes on Ukraine and Russia at this time, we are reminded of the link between climate and national and international security as well as the matter of energy security.

Colleagues, we have room for all kinds of climate solutions and a place for you at the table.

As mentioned earlier, the final section of my inquiry intervention today introduces the concept of a just transition: finding innovative and effective ways to ensure the people, communities and regions most closely impacted by the transition to a net-zero economy are considered, have a voice and are supported.

• (1930)

In its June 2021 initial observations report, Canada's new Net-Zero Advisory Body recommended a “seize the upsides” approach, stating that climate action is a net creator of jobs and economic benefits and has the potential to advance justice if done right. No one should be left behind because of where they live, work or their identity.

In his former role as President of the Canadian Labour Congress, our colleague Senator Yussuff said:

Labour will be looking to the federal government to make good on its commitment to supporting local job creation, skills training, apprenticeships and decent wages for workers, especially to those historically underrepresented in the skilled trades sector, including Indigenous workers, racialized workers and women. . . . Canada needs strong Just Transition measures to assist workers in resource communities and fossil fuel-dependent economies to access new job opportunities in clean energy, green transportation, efficient buildings and conservation . . .

Honourable senators, the Liberals promised to introduce just transition legislation as part of their 2019 election platform. An engagement process was launched in July 2021. A report and just transition legislation are expected soon, as well as the creation of a just transition advisory body. These will be foundational for Canada's just transition plan, which one would expect to operate in tandem with the expected emissions reduction plan due later this month.

The IndustriAll Global Union, which represents 50 million workers in the mining, energy and manufacturing sectors, outlines what their trade unions are looking for in a just transition. One, a social dialogue, and with that, ensuring that there is a seat at the table for workers. Two, industrial policies and plans that are sustainable. They call for public policy developed in the public interest with a goal to create decent work. And three, labour market adjustment programs that recognize the importance of customization; one size definitely does not fit all in a successful just transition.

Honourable senators, there are many examples of just transition strategies in other countries, as well as our own early and current experiences with transitioning from coal in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Saskatchewan and Alberta to learn from. Getting Canada's just transition right is imperative. It is complex, and so much depends on Canada's ability to pursue the right future-focused economic opportunities. At the same time, our net-zero future rides on the success of the just transition strategy. We need a lot of attention on job creation opportunities, and we need to ensure Canadians in all regions are well equipped for those jobs.

Honourable colleagues, as I move towards the conclusion of this first intervention, I want to again extend an invitation to each of you to participate and contribute your climate solutions perspectives to this inquiry. The Senate of Canada's engagement on climate matters. We have a collective opportunity to take a leadership role in examining and influencing action on the defining issue of this century.

Honourable senators, two years ago, I heard former Governor General David Johnston speak about shared responsibility of parliamentarians as builders of trust in our democratic institutions, referring to trust as the glue and the grease in our society that keeps us together and helps us to move forward. Honourable senators, I believe by demonstrating our sincere engagement on climate solutions and our collective commitment to helping Canada transition to a fair, prosperous, sustainable and peaceful net-zero future, we can contribute to building that trust. Honourable senators, Canadians expect that of us. Thank you, and *Wela'liq*.

[Translation]

Hon. Patricia Bovey: Honourable senators, I am speaking to you from Treaty 1 territory, the traditional lands of the Anishinaabe, Cree, Oji-Cree, Dene and Dakota, the birthplace of the Métis Nation and the heart of the Métis Nation homeland.

Senator Coyle, I accept your invitation. I rise to add a visual and museological perspective to your inquiry, which calls our attention to the importance of finding solutions to transition

Canada's society, economy and resource use in pursuit of a fair, prosperous, sustainable and peaceful net-zero emissions future for our country and the planet.

I fully support this objective, and I believe that we can find these solutions. We know that collaboration between multiple sectors, both in Canada and in the world, will be necessary, with a constructive vision and a commitment from individuals, communities, industry, scientists, environmentalists and not-for-profit organizations — in short, from everyone.

Colleagues, I applaud the many ways that the Senate's standing committees and working groups are rising to these challenges. The intersections of these approaches are encouraging and important.

[English]

Museums are responding to this crisis in their collections, exhibitions, shipping, mechanical systems and even their restaurant menus. Museums' and galleries' roles are to communicate realities, including eco-awareness to educate audiences through exhibitions and their programs. More than 550 organizations have formed the international Gallery Climate Coalition to "facilitate the decarbonisation of the visual arts sector and promote zero waste practices." They have a decarbonization plan.

But museums must also consider their carbon footprint. An article in *Canadian Art*, entitled "The Green Cube," states:

Museums are regularly forums for such big ideas. But seldom do we consider: are they also places that practice them?

Noting art and exhibitions do have environmental costs, what are their impacts? How are museums mitigating those impacts? A 2021 Statistics Canada survey showed that nearly two thirds of Canada's arts, entertainment and recreational organizations and businesses have some type of environmental practice or policy, but that:

"Requirements for climate action are still quite rare in national cultural policy", as are connections between government departments that are responsible for culture and the environment.

And that:

The cultural community needs "the policy frameworks and authority, funding and accountability to be fully mainstreamed into national environmental planning".

I know improvements will come. This sector is aware of the goals and is transitioning, adding to the dialogue and drawing from that dialogue.

Individual artists have been giving visual voice to environmental and climate change concerns for years. I thank Senator Coyle and Senator Kutcher for their idea to include art in the possible commission of a piece heralding the Senate working

group's goals. Rather than commissioning, which is complex, costly, time-consuming and with clearly articulated processes, we have been exploring borrowing art.

[Translation]

We have chosen instead to borrow two works by two established and internationally renowned Canadian artists, Roberta Bondar and Ed Burtynsky. The theme is "Visual Voices: Climate Change & Environment."

[English]

Artists have for decades portrayed the realities of environmental preservation, and more recently the understanding of the effects of climate change. One — astronaut, neurologist and artist Roberta Bondar, working with NASA — depicts endangered species. Another — recipient of the Governor General's Awards in the Visual and Media Arts, Ed Burtynsky, with support from industry and business — documents human impacts on various locales in his art. In their photographs, both these artists honestly present what they see and call us to preserve our planet and to sustain life — human, flora and fauna — and to work together as individuals, communities and industry.

• (1940)

Artists' visual voices are drawing global citizens into the reality of our planet's crisis.

Let's go back to 1939. As I said earlier today, I believe Emily Carr was the first Canadian artist to address environmental issues in art. From 1939 to the early 1940s, she did a number of paintings depicting the concerns of clear-cutting, such as *Logged-over Hillside*. Each summer, a friend towed her trailer, called "The Elephant," to the site she wanted to paint. I would be delighted to take you to some of her favourite sites.

In her journals *Hundreds and Thousands*, Carr revealed her observations and hopes for renewal:

Yesterday I went into a great forest, I mean a portion of growth undisturbed for years and years. Way back, some great, grand trees had been felled, leaving their stumps with the ragged row of "screamers" in the centre, the last chords to break, chords in the tree's very heart. Growth had repaired all the damage and hidden the scars. There were second-growth trees . . . that stood at the foot of those mighty arrow-straight monarchs long since chewed by steel teeth in the mighty mills, chewed into utility, nailed into houses, churches, telephone poles, all the "woodsness" extracted, nothing remaining but wood.

Many artists, working in all media, have since portrayed the realities of place and change, beauty and devastation. Not wanting to be negative but wanting to show where we are "at," they call us to action to turn the tide of potential environmental devastation.

[Senator Bovey]

We must preserve the miracle that former grand chief, artist and poet Ovide Mercredi reveals in his poem *The Earth*:

The Earth is a great miracle
The author of its unique destiny
A traveler in unending space
The designer of all its beauty
The orchestra of all natural events
Benign or catastrophic.

Governor General's Visual Arts Award recipient Carole Sabiston, long interested in space, worries about the debris we leave up there. Her textile assemblages, like *Take Off: Point Of Departure And Mode Of Travel*, 1987-1989, bring that issue to light.

Multi-award recipient artist Aganetha Dyck worked for decades with global scientists researching the international concern of decreasing bee populations. Bees were her art collaborators.

In his compelling elevator sculptures, Don Proch, who grew up on a Prairie farm, has drawn attention since the 1970s to farmers' acid rain concerns. His 2019 *From Aseissippi to Altona* portrays Prairie fields, skies, the grain elevator with its characteristic drive-through and the wind farm near Altona, Manitoba.

Artist David McMillan photographed the immediate devastation of Chernobyl after the nuclear disaster. He returned to the same sites annually, for years — almost two decades — documenting the changes, the deterioration of the man-made structures and the slow appearance of bits of vegetation.

Inuit artists across the North have also created compelling work over decades, depicting their changing lives and concerns about climate change.

[Translation]

Let us now turn to Roberta Bondar and Edward Burtynsky. I have organized exhibits of these two esteemed artists. Both of them truly love our planet. Neither one hesitates to show it and to call on society to make changes.

[English]

Much-honoured astronaut, neurologist and artist Roberta Bondar draws from her experiences and accomplishments in each of her professions, tying them together in her art. Seeing our planet from space made an indelible impact on her, which she shares with us through her art.

She hangs from planes, climbs trees and balances on limbs to get the images she wants. She has no fear in creating her images but fears for the world's endangered species. Her well-known *Discovering Canada's National Parks* series documents the richness of our country's land, taking us to parts of this nation we may not have seen in person. She is working with NASA again, this time as an artist, to create her project on endangered birds.

Bondar wrote to me about her image *Endangered Shadows*:

... the abstract three-dimensional background of a remnant pond in the Prairie Pothole Region of Saskatchewan looks like a wave that threatens to engulf [the Whooping Cranes], portending dangers that they will face during this twice yearly flight. The long, fall shadows of the cranes underscore their evanescence.

Years ago, Alberta's energy sector sponsored the exhibition of Ed Burtynsky's *Oil Sands* series, clearly indicating their active part in finding solutions. I applaud their development of clean energy and the increasing number of wind and solar installations across Canada.

Burtynsky's 2018 London Photo Festival submissions, as international celebrated guest artist, were captivating. I was pleased to see his work in that context and to hear his lecture. His two- and three-dimensional works showed landfills with mountains of discarded tires and computer elements. I am sure he is aware of the new museum in Nigeria showing issues of waste.

Burtynsky's National Gallery of Canada and Art Gallery of Ontario exhibitions, and 2018 book *Anthropocene* explored these issues with artistic honesty and integrity, and he presented next steps. He does not harp on particular industries. Rather, he calls for collaboration of thought, action and vision.

We need fuel to heat our homes, for travel and in making the materials we use daily. He states:

When I first started photographing industry it was out of a sense of awe at what we as a species were up to. Our achievements became a source of infinite possibilities. But time goes on, and that flush of wonder began to turn. The car that I drove cross-country began to represent not only freedom, but also something much more conflicted. I began to think about oil itself: as both the source of energy that makes everything possible, and as a source of dread, for its ongoing endangerment of our habitat.

Colleagues, Hill Strategies Research underlines the inextricable link between the arts and the environment in their January 12 blog. The international Climate Heritage Network identifies some of these relationships:

Culture anchors people to places and to each other. It can create cohesion in ways that enable community-building and collective action. Artists and cultural voices drive public awareness and actions; their work can be a powerful tool for climate mobilization. Through public accessibility and trust, cultural institutions like museums and libraries provide platforms for listening to communities and hubs of multicultural and inter-generational exchange, capacity building and knowledge-sharing.

[*Translation*]

Colleagues, I was delighted to learn that, in December, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, or MIT, brought together academics and musicians for an environmental solutions

initiative entitled "Artists and Scientists Together on Climate Solutions." This proves that the solution to climate change will not emerge from a single area, but from all cultures.

Dava Newman, a professor at the MIT Department of Aeronautics and Astronautics, noted that while scientists collect vast amounts of data that demonstrate the changes happening on our planet, communication is the biggest challenge faced by the scientific community. According to Dava Newman, human behaviour will require working together across the boundaries of different disciplines and areas of expertise, which could be crucial to winning the battle against climate warming.

[*English*]

Colleagues, we have the opportunity to garner support and awareness from all regions and all sectors in our country, as we are from all regions and all sectors. Let us follow the vision of scientists and artists; let us be proactive in our collaborations and open to hearing the hard facts and learning from the inspirations of many.

Let us do our part: listen, examine, study and change the ways that need to be changed.

Thank you, Senator Coyle. Thank you, colleagues.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

(On motion of Senator Wells, debate adjourned.)

• (1950)

BUSINESS OF THE SENATE

Hon. Donald Neil Plett (Leader of the Opposition): Your Honour, I rise to ask for your indulgence, and I apologize for doing so this late in the evening.

A few minutes ago, we dealt with Motion No. 50 on the Order Paper, a motion by Senator Dean that Senator Wells inadvertently did not adjourn and it moved on. He asked to go back so he could adjourn this. You graciously asked the chamber whether they would allow that. A few members of the chamber did not and, of course, you need leave for something like this to happen.

I want to draw the attention of the Speaker and the chamber to a few instances this evening that occurred either as a result of wearing masks, not hearing properly or the changing of procedures. We had two instances earlier this evening, Your Honour. One was on Senator Patterson's amendment to Bill C-12. When the question was called on whether people were in agreement with the motion there were a few "nays." You declared that the amendment did not pass. You never asked for any "yeas" to the motion.

If I recall, Your Honour, we would have voice votes first, and you would declare whether the yeas or the nays had it. Senators would then be able to rise. Two senators rising would then trigger a standing vote. You didn't do that with Senator Patterson's motion.

Subsequently, they were caught somewhat off guard and failed to stand when they very much wanted a standing vote. I believe the scroll notes indicated that there would be a standing vote with a 15-minute bell. These are items that are discussed at scroll ahead of time, decisions made, negotiations had, and we try to have collaboration and cooperation in the Senate in that regard.

The same thing happened, Your Honour, on Senator Gold's motion with regard to the special committee. Senator Gold was trying to do the job based on conversations and agreements we had. He was not trying to sneak anything by us. He had wanted to be able to speak later in the day but, because of the Order Paper, was impelled to speak to it at the time.

The same thing happened when you asked whether the motion should pass. I got up — a little late — because I realized you were declaring the motion passed, and said I would like to adjourn the debate. You graciously agreed and allowed me to do that. There was a senator who challenged whether you should have allowed me to do that because the vote had taken place.

Your Honour, the fact of the matter is, had you not done that, we would have gotten into an acrimonious debate over a motion that we now passed with virtually no debate, and by agreement from everybody, because you allowed us to go back the way you did. The other Senate leaders were able to come, and we collaborated very quickly.

After Question Period, I withdrew my request to adjourn. Senator Gold then presented an amendment and we could pass a motion that the government clearly wanted passed tonight, and that was only as a result of collaboration.

When Senator Dean moved Motion No. 50, I was watching it on television. It was somewhat muffled. I credited that possibly to being the television. Then I heard Senator Wells indicate that he had had the same difficulty in hearing and that he actually had wanted to adjourn, which again is clearly indicated in block letters, "Senator Wells to adjourn." I'm not sure, Your Honour, whether you have access to that or whether it's there. I believe the table has it. It was evident that Senator Wells wanted to adjourn this.

In fairness, Your Honour, on two occasions you asked whether senators would give leave for Senator Wells to do that. Ironically, they were the same senators who initially, when I wanted to adjourn Senator Gold's motion, challenged you about allowing me to do that.

We have meetings going on. We spend a lot of time at scroll discussing these things, sometimes with good collaboration and sometimes with acrimony. But if we want to develop a culture of getting along in this chamber, then I think we have to allow for some mistakes, certainly during this time when we're still wearing masks like you, Your Honour, when you speak.

We have people on Zoom to whom we are constantly giving the benefit of the doubt when their internet goes down. You allow them to start over again with their speeches because we have not been able to hear them, and rightfully so.

During this type of debate we are having, if we aren't going to forgive each other's mistakes and allow us to go back a minute later — not an hour, not half an hour, not 15 minutes later — at the next motion; that's when Senator Wells got up and asked the Senate's indulgence to go back and adjourn a motion that is clearly on the scroll. Every leadership person, every person on scroll here has that.

I find it a little perplexing that possibly the leadership teams of the groups that denied leave wouldn't have said to their senators, "Listen, it's right here. Senator Wells was going to adjourn it." No one jumped to the defence.

Your Honour, I am asking that we go back and do the right thing and allow Senator Wells to adjourn a motion that everyone at scroll knew. The Deputy Leader of the Government knew, I'm sure. The scroll people in other groups knew. If we don't allow Senator Wells to adjourn this, we are making a mistake here.

Mistakes have been made. I'm not pointing fingers at anybody. These are mistakes that have been made. But these are mistakes that are serious to people. Senator Patterson was serious about wanting to at least have a standing vote on his amendment that he felt was important.

Your Honour, I'm asking for the indulgence of this chamber to go back and allow Senator Wells to adjourn this. If this is the type of thing that we want to have happen, we will have to constantly default to adjourning and then going back.

I think that when we make deals before we come into this chamber, those deals should be honoured. Your Honour, I accept the fact that you're not party to those deals. You're not there. Again, I don't know what you see there, but I'm sure the people assisting you see this. Somebody should have pointed out to you that Senator Wells wanted to adjourn this. Yes, you did hesitate. No question.

I am often accused of having a loud voice. I don't often hear, "Well, I couldn't understand you, Don." Not everyone in this chamber is the same, Your Honour. You have a softer voice; it's a little more difficult to understand. It is possible that we don't have our hearing aids on.

I'm going to stop here, other than asking again for the indulgence of the Senate to go back and allow Senator Wells to adjourn Motion No. 50.

• (2000)

The Hon. the Speaker: I'm not going to ask anyone to speak on this.

Before telling the Senate that I would normally take this under advisement, I'm going to put the question to the chamber.

Senator Plett is asking again that we revert to Motion No. 50 and we give Senator Wells an opportunity to adjourn it. However, it will take leave. I'm asking the chamber now again, after Senator Plett's speech, if you will give leave. If you are opposed to leave, please say "no."

Leave is granted. Senator Wells.

NATIONAL SECURITY AND DEFENCE

MOTION TO AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE TO MEET DURING ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE—DEBATE ADJOURNED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Dean, seconded by the Honourable Senator Saint-Germain:

That, pursuant to rule 12-18(2), for the remainder of this session, the Standing Senate Committee on National Security and Defence be authorized to meet at their approved meeting time as determined by the third report of the Committee of Selection, adopted by the Senate on December 7, 2021, on any Monday which immediately

precedes a Tuesday when the Senate is scheduled to sit, even though the Senate may then be adjourned for a period exceeding a week.

Hon. David M. Wells: I move the adjournment of Motion No. 50 in my name.

The Hon. the Speaker: Moved by the Honourable Senator Wells that further debate be adjourned until the next sitting of the Senate.

If you are opposed to the motion, please say, "no."

Hon. Tony Dean: I want to say one thing. On my scroll, it says Senator Wells may adjourn. May. So I could be excused, I hope, for assuming that there was an element of choice when it came to that motion. But I'm in the hands of the chamber. I stand back from this now and the chamber can deal with it.

(On motion of Senator Wells, debate adjourned.)

(At 8:02 p.m., the Senate was continued until tomorrow at 10 a.m.)

[Translation]

APPENDIX

DELAYED ANSWERS TO ORAL QUESTIONS

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

COVID-19 PANDEMIC—INTERNATIONAL AID

(Response to question raised by the Honourable Peter Harder on November 30, 2021)

Global Affairs Canada (GAC)

Canada recognizes that there continues to be great need and high demand globally for safe, efficacious and WHO-approved COVID-19 vaccines. Canada is prioritizing sharing doses via the COVAX Facility to ensure efficient distribution and to maximize impact. COVAX provides a one-stop mechanism that weighs global needs and priorities based on access, epidemiological concerns, and absorption capacity.

COVAX uses a transparent equitable allocation framework to determine where doses are sent. The delivery schedule is dependent on the agreement between COVAX and partner organizations, manufacturers, and recipient countries. In the majority of cases, doses donated by Canada to COVAX are delivered directly to recipient countries from manufacturers.

Canada is working closely with COVAX to finalize donation agreements as quickly as possible and to confirm with manufacturers when doses will be available for delivery.

Canada has ensured complementary financing to cover the ancillary costs for all doses donated through COVAX. These funds cover the freight, syringes, diluent, and indemnity and liability costs associated with these doses. Canada is one of only three countries to ensure full funding of ancillary requirements for donated doses.

FINANCE

CANADA'S COMMITMENT TO THE FIGHT AGAINST HIV/AIDS

(Response to question raised by the Honourable René Cormier on December 1, 2021)

Global Affairs Canada (GAC)

Canada has been a strong supporter of AIDS programming globally over the past two decades. The Government of Canada is providing \$930.4 million between 2020 and 2022 to support the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, and \$20 million in core funding to UNAIDS between 2017 and 2022.

With the support of donors like Canada, tremendous results have been achieved, while more still must be done. Thanks to efforts led by the Global Fund, new HIV infections among adolescent girls and young women have dropped by 41% since 2010 in the 13 priority countries where the HIV burden is highest. In addition, the global rollout of HIV treatment over the past decade has saved millions of lives: UNAIDS estimates that 16.6 million AIDS-related deaths have been averted over the last two decades.

Canada continues to promote and defend the comprehensive sexual and reproductive health and rights of those most at risk of HIV, including key populations. Canada remains committed to end AIDS by 2030 and is proud to be hosting the 24th International Conference on AIDS in Montreal in July.

NATURAL RESOURCES

CARBON CAPTURE, UTILIZATION AND STORAGE STRATEGY

(Response to question raised by the Honourable Marty Klyne on December 14, 2021)

Natural Resources Canada (NRCan):

Carbon capture, utilization and storage (CCUS) is an area of significant opportunity for Canada. It is an essential part of the transition towards a prosperous net-zero future, and will help key sectors compete in a low-carbon global economy.

The advancement of the CCUS industry in Canada will facilitate the creation and retention of jobs in a variety of existing industries and emerging sectors, including heavy industries (such as cement and steel), oil and gas, forestry, electricity, and hydrogen. As such, these jobs will be distributed across the entire country, and draw upon many of the skill sets that are currently commonplace in those sectors.

Through Budget 2021, the Government of Canada committed to providing \$319 million to support research, development and demonstrations that would improve the commercial viability of CCUS technologies. This will help Canada achieve its goal of net zero by 2050, while being a global supplier of choice for cleaner energy and innovative new technologies.

The scale-up required in the deployment and adoption of the CCUS technologies will increase high-value employment opportunities in engineering and research, design, and development, and jobs supporting project construction, operations and maintenance.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

ACCESS TO COVID-19 TOOLS (ACT) ACCELERATOR

(Response to question raised by the Honourable Peter Harder on December 16, 2021)

Global Affairs Canada (GAC)

Canada has been a leading international donor to end the acute phase of the pandemic. Canada has committed over \$1.3 billion for the Access to COVID-19 Tools (ACT) Accelerator, a critical international partnership to ensure equitable access to COVID-19 tests, treatments and vaccines which the Prime Minister has championed alongside other world leaders since May 2020. Canada is among the top five donors to the ACT Accelerator to date and remains committed to continuing to support this important global initiative in 2022.

The mandate letter for the Minister of International Development and Minister responsible for the Pacific Economic Development Agency of Canada outlines the government's commitment to reinforce international efforts to ensure that people around the world have access to health interventions to fight COVID-19, including by donating at least 200 million vaccine doses to vulnerable populations around the world through COVAX by the end of 2022 and providing additional funding for enhanced testing and vaccine production capacity in developing countries.

CONTENTS

Thursday, March 3, 2022

	PAGE		PAGE
SENATORS' STATEMENTS		The Estimates, 2022-23	
Expression of Thanks		National Finance Committee Authorized to Study Main Estimates	
Hon. Diane F. Griffin	785	Hon. Raymonde Gagné	792
World Engineering Day for Sustainable Development		Emergencies Act	
Hon. Rosa Galvez	785	Appointment of Special Joint Committee—Message from Commons—Motion—Debate	
Ukraine—Russia's Actions		Hon. Marc Gold	793
Hon. Patricia Bovey	786	Hon. Donald Neil Plett	794
Olympic and Paralympic Games 2022		Point of Order—Speaker's Ruling Reserved	
Canadian Athletes		Hon. Lucie Moncion	795
Hon. Victor Oh	786	Hon. Donald Neil Plett	795
Ukraine			
Hon. Marilou McPhedran	786	<hr/>	
Hon. Raymonde Gagné	787	QUESTION PERIOD	
Michelle Smith		Business of the Senate	
Hon. Raymonde Gagné	787	The Hon. the Speaker	795
<hr/>		Ministry of Environment and Climate Change	
ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS		Bay du Nord Development Project	
Bill Respecting Certain Measures Related to COVID-19 (Bill C-10)		Hon. David M. Wells	795
Fourth Report of Social Affairs, Science and Technology Committee Presented		Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change	796
Hon. Ratna Omidvar	788	2030 Emissions Reduction Plan	
Aboriginal Peoples		Hon. Mary Coyle	796
Motion to Affect Committee Membership Adopted		Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change	796
Hon. Marc Gold	788	Challenges in the Fight Against Climate Change	
Ethics and Conflict of Interest for Senators		Hon. Paul J. Massicotte	796
Motion to Affect Committee Membership Adopted		Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change	797
Hon. Marc Gold	788	Collaboration with Indigenous Groups	
Business of the Senate	788	Hon. Marty Klyne	797
<hr/>		Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change	797
ORDERS OF THE DAY		Migratory Birds Regulations	
Emergencies Act		Hon. Diane F. Griffin	797
Appointment of Special Joint Committee—Message from Commons		Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change	797
Hon. Marc Gold	790	Carbon Tax	
Old Age Security Act (Bill C-12)		Hon. Denise Batters	797
Bill to Amend—Third Reading—Motion in Amendment Negatived		Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change	797
Hon. Jane Cordy	790	Nuclear Energy Development	
Hon. Stan Kutcher	790	Hon. Salma Ataullahjan	798
Bill to Amend—Third Reading	791	Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change	798
		Federal Departments' Climate Policy	
		Hon. Rosa Galvez	798
		Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change	798
		Seventeen Sustainable Development Goals of the 2030 Agenda	
		Hon. Renée Dupuis	798
		Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change	799

CONTENTS

Thursday, March 3, 2022

	PAGE		PAGE
Oil and Gas Production and Net-Zero Emissions		Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change	803
Hon. Clément Gignac	799	Environmental Transition Action Plan	
Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change	799	Hon. Mary Coyle	804
Nuclear Energy Development		Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change	804
Hon. Pamela Wallin	799	Nuclear Energy Development	
Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change	799	Hon. Salma Atallahjan	804
Liquefied Natural Gas		Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change	804
Hon. Pierre-Hugues Boisvenu	799	Jeanne D’Arc Basin Exploration Drilling Project	
Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change	799	Hon. David M. Wells	804
Climate Change Adaptation Initiatives		Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change	804
Hon. Mary Jane McCallum	800	Carbon Capture Tax Credit	
Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change	800	Hon. Pierre J. Dalphond	804
Collaboration with Artists and the Creative Sector		Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change	805
Hon. Patricia Bovey	800	Climate Change Adaptation Initiatives	
Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change	800	Hon. René Cormier	805
Impact of Inflation on Oil Prices		Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change	805
Hon. Jean-Guy Dagenais	800	Delayed Answers to Oral Questions	805
Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change	801		
Parks Canada Real Estate Assets			
Hon. Rose-May Poirier	801	ORDERS OF THE DAY	
Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change	801	Business of the Senate	
Climate Change Adaptation Initiatives		Hon. Donald Neil Plett	805
Hon. Bernadette Clement	801		
Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change	801	Emergencies Act	
Atlantic Loop		Appointment of Special Joint Committee—Message from Commons—Motion in Modification Adopted	
Hon. Terry M. Mercer	801	Hon. Marc Gold	807
Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change	802	Hon. Donald Neil Plett	809
Carbon Tax		Hon. Marilou McPhedran	810
Hon. Dennis Glen Patterson	802		
Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change	802	Royal Assent	811
Transport of Oil			
Hon. Michael L. MacDonald	802	Food Day in Canada Bill (Bill S-227)	
Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change	802	Second Reading	
Environmental Transition Action Plan		Hon. Rose-May Poirier	811
Hon. Hassan Yussuff	802	Referred to Committee	811
Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change	802		
Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999		Employment Insurance Act	
Hon. Pierre J. Dalphond	803	Employment Insurance Regulations (Bill S-236)	
Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change	803	Bill to Amend—Second Reading—Debate Adjourned	
Climate Change Education		Hon. Diane F. Griffin	812
Hon. Frances Lankin	803	Hon. Pat Duncan	813
Hon. Steven Guilbeault, P.C., M.P., Minister of Environment and Climate Change	803	Hon. Kim Pate	813
Dormant Oil and Gas Wells			
Hon. Paula Simons	803	Criminal Code	
		Canadian Victims Bill of Rights (Bill S-238)	
		Bill to Amend—Second Reading—Debate Adjourned	
		Hon. Pierre-Hugues Boisvenu	813

CONTENTS

Thursday, March 3, 2022

	PAGE		PAGE
Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration		Business of the Senate	
Second Report of Committee—Debate Adjourned		Hon. David M. Wells	828
Hon. Sabi Marwah	816		
Hon. Diane Bellemare	817	Rules, Procedures and the Rights of Parliament	
Hon. Denise Batters	817	Motion to Authorize Committee to Meet During Adjournment	
Hon. Frances Lankin	818	of the Senate—Debate Adjourned	
		Hon. Diane Bellemare	828
The Senate			
Motion to Recognize that Climate Change is an Urgent Crisis		Net-zero Emissions Future	
—Debate Continued		Inquiry—Debate Adjourned	
Hon. Margaret Dawn Anderson	819	Hon. Mary Coyle	829
Motion Pertaining to Section 55 of the Constitution Act,		Hon. Patricia Bovey	831
1982, As Amended—Debate Continued			
Hon. Pierre-Hugues Boisvenu	821	Business of the Senate	
Motion to Adopt the Senate of Canada Environmental and		Hon. Donald Neil Plett	833
Sustainability Policy Statement—Debate Continued			
Hon. Colin Deacon	823	National Security and Defence	
		Motion to Authorize Committee to Meet During Adjournment	
Contributions and Impacts of Métis, Inuit, and First		of the Senate—Debate Adjourned	
Nations		Hon. David M. Wells	835
Inquiry—Debate Continued		Hon. Tony Dean	835
Hon. Mary Jane McCallum	825		
		APPENDIX	
Aboriginal Peoples		DELAYED ANSWERS TO ORAL QUESTIONS	
Committee Authorized to Study the Federal Government’s		Foreign Affairs	
Constitutional, Treaty, Political and Legal Responsibilities		COVID-19 Pandemic—International Aid	836
to First Nations, Inuit and Métis Peoples and Refer Papers			
and Evidence Since the Beginning of the First Session of		Finance	
the Forty-Second Parliament		Canada’s Commitment to the Fight Against HIV/AIDS	836
Hon. Brian Francis	827		
		Natural Resources	
Human Rights		Carbon Capture, Utilization and Storage Strategy	836
Committee Authorized to Study Issues Relating to Human			
Rights Generally		Foreign Affairs	
Hon. Salma Ataullahjan	828	Access to COVID-19 Tools (ACT) Accelerator	837
National Security and Defence			
Committee Authorized to Meet during Adjournment of the			
Senate			
Hon. Tony Dean	828		
Official Languages			
Motion to Authorize Committee to Meet During Adjournment			
of the Senate—Debate Adjourned			
Hon. René Cormier	828		