



DEBATES OF THE SENATE

1st SESSION • 42nd PARLIAMENT • VOLUME 150 • NUMBER 113

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Thursday, April 13, 2017

The Honourable GEORGE J. FUREY
Speaker

CONTENTS

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

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

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

THE SENATE

Thursday, April 13, 2017

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

Prayers.

SENATORS' STATEMENTS

NATIONAL VOLUNTEER WEEK

Hon. Terry M. Mercer: Honourable senators, April 23 to 29 is National Volunteer Week. This is a special week set aside to recognize and pay tribute to the great contributions that volunteers have made to our lives, our communities and our nation.

Having worked in the non-profit sector for over 30 years, volunteering has been a large part of my life. Generosity exists in abundance and comes from many forms. Canadians want to feel like they are connected to something bigger than themselves. That is why people volunteer to try and change the world.

Volunteers often fill gaps where services are not adequately being addressed. Volunteers deliver meals, make phone calls, raise money, rescue animals, mow lawns for their neighbours, support palliative care, clean parks and build houses. The list goes on and on. If something needs to be done, a volunteer will be there to help do it.

Honourable senators, too often we forget that volunteers are essential to the success of many organizations. Without volunteers, these organizations would not be as effective as they need to be. In fact, political parties would not exist without volunteers, something that many of us in this place know all too well.

During National Volunteer Week, don't forget to thank a volunteer for the hard work they do, or perhaps volunteer yourself for a cause you hold dear to your heart. You will be surprised how good it makes you feel. Volunteer, colleagues.

WORLD FIGURE SKATING CHAMPIONSHIPS 2017

CONGRATULATIONS TO KAETLYN OSMOND AND GABRIELLE DALEMAN ON WINNING SILVER AND BRONZE MEDALS

Hon. Elizabeth Marshall: Honourable senators, Newfoundland and Labrador's success in the world of sports continues.

I rise today to congratulate an exceptional Canadian and Newfoundland figure skater, Kaetlyn Osmond, who won the silver medal in the 2017 World Figure Skating Championships held earlier this month in Helsinki, Finland.

Kaetlyn, originally from Marystown in Newfoundland and Labrador, and an extraordinary Canadian figure skater and proud Newfoundlander, had a remarkable comeback after she suffered an injury that would not allow her to skate much less compete in figure skating championships.

Kaetlyn had a horrific accident in 2014, when she turned sharply to avoid someone in practice. She required two surgeries and faced both physical and mental obstacles in returning to the ice rink to fulfill what she loves to do, skating. Kaetlyn had to relearn how to skate again, including all her techniques. She had to learn to compete again. Most importantly, she had to learn to trust in herself again.

Honourable senators, although it was hard for Kaetlyn to believe that she would ever be able to compete at her best again, she never gave up.

After her off-season and recovery, she was able to train through the help of her coach Ravi Walia. Her entire coaching staff and her friends and family played an essential role in her motivation and confidence.

This month, Newfoundlanders and Labradorians and all Canadians celebrated two astounding triumphs that two young Canadian women accomplished in Helsinki. Kaetlyn Osmond gave Canada an historic silver medal and set a new record; Gabrielle Daleman from Newmarket, Ontario, won the bronze medal.

This is the first time two Canadian women won the silver and bronze medals. Indeed, it was the first time the Canadian flag has been doubled up on the podium for women at the World Figure Skating Championships.

Honourable senators, I invite you to join me and Canadians from coast to coast as we celebrate Gabrielle's bronze medal and Kaetlyn's astounding comeback and silver medal in the world of figure skating.

Gabrielle and Kaetlyn, we wish you all the best in the 2018 Winter Olympics to be held in Japan.

THOMAS "TOMMY" RICKETTS

Hon. Fabian Manning: Today I'm pleased to present Chapter 16 of "Telling our Story."

Throughout 2016, commemorations were held in Canada and in France to mark the one hundredth anniversary of the Royal Newfoundland Regiment's heroism and loss at Beaumont-Hamel. These commemorations also gave voice to the soldiers who received special recognition for their heroic deeds on the battlefields of France and Belgium, such as Newfoundland hero Private Thomas Ricketts. He earned the Victoria Cross, the

highest and most prestigious award for gallantry in the face of the enemy that can be awarded to the British and Commonwealth forces. At the time, he was only 17 years of age.

Private Ricketts was the only member of the Newfoundland contingent to receive this distinguished award and was the youngest Victoria Cross recipient in the British Army.

On October 14, 1918, during the advance from Ledgehem, Belgium, Private Tommy Ricketts' platoon was temporarily held up by heavy hostile fire. The platoon suffered severe casualties. Private Ricketts volunteered to go forward with his section commander and a Lewis Gun to attempt to outflank the battery of the enemy. They advanced by short rushes while subject to severe fire from enemy machine guns.

When they were only 300 yards away, they ran out of ammunition. The enemy seized on this opportunity and brought up their gun teams. Private Ricketts at once realized the situation and doubled back 100 yards, procured more ammunition and dashed back to the Lewis Gun. By very accurate fire, he drove the enemy and their gun teams back into a farm. His platoon then advanced without casualties and captured four field guns, four machine guns and eight prisoners.

By his presence of mind and anticipating the enemy intentions, and his utter disregard for personal safety, Private Ricketts secured the future supplies of ammunition, which directly resulted in these important captures and undoubtedly saved many lives.

"This is the youngest Victoria Cross in my Army," said King George V as he presented Private Ricketts with his Victoria Cross on January 19, 1919.

A lot has been written about Thomas Ricketts and his personality. He was extremely shy and modest and somewhat embarrassed by the attention that he received because of the medal. He confided in his wife that he believed he was no more deserving of the award than any other soldier that he fought beside.

The fact that his brother, George Ricketts, went missing in battle and has no known grave, and many of his other friends never came home from the war, played heavily on his mind.

Tommy Ricketts appears on a street, a stadium, a school and a legion hall in Newfoundland, and his story of bravery is well known to generations of Newfoundlanders, but he has shunned the spotlight, going as far as declining invitations to meet Queen Elizabeth. For many years, he declined to accept his Victoria Cross pension from the British government.

Senators, it is my understanding that the Royal Newfoundland Advisory Council, along with the Belgium family who now owns the farmland where Thomas Ricketts' brave deeds occurred, are currently planning to place a memorial plaque on the farmland in his honour.

The Ricketts family donated Thomas Ricketts' Victoria Cross to our Canadian War Museum in late 2003, but then this past summer special arrangements were made to bring his Victoria

Cross back home to Newfoundland, where it has been placed on a special display at The Rooms Provincial Museum in St. John's.

Tommy Ricketts was given a state funeral on Monday, February 13, 1967, after leaving behind a legacy of a humble and illiterate fisherman who rose to become Newfoundland's greatest war hero.

Newfoundlander Tommy Ricketts was a true hero and soldier, and at the going down of the sun and in the morning, we shall remember them.

[*Translation*]

BATTLE OF VIMY RIDGE

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY

Hon. Mobina S. B. Jaffer: Honourable senators, on April 9, 2017, I had the privilege and the honour of being invited along with our Speaker, Senator Furey, and Senator White to attend the ceremony marking the 100th anniversary of the Battle of Vimy Ridge.

As the chair of the Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs, I would like to acknowledge the sacrifice that our troops and their families have made for us. I wish to sincerely thank all veterans for their service to Canadians.

I also want to thank Elder Annie Smith St-Georges for the opening prayer and the smudging ceremony, as well as the Ottawa Chorale Society and all the artists for their touching performances, which helped make the ceremony memorable for all Canadians.

• (1340)

During the ceremony, I was deeply moved and proud to stand next to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, which holds the body of an unidentified Canadian soldier from the First World War. It deserves our attention and respect.

Two years ago, I visited Vimy Ridge with my grandson, Ayaan. He was amazed at what our soldiers accomplished, and so am I.

The commemorative ceremony will be forever etched on my memory. Etched on my memory because of the sacrifices made at Vimy to give me my freedom. Etched on my memory because war is destructive and we will never forget the men and women who made the ultimate sacrifice. All of this is etched on my memory so that you and I, as politicians, work harder to prevent war because it demands the ultimate sacrifice from our men and women and their families. We must never ask anyone to make that sacrifice except as a last resort.

Today I would like to take the opportunity to thank everyone who has served in the Canadian Armed Forces. I thank them for paying such a terrible price to protect our world. We will always remember your ultimate sacrifice. We will never forget you.

[Senator Manning]

[English]

SYMPOSIUM150

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I wish to inform senators that next month, on May 25 and 26, the Senate will host an important symposium to mark the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Confederation. This outstanding symposium will involve many eminent Canadians, including scientists, jurists, economists, Aboriginal leaders and accomplished women. Among them are two former Governors General, the Chief of the Supreme Court of Canada, and three past premiers. Through 10 separate sessions over two days, we will hear their views on topics that have challenged the nation over the last 50 years and how these issues will be addressed in the coming decades.

This event was developed through the hard work and dedication of Senator Joyal and Senator Seidman, and it is supported through the funding of Internal Economy. The papers of this symposium will be published in separate English and French editions later in the year by McGill-Queen's University Press. The symposium will also be broadcast by CPAC and it promises to be an extraordinary event. We should all be very proud that it is being organized and sponsored by the Senate and taking place in our chamber. A program for the event will be available in the Reading Room and I will take it upon myself to ensure that a copy of this notice is sent to all senators' offices.

[Translation]

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

STUDY ON THE POLICIES, PRACTICES AND COLLABORATIVE EFFORTS OF THE CANADA BORDER SERVICES AGENCY IN DETERMINING ADMISSIBILITY TO CANADA AND REMOVAL OF INADMISSIBLE INDIVIDUALS

SIXTEENTH REPORT OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY AND DEFENCE COMMITTEE TABLED DURING THE SECOND SESSION OF THE FORTY-FIRST PARLIAMENT—GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TABLED

Hon. Peter Harder (Government Representative in the Senate): Honourable senators, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government response to the sixteenth report of the Standing Senate Committee on National Security and Defence, entitled *Vigilance, Accountability and Security at Canada's Borders*, tabled in the Senate on June 18, 2015 during the Second Session of the Forty-first Parliament.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, pursuant to rule 12-24(4), this response and the original report are deemed referred to the Standing Senate Committee on National Security and Defence.

[English]

CONTROLLED DRUGS AND SUBSTANCES BILL

BILL TO AMEND—FOURTEENTH REPORT OF LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE PRESENTED

Hon. Bob Runciman, Chair of the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs, presented the following report:

Thursday, April 13, 2017

The Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs has the honour to present its

FOURTEENTH REPORT

Your committee, to which was referred Bill C-37, An Act to amend the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act and to make related amendments to other Acts, has, in obedience to the order of reference of March 9, 2017, examined the said bill and now reports the same with the following amendments:

1. *Clause 42, page 44:*

(a) Replace, in line 31, the words “not to exceed” with the words “not less than 45 days or more than”.

(b) add after line 36 the following:

“**56.2 (1)** The Minister may establish, for each supervised consumption site, a citizen advisory committee charged with advising those in charge of the site on matters relating to its operation and public concern about the presence of the site in their community, including with respect to public health and safety.

(2) The committee shall consist of 5 to 10 volunteers who live in the immediate vicinity of the site.

(3) The committee shall provide the Minister with a written report on its activities each year, no later than sixty days after the anniversary of the date on which it was established.

56.3 (1) A person who is responsible for the direct supervision, at a supervised consumption site, of the consumption of controlled substances, shall offer a person using the site alternative pharmaceutical therapy before that person consumes a controlled substance that is obtained in a manner not authorized under this Act.

(2) The failure to offer alternative pharmaceutical therapy in subsection (1) does not constitute an

offence under this Act or any other Act of Parliament.”

Respectfully submitted,

BOB RUNCIMAN

Chair

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

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

STUDY ON ISSUES RELATED TO THE GOVERNMENT'S CURRENT DEFENCE POLICY REVIEW

TENTH REPORT OF NATIONAL SECURITY AND
DEFENCE COMMITTEE TABLED

Hon. Daniel Lang: Honourable senators, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the tenth report, interim, of the Standing Senate Committee on National Security and Defence, entitled *Military underfunded: The walk must match the talk*.

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

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

BUDGET AND AUTHORIZATION TO TRAVEL—STUDY
ON MARITIME SEARCH AND RESCUE
ACTIVITIES—SIXTH REPORT OF
COMMITTEE ADOPTED

Hon. Fabian Manning, Chair of the Standing Senate Committee on Fisheries and Oceans, presented the following report:

Thursday, April 13, 2017

The Standing Senate Committee on Fisheries and Oceans has the honour to present its

SIXTH REPORT

Your committee, which was authorized by the Senate on Thursday, April 14, 2016, to study Maritime Search and Rescue activities, including current challenges and opportunities, respectfully requests funds for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2018, and requests, for the purpose of such study, that it be empowered to:

(a) travel outside Canada.

Pursuant to Chapter 3:06, section 2(1)(c) of the *Senate Administrative Rules*, the budget submitted to the Standing Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and

Administration and the report thereon of that committee are appended to this report.

Respectfully submitted,

FABIAN MANNING

Chair

(For text of budget, see today's Journals of the Senate, Appendix A, p. 1640.)

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

Senator Manning: Honourable senators, with leave of the Senate and notwithstanding rule 5-5(f), I move that the report be considered now.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Senator Manning: Honourable senators, the Standing Senate Committee on Fisheries and Oceans is continuing its study on maritime search and rescue. The purpose for presenting the report today is to make arrangements for travel to Europe when we have our two-week break period. I wanted to get this done, if possible, today.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to and report adopted.)

[Translation]

RULES, PROCEDURES AND THE RIGHTS OF PARLIAMENT

SIXTH REPORT OF COMMITTEE PRESENTED

Hon. Joan Fraser, Chair of the Standing Committee on Rules, Procedures and the Rights of Parliament, presented the following report:

Thursday, April 13, 2017

The Standing Committee on Rules, Procedures and the Rights of Parliament has the honour to present its

SIXTH REPORT

Your committee, to which was referred a case of privilege respecting the leaks of the auditor general's report on the audit of senators' expenses, has, in obedience to its order of

reference of May 9, 2016, examined the said case of privilege and herewith presents its report entitled *Report on the Case of Privilege Relating to Leaks of the Auditor General's Report on the Audit of Senators' Expenses*.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Fraser

Chair

(For text of report, see today's Journals of the Senate, *Appendix B*, p. 1653.)

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

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

[*English*]

THE SENATE

NOTICE OF MOTION TO RESOLVE INTO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO RECEIVE PATRICK BORBEY, PRESIDENT OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION, AND THAT THE COMMITTEE REPORT TO THE SENATE NO LATER THAN ONE HOUR AFTER IT BEGINS

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

That, at the end of Question Period on Thursday May 4, 2017, the Senate resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole in order to receive Mr. Patrick Borbey respecting his appointment as President of the Public Service Commission; and

That the Committee of the Whole report to the Senate no later than one hour after it begins.

• (1350)

PALLIATIVE CARE

NOTICE OF INQUIRY

Hon. Jane Cordy: Honourable senators, I give notice that, two days hence:

I will call the attention of the Senate to the importance of identifying palliative care as an insured health service covered under the Canada Health Act and to the importance of developing a national strategy for uniform standards and delivery of palliative care.

QUESTION PERIOD

JUSTICE

CANNABIS LEGALIZATION LEGISLATION

Hon. Larry W. Smith (Leader of the Opposition): My question for the Leader of the Government in the Senate today concerns a bill tabled by the Minister of Justice in the other place earlier today, Bill C-45, an act respecting cannabis. Last year, the Canadian Medical Association's submission to the Task Force on Cannabis Legalization and Regulation recommended that the federal government set the minimum age for purchase and consumption at 21 years and that quantities and potency be restricted for those under 25 years of age.

Just yesterday, the Canadian Psychiatric Association released a statement agreeing with the CMA's recommendation regarding age restrictions, citing research into the negative effect of cannabis on developing brains of young people.

Could the Government Leader then please explain why the government has chosen to ignore the advice from Canada's physicians and psychiatrists and instead adopted the recommendation of its own task force of a much lower age of 18 years old?

Hon. Peter Harder (Government Representative in the Senate): I thank the honourable senator for his question.

As he referenced, the government has tabled legislation in the other place, which, of course, will find its way here at the appropriate time, and we'll have a fulsome debate on the subject, including the ones that he has raised.

I want to stress that the government, through its ministers, has committed to legalizing, strictly regulating, and restricting access to cannabis in a careful way, to, obviously, protect Canadian children and youth and to stop criminals from profiting. The objective of the legislation is clear in that regard, as well as fulfilling a commitment the government has made in the course of the last election campaign. The government is guided by the advice it has sought from a task force of eminent Canadians, and it is coming forward with a bill that provides the balance and path forward that it believes can best meet the obligations the government feels it has to the Canadian electorate.

Senator Smith: I listened interestedly to the idea of "balanced," but I guess the experts have advised the government that 18 years is too young. So does this Liberal government acknowledge, in any way, the research-based, expert advice of the medical community on this particular matter, the serious negative effects of marijuana on the developing brains of young people?

The issue here is that we have research that says 21 to 25 years of age. This is a serious issue. The government comes out with legislation that states 18 years. Does that mean that, when the

measure comes back to us, we'll have the ability to amend or adjust to the proper age, based on research and expert advice?

Senator Harder: Again, Your Honour, I thank the honourable leader for his question. I think it would be presumptuous of me to suggest how the legislation will arrive in this chamber and how this chamber will consider the legislation. Obviously, as has taken place with other bills that have been tabled and ultimately find their way here, they are open for debate.

I point out, though, that the government's commitment to research- and evidence-based policy does not obviate the need for governments to have competing expert advice and to decide how to balance the advice that it receives, and that is the basis on which the government has moved forward on this legislation.

[Translation]

Hon. Claude Carignan: Honourable senators, my question is for the Leader of the Government in the Senate. It has to do with the bill to legalize marijuana, which was tabled just a few minutes ago in the House of Commons.

Last year, I placed a question on the Order Paper to ask the government for information about the cost associated with legalizing marijuana for certain important sectors, including health. We know there could be an increase in the number of hospitalizations associated with marijuana or the number of injuries caused by drug-impaired driving. On top of that, there could also be an increase in costs related to justice, security, crime prevention and youth drug prevention. Those are all areas of provincial jurisdiction, and it is the provinces that will have to pick up the tab for their costs.

Can the Leader of the Government provide us with information on the consultations that took place with the provinces about legalizing marijuana? Can he give us any information on the projected costs that the government may have discovered since tabling its response to my question on the Order Paper? Does the government plan to give the provinces any financial compensation? Upon reading the legislation, it seems that quite a few things are being downloaded onto the provinces.

[English]

Senator Harder: I thank the honourable senator for his question, and I take his question as a commitment to seek the answers with respect to consultations with the provinces and what costs, if any, are established in studies. I simply want to, though, take the opportunity to remind all senators of the obvious fact that the consumption of marijuana does take place, and it takes place by a wide range of age groups. What the government is seeking to do, as I said earlier, is to legalize and strictly regulate the access of cannabis in a careful way that manages this product in a way that safeguards the interests of children and youth and stops criminals from profiting.

The existing social costs of the existing non-system have imposed significant burdens on the Canadian health system, and I do believe that moving forward with a regime that is more strictly regulated will improve not only the health care system but the well-being of children and youth.

[Senator Smith]

FINANCE

OFFICE OF THE PARLIAMENTARY BUDGET OFFICER

Hon. Joseph A. Day (Leader of the Senate Liberals): My question is for the Leader of the Government in the Senate, and it relates to the independence of the Parliamentary Budget Officer. The independence of the Parliamentary Budget Officer is something that many of us have fought for since its creation about a decade ago, in the previous government's Accountability Act, and it was an election-campaign promise by the current government that they would ensure that the Parliamentary Budget Officer was "truly independent." That section of the platform continued:

To make sure that we have the best information on hand, we will ensure that the Parliamentary Budget Officer is truly independent of the government. We will make sure that the office is properly funded, and accountable only . . . to Parliament, not the government of the day.

That was a very clear election promise. But on Tuesday of this week, the government tabled its omnibus budget bill in the other place, Bill C-44. It includes provisions concerning the Parliamentary Budget Officer, and, far from ensuring that the office is "truly independent," as promised, the bill appears to reduce the Parliamentary Budget Officer's independence. In particular, the bill would mandate the federal watchdog to submit its annual workplans to the Speakers of the Senate and the House of Commons for approval. Clause 79.14(2) stipulates that:

The annual work plan is subject to the approval of the Speaker of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Commons. . . .

As you know, our Speaker, while he does, of course, represent the Senate, and well — and we love him dearly — is appointed by the government. Can you tell us, leader, and can you tell this chamber, how this clause ensures that the Parliamentary Budget Officer is accountable "only" to Parliament and not to the government of the day?

• (1400)

Hon. Peter Harder (Government Representative in the Senate): I thank the honourable senator for his statement and question, just to cover all the bases of his intent.

It is the view of the Government of Canada that the legislation introduced does indeed provide greater independence to the Parliamentary Budget Officer; that the PBO will have a stand-alone office; that the PBO leader will be an officer of Parliament, and yes, will report to the Speakers of the House of Commons and the Senate in the architecture of that accountability and that independence.

The PBO will also have improved access to government information so it can do its job more effectively, and the government is expanding its mandate to include the cost of election platforms at the request of political parties so Canadians can have access to parties' fiscal plans.

This is all part of the commitment the government made in its election campaign. It sees itself in this budget and will be, I'm sure, well debated in the other place and in this chamber.

Senator Day: I have a supplementary question. I look forward to that debate, but I want honourable senators to know that there are other reasons to be concerned about the changes to the promised independence of the Parliamentary Budget Officer.

Right now, individual MPs and senators can ask the Parliamentary Budget Officer for costing of any proposal that relates to a matter over which Parliament has jurisdiction. That was how Liberal MPs, including now Fisheries Minister Dominic LeBlanc, was able to request the Parliamentary Budget Officer to do the critical true costing of the potential purchase of the F-35 aircraft.

That would no longer be possible under the proposed Bill C-44. Under the new provisions of the bill, individual MPs and senators could only request the Parliamentary Budget Officer to:

. . . estimate the financial cost of any proposal that the member is considering making before the Senate or the House of Commons or a committee of either or both Houses.

How can restricting the work that can be undertaken by the Parliamentary Budget Officer, and putting the Parliamentary Budget Officer under the direction and control of the Speakers, be making the Parliamentary Budget Officer truly independent?

Senator Harder: Again, I thank the honourable senator for his question. Let me repeat that it is the view of the government that establishing the Parliamentary Budget Officer as a stand-alone office and therefore as an officer of Parliament accords that independence. This, as I've indicated, is obviously a matter that will be debated and discussed in Parliament as well as outside of Parliament, and I would invite all senators to participate in that debate as it comes forward.

But it is the view of the government that it is acting entirely consistently with the promise it made.

[*Translation*]

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

ASSISTANCE FOR WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS

Hon. Renée Dupuis: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Government Representative in the Senate.

Leader, could you ask the minister or ministers concerned what percentage of Canadian aid for international development goes directly to local or regional women's organizations?

Thank you.

Hon. Peter Harder (Government Representative in the Senate): I thank the honourable senator for her question. I will pass your question on to the minister responsible, and I hope to be able to give you the answer as soon as possible.

[*English*]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

TAIWAN—PARTICIPATION AT WORLD HEALTH ASSEMBLY MEETINGS

Hon. Yonah Martin (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, my question is for the Leader of the Government in the Senate. I'm asking it today on behalf of our colleague Senator Ngo.

On February 9, Senator Ngo asked you a question regarding the Government of Canada's support for the participation of Taiwan at the upcoming meeting of the World Health Assembly, which will be held in Geneva in a few weeks, from May 22 to May 31. Given that this meeting will be taking place very soon, could the government leader please provide an update on the status of Senator Ngo's inquiry?

Hon. Peter Harder (Government Representative in the Senate): Again, I thank, through you, Senator Ngo for his ongoing interest in this. I am frankly unaware of the meeting that is scheduled to take place in a few weeks and will seek the information being requested.

As I indicated when he asked this question earlier, Canada has supported participation in appropriate fora for Taiwan. I will be happy to report back with regard to the meeting that is taking place, as I understand it from the question, in a few weeks' time.

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN HERITAGE

ABSENCE OF REFERENCE TO FRANCOPHONE CONTENT IN CBC PROGRAM—"CANADA: THE STORY OF US"

Hon. Pierre-Hugues Boisvenu: My question is for the Leader of the Government in the Senate.

Leader, my story is not a work of fiction. It is an accurate account of the past. You have been asked about the series "Canada: The Story of Us," which was produced for the 150th anniversary of our country. This series, which was aired by our public broadcaster using taxpayers' money, provides a very incomplete and rather unedifying picture of the role French Canadians played in the history of our country. It promotes negative stereotypes of Quebecers that run counter to Canadian unity and do not accurately reflect the historic facts. The history of our Acadian brothers and that of Canada's First Nations have also been devalued.

The CBC reluctantly apologized to Canadians. However, the worst part is that this program, which will still be used in schools for educational purposes, will also be shown to new Canadians.

I would therefore like the Leader of the Government in the Senate to tell me why the Minister of Canadian Heritage, Ms. Joly, is so reluctant to recognize the harm this does to the historical heritage of Quebecers, Acadians, and First Nations.

As guardian of our cultural heritage, how can the minister abdicate her responsibility to publicly question the use of this program for educational purposes in our schools, as I was saying, which will give our children a distorted image of the founders of our country?

[English]

Hon. Peter Harder (Government Representative in the Senate): Again, I want to thank the honourable senator for his question. Earlier, Senator Cormier asked a related question.

On behalf of the minister, I want to indicate that the CBC is, after all, an independent Crown corporation, making its own programming decisions and having to be accountable for those decisions. I did, and the minister has noted elsewhere, speak to the statements made by the leadership of the CBC recently with respect to their regret, if I can put it that way, to the programming. But it would be important for us to expect the minister to keep an arm's length to the organization, which is an important Crown organization responsible for its own content.

I would also wish to reinforce comments made by all senators that the minister and the Government of Canada remain deeply committed to reflecting, in all of our celebrations of the sesquicentennial this year and all years, the important contributions made by Acadians, francophones and indigenous peoples in the development of Canada into what it is today.

It is an important issue. The response must reflect the independence of the corporation but also hold to account the leadership of that organization to be responsible and to respond to the concerns with respect to its content.

[Translation]

Senator Boisvenu: Leader, the history of Canada is part of our heritage. The Minister of Canadian Heritage is its guardian, and the history presented in this program is inaccurate.

As the minister responsible for Canadian Heritage and responsible for CBC/Radio-Canada, why is she not calling for this show to be taken off the air?

[English]

Senator Harder: Again, honourable senators, I think it is an important principle of governance of our national broadcaster that it be at arm's length from the government, that its content not be interfered with by the government. The minister has made her views known very strongly with respect to the importance of the Acadian, francophone and indigenous communities to ensuring Canada is what it is today, particularly in this year of

[Senator Boisvenu]

celebration, and that, at the same time, the CBC is going to have to be accountable for its content through its governance channels. You see that happening with the leadership of the CBC and its comments and reflections on this program.

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

REFUGEE PROGRAMS—TRAUMA SUPPORT— YAZIDI WOMEN

Hon. Mobina S. B. Jaffer: Honourable senators, my question is to the leader of the government.

Leader, I would like to ask you about the government's recent commitment to provide help for the vulnerable Yazidi women and children and other survivors of ISIS.

• (1410)

I am pleased to see that the government has devoted \$28 million towards providing asylum to 800 Yazidi refugees before the end of the year. In particular, I'm glad to see that the program will focus on keeping families together and providing trauma care to the refugees. By that I mean the government made the very wise decision of not only bringing the women who were abducted but also to support them by bringing their families as well. I applaud that decision.

Leader, can you provide us with an update concerning the status of this program and an idea of how many Yazidi refugees have been accepted into Canada so far?

Hon. Peter Harder (Government Representative in the Senate): Again, I thank the honourable senator for her question and her ongoing interest in this community and other communities needing the protection of Canada and other like-minded countries.

I'm happy to inform the house that more than 450 persons have already arrived in Canada, and we expect to welcome a total of 1,200 vulnerable Yazidi and other survivors of Daesh by the end of this year.

In addition, the Government of Canada is facilitating private sponsorship of the Yazidi refugees. As a government, we are committed not only to welcoming these highly vulnerable persons to Canada but supporting them on the very difficult road ahead, given the circumstances they have experienced and therefore the circumstances in which they're arriving. The department and the government has therefore engaged closely with local partners to ensure appropriate support is in place because it's a special needs support, as the honourable senator will know. This includes reaching out to members of the Yazidi community, engagement with the Canadian Yazidi Association and other partners involved in the community to act as interpreters, volunteers and support. The timeline is challenging but it is one that the government is confident it can achieve, with 450, as I say, having already arrived.

I'm going longer with this answer because of the importance of this issue to Canadians and the need for information. The logistical challenges involved with this community are particularly

difficult because they come from a highly volatile region. The Government of Canada is very grateful to other governments, particularly the Government of Germany, in organizing how we best provide the support to and extract these candidates for status in Canada. The circumstances of trauma and other difficulties will require special, on-the-ground work, not just in Canada but also in the extrication itself. I reference Canada's contributions to the region in the context of refugees but also other support to displaced and vulnerable populations in the region.

As senators will know, since November 2015 we've welcomed nearly 40,000 Syrian refugees and also fully fulfilled the commitments to resettle 23,000 Iraqi refugees by 2015. Canada is providing \$150 million in humanitarian assistance over three years to Iraq, in line with our pledge in the Washington conference of late last year and is working with experienced partners to provide particular attention to the Yazidi community working with like-minded countries.

I would also reference that Canada is investing over \$1.6 billion over three years for countering Daesh and is responding to the crisis in Iraq and Syria to address the impact that is having on the wider region, including Lebanon and Jordan. That investment includes humanitarian assistance in the amount of \$840 million, \$305 million in military assistance, \$270 million in development assistance and \$145 million in stabilization and security assistance.

This is a very important holistic approach because it is not just in receiving refugees but also dealing with the context of a situation which is causing the refugee movement that I would wish to respond to this question, and I thank Senator Jaffer for it.

Senator Jaffer: Leader, I really appreciate your thorough response to this question because this is a serious issue.

Senator Dupuis, Senator McPhedran and I attended a lunch today where a Canadian-Iraqi woman activist, Ms. Yanar Mohammed, described how the Yazidi women are really like pieces of meat. After hearing her, I want to emphasize — and you covered this — that if there was a group of women who needed help with psychological, social and physical support, it's the Yazidi women.

For the purposes of your discussions with the government, I would like to share with you one of the things I learned today. The women who were abused not only suffered at the hands of Daesh/ISIS but they are also suffering at the hands of their family because they are seen as women who have been dishonoured. I appreciate your response and we cannot forget that these women will need a lot of help for a long time.

Senator Harder: Again, I thank the honourable senator for her question and for her encouragement in having this holistic approach that the trauma engagement take place immediately in the region. We also need to ensure that trauma support is available here and in cooperation with the Yazidi community and associations across Canada.

The observations that the senator makes from the luncheon event is another occasion to remind all senators of the comments made by Malala yesterday of the beacon Canada is to so many

affected groups in receiving refugees: women, children, families and of course men. This is a challenge that we have engaged in collectively with all partners across the country and will continue to do so.

[*Translation*]

JUSTICE

CANNABIS LEGALIZATION LEGISLATION

Hon. Josée Verner: Honourable senators, my question is for the Leader of the Government in the Senate. I want to follow up on the questions the Honourable Larry Smith asked about marijuana legislation.

My understanding is that the legislation will allow young adults 18 and over to use and buy marijuana. We know that Health Canada is taking a close look at its regulations because it is considering raising the minimum age for purchasing tobacco products to 21. That means the minimum age for marijuana would be 18 years, but it would be 21 for cigarettes. Am I to understand that the government would rather have our young Canadians buy marijuana than cigarettes?

[*English*]

Hon. Peter Harder (Government Representative in the Senate): I thank the honourable senator for her question. I am sure that the questions on this subject and other related subjects of the cannabis legislation will animate debate here and in the other place for some time.

I again reference that decisions of the government are based on a broad consultation with numerous stakeholders from the health, police and other stakeholder communities, as well as provinces, obviously. I would also simply observe — not that I have any familiarity with it — I do believe that people younger than 18 are consuming cannabis today and that the objective of the government is to ensure that cannabis is strictly controlled and made available in the strictest of circumstances to appropriate age groups.

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN HERITAGE

CBC PROGRAM—"CANADA: THE STORY OF US"

Hon. Ghislain Maltais: Honourable Senator, my question is for the Leader of the Government in the Senate.

It is about the CBC's "big, fat Canadian lies" series. Can the leader tell us how much the CBC paid to pervert history? I'm sure it wasn't free. What did the series cost to produce, including the salaries of the actors, the producers and the narrator? I don't think that should be too hard to find out. Can we look forward to getting information about the actual cost of the series after the Easter break?

Hon. Peter Harder (Government Representative in the Senate): I'll try. I thank the hon. senator for his question, and I will ask the department to cooperate.

• (1420)

[English]

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, the time for Question Period has expired.

[Translation]

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Hon. the Speaker: I am ready to deal with the point of order raised yesterday by Senator Lankin in relation to the amendment of Senator Frum to Bill C-6, as amended. The point of order questioned whether the amendment violates the rules and practices governing the receivability of amendments and, as such, should not be considered by the Senate.

[English]

Senator Lankin was concerned that the amendment fundamentally undermines the basic principle of the bill, which she characterized as being to facilitate access to citizenship. Senator Lankin cited a range of procedural authorities and precedents in making her argument. I thank her for this very useful review.

Several other senators also participated in debate on the point of order. Among them was Senator Carignan, who expressed concern about adopting an excessively rigid approach when dealing with amendments.

[Translation]

It is a basic tenet of parliamentary practice that an amendment must respect the principle and scope of a bill, and must be relevant to it. A ruling of December 9, 2009, cited by Senator Lankin, noted that:

It may generally be helpful to view the principle as the intention underlying a bill. The scope of the bill would then be related to the parameters the bill sets in reaching any goals or objectives that it contains, or the general mechanisms it envisions to fulfil its intentions. Finally, relevancy takes into account how an amendment relates to the scope or principle of the bill under examination.

[English]

Amendments must, therefore, be in some way related to the bill and cannot introduce elements or factors alien to the proposed legislation or destructive of its original goals. In addition, amendments must respect the objectives of the bill.

In considering these issues, it may be necessary to identify the fundamental policy and goals behind a bill. Factors such as the long title of the bill, its content and the debate at second reading may be taken into account. Debate at second reading is particularly relevant since, according to rule 10-4 "The principle of a bill is usually debated on second reading." However, as acknowledged in previous rulings, it is often difficult to identify the principle.

There is another element, not directly raised during the point of order, which must also be taken into account. As noted in a ruling of April 16, 2013 several Speakers "have expressed a preference for presuming a matter to be in order, unless and until the contrary position is established." This approach is in keeping with the role of the Senate as a debating chamber, where legislation and policy issues are subject to vigorous discussion, and to the consideration of possible alternatives. As a result, unless an item of business, such as an amendment, is clearly out of order, debate should be allowed to proceed.

Debate on second reading of Bill C-6 included the following statement by the sponsor: "This bill finds a more appropriate balance between fulfilling reasonable requirements, on the one hand, and facilitating citizenship, on the other, because evidence shows that citizenship is a facilitator of integration." This was in a speech identifying three basic principles of citizenship that are woven through the bill. The other principles were the equality of Canadians and program integrity.

The amendment at issue does not affect many of the changes proposed in Bill C-6. As an example, it would not affect the proposed reduction of the total length of time a person must be resident in Canada to 1,095 days during the five years immediately before the application for citizenship. The current requirement under the Citizenship Act is 1,460 days during the period of six years preceding the application. What the amendment does propose is to maintain the current requirement, which Bill C-6 would remove, that a person must be "physically present in Canada for at least 183 days during each of four calendar years that are fully or partially within the six years immediately before the date of his or her application."

It is possible to understand this amendment as an effort to rebalance the competing aims of facilitating citizenship while maintaining reasonable requirements for becoming a Canadian citizen. Such a re-balancing of these two objectives is not clearly destructive of the basic intention underlying the bill. The reduced residency requirements in Bill C-6 would, as an example, be maintained with this amendment.

Honourable senators, it is not clearly evident that the amendment is fundamentally destructive of the original goals of Bill C-6. Taking into account the importance of allowing senators wide latitude in debate, the ruling is that the amendment is in order, and debate can continue.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

CITIZENSHIP ACT

BILL TO AMEND—THIRD READING—MOTION IN AMENDMENT—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Omidvar, seconded by the Honourable Senator Gagné, for the third reading of Bill C-6, An Act to amend the Citizenship Act and to make consequential amendments to another Act, as amended.

And on the motion in amendment of the Honourable Senator Frum, seconded by the Honourable Senator Stewart Olsen:

That Bill C-6, as amended, be not now read a third time, but that it be further amended:

- (a) in clause 1, on page 1, by deleting lines 17 and 18;
- (b) by deleting clause 8, on page 4;
- (c) in clause 14, on page 6, by replacing lines 6 to 8 with the following:

“14 Paragraph 5(1)(c) of the Citizenship Act, as it read immediately before the day on which subsection 1(1) comes into force, applies”; and

- (d) in clause 27, on page 9, by replacing line 1 with the following:

“27 (1) Subsections 1(1) and (7)”.

Hon. Peter Harder (Government Representative in the Senate): Your Honour, I thank you for your ruling and I'm happy to participate in the debate on the amendment moved by Senator Frum, on Senator Eaton's behalf.

Before I do so, I would like to associate myself with the condolences and remorse that I would pass to Senator Eaton, along with all colleagues who have spoken thus far.

I would also like to take the opportunity to thank Senator Omidvar for her sponsorship of this bill over the last number of months and her attention to detail; her availability for all senators is a model of sponsorship, so I thank her for that.

It seems like a long time ago, but Senator Woo, in his speech yesterday reflected more eloquently than the speech I'm about to give. But, senators, I do want to indicate that the amendment we are considering today, as it relates to the physical presence requirement, is one that the government does not support, and I would also urge the chamber not to support.

We know from decades of experience that immigrants who become Canadian citizens are likely to achieve greater economic success in this country and to make a greater contribution to the Canadian economy, so this commitment benefits all of Canada, and the sooner this integration begins, the better for us, collectively, as a country.

One significant predictor for successful integration into Canadian life is achieving Canadian citizenship. It goes without saying that that also benefits both the lives of the new Canadians and, as I say, the social cohesion of our diverse country. Indeed, the proposed changes in Bill C-6 that are presented in this amendment would remove unnecessary burdens for applicants to meet citizenship requirements, and this will help to encourage their sense of belonging and connection to Canada.

One of the ways Bill C-6 does this is through the change of the physical presence requirements. Through the change of the physical presence requirements to the equivalent of three years out of five, individuals will be able to apply for Canadian citizenship one year earlier than under the requirements that came into force in 2015, making the path to a permanent place in Canada, as a result of citizenship, shorter and more assured.

Honourable senators, this supports the government's goal, of which I spoke earlier, and that is the goal of increasing flexibility and making it easier for immigrants to build successful lives in Canada.

The five-year window in which to accumulate three years, or, more specifically, 1,095 days, of physical presence also provides greater flexibility for those who are absent from Canada during the five-year qualification period for work or other personal reasons, all of which are part and parcel of today's global economy.

Similarly, Bill C-6 also proposes to repeal the supplemental physical presence requirement that citizenship applicants be physically present in Canada for 183 days in each year of four calendar years within the six years before the date of application. As Senator Woo so aptly pointed out, keeping this requirement would not allow applicants to fully benefit from the shorter physical presence or increasing flexibility that I just described, or the new non-permanent resident time credit that Bill C-6 also proposes.

• (1430)

The honourable senator's amendment would remove the flexibility for prospective applicants to meet the requirements of citizenship. I would like to emphasize more broadly that the changes proposed by Bill C-6 support the government's commitment to foster a diverse, fair and inclusive society which citizenship is a key to ensuring.

I am sure that all honourable senators would agree that Canada is strong because of the diversity of Canadians, and Canadians are diverse because of our country's long-standing warm and open-hearted embrace of newcomers.

Because of this, the story of immigration and citizenship is inseparable from the story of Canada and the story of everybody in this room as well. The government is committed to a Canada

that is both diverse and inclusive. Whether newcomers arrive as refugees, family members or economic migrants, their contributions to Canada and those of generations that follow will be important. It is this conviction that has driven the government to facilitate the process of acquiring citizenship, among other policies, that will help carry our society and economy towards a more harmonious, successful and prosperous future.

Removing barriers to citizenship and helping newcomers achieve citizenship is, the government believes, an important contribution to the future of Canada's economic and social well-being. For that reason, the government does not support this amendment.

I would also close on a personal note. I would be remiss not to mention the abundance of correspondence that I, like you, am receiving from people across the country who are already Canadians at heart but who are desperately waiting for the passage of this bill so they may become Canadian citizens.

I even understand from my staff that a member of the Senate's staff community is closely following these proceedings because when Bill C-6, as tabled in the Senate, receives Royal Assent, she will become a Canadian citizen.

Honourable senators, that is where I draw my inspiration on Bill C-6.

Also on a personal note, like so many in this room, my parents came as refugees to Canada, and the citizenship that was conferred on them is a citizenship that I embrace naturally, but it ought to have no distinction in my family nor in the family that is the fabric of this country.

To those individuals directly affected by our deliberations, know that you are not forgotten. Know that the Senate of Canada has your interests on the top of its mind and know that Senator Omidvar and other notable senators in this chamber are working constantly on your behalf with unwavering resolve to pass this legislation as quickly as possible.

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

Hon. Senators: Question.

The Hon. the Speaker: In amendment, it was moved by the Honourable Senator Frum, seconded the Honourable Senator Stewart Olsen, that Bill C-6 as amended be not now read a third time, but that is be further amended — shall I dispense?

Hon. Senators: Dispense.

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

Some Hon. Senators: Yes.

Some Hon. Senators: No.

The Hon. the Speaker: All those in favour will please say "yea."

Some Hon. Senators: Yea.

The Hon. the Speaker: All those opposed will please say "nay."

Some Hon. Senators: Nay.

The Hon. the Speaker: In my opinion, the "nays" have it.

And two honourable senators having risen:

The Hon. the Speaker: Do we have an agreement on the bell?

Senator Plett: Fifteen minutes.

The Hon. the Speaker: A 15-minute bell. The vote will be held at 2:48.

Call in the senators.

• (1450)

Motion in amendment negated on the following division:

YEAS THE HONOURABLE SENATORS

Andreychuk	Martin
Batters	McIntyre
Beyak	Mockler
Boisvenu	Neufeld
Carignan	Ogilvie
Dagenais	Patterson
Enverga	Plett
Frum	Runciman
Housakos	Seidman
Lang	Smith
MacDonald	Stewart Olsen
Maltais	Tannas
Manning	Tkachuk
Marshall	White—28

NAYS THE HONOURABLE SENATORS

Baker	Harder
Bellemare	Hartling
Bernard	Jaffer
Black	Joyal
Boniface	Lankin
Bovey	Lovelace Nicholas
Brazeau	Marwah
Campbell	Massicotte
Cools	McCoy
Cordy	McPhedran
Cormier	Mercer
Dawson	Mitchell

Day	Moncion
Dean	Munson
Downe	Oh
Duffy	Omidvar
Dupuis	Pate
Dyck	Petitclerc
Eggleton	Pratte
Forest	Ringuette
Fraser	Saint-Germain
Gagné	Sinclair
Galvez	Wallin
Gold	Wetston
Greene	Woo—51
Griffin	

ABSTENTIONS
THE HONOURABLE SENATORS

Nil

The Hon. the Speaker: Resuming debate on the main motion for the third reading of Bill C-6, as amended.

Hon. Daniel Lang: Colleagues, I rise to join the third reading debate on Bill C-6.

First off, I'm pleased to see all senators take the recommendations of the Prime Minister seriously as they apply themselves to the scrutiny of legislation and, where required, make improvements.

You will also recall that last June, almost a year ago, our colleague Senator Campbell of British Columbia, the government sponsor of Bill C-7, supported amendments at committee and in this chamber to a bill to ensure members of the RCMP had the opportunity for fair and meaningful collective bargaining. This chamber unanimously endorsed those amendments made by our committee.

In the spirit of improving legislation, I also would like to recognize the sponsor of the bill, Senator Omidvar, and Senator McCoy from the independent Senate caucus, for demonstrating once again that even sponsors of government bills can improve government legislation through amendments.

Also, I'd like to recognize the senator from Prince Edward Island, Diane Griffin, for putting forward a reasonable amendment to this bill to ensure more new immigrants have a working knowledge of either English or French. The government would be very wise to welcome this amendment, which would support the integration of new Canadians within our communities.

I also want to recognize Senator Oh for bringing forward his amendment to this chamber. It will help protect minors within our immigration system.

Colleagues, by amending this bill, we are affirming the rights of this chamber to fulfill its responsibility when it comes to

improving legislation. I want to commend the Speaker for his ruling earlier today, confirming the authority that we have.

In the spirit of approving this bill, I will be moving an amendment at the end of my presentation to address the issue of the revocation of citizenship for dual nationals who are convicted of serious crimes related to terrorism.

Some argue that, once granted, we should not revoke citizenship for dual nationals because it will be creating two classes of Canadians. That argument is flawed. As the sponsor of the bill and Senator McCoy have already endorsed, the right to revoke citizenship is in the Citizenship Act for cases related to fraud, criminality, misrepresentation and war crimes.

Yesterday, I circulated to you by email a document from the Minister of Immigration indicating that the present government has revoked 222 Canadian citizenships from those who have dual national status between 2015 and November 2016, 144 of which were related to residency, 14 for criminality as it relates to citizenship, 5 for criminality as it relates to immigration and 24 for false identity.

Colleagues, when it comes to revocation, it must be stressed that citizenship is granted by the state, and the principle remains that citizenship can be revoked by the state. Therefore, Bill C-6 and the Citizenship Act allow for revocation.

• (1500)

My amendment proposes to revoke citizenship granted to the worst citizens as defined by the courts. The amendment that will be put before you contains the following principles. It allows for the sentencing judge, in matters related to terrorism, at his or her discretion, to declare that the person has been sentenced in this manner and is therefore subject to having his or her citizenship revoked. The amendment removes political discretion of the minister and leaves it to the sentencing judge within our judicial system. It allows the individual subject to this provision to be able to appeal, protecting their Charter rights and respecting the spirit of the amendment provided earlier by Senator McCoy and Senator Omidvar.

The amendment is not retroactive, as I do not believe that it's appropriate to impose punitive punishments on those who have already been convicted and sentenced.

Finally, in relation to the amendment that I will put before you, colleagues, the deputy law clerk has confirmed that there are no Charter concerns.

Colleagues, I would urge you to bring Canada in line with 34 other countries which currently revoke citizenship for those convicted of terrorism. The list, for example, includes such countries as Barbados, Austria, Australia, Cyprus, France, Latvia, Slovenia, the United Kingdom, the United States, and the list goes on.

Let's take a moment and examine some of our closest allies. In Australia, Part 2 of Division 3 of the Australian Citizenship Act, 2007, provides for automatic cessation of Australian citizenship

from dual citizens, whether born in Australia or naturalized, where that person renounces their Australian citizenship by engaging in specified conduct in existence with their allegiance in Australia; fights for, or is in service of, a “declared terrorist organisation” outside Australia; or is convicted of a specified offence under the Australian Criminal Code.

In the United Kingdom, section 40 of the British Nationality Act, 1981, confers upon the Secretary of State the power to make an order to deprive a person of their British citizenship status in any of the following circumstances: fraud, false representation, or the concealment of any of material fact. This is found at section 40(3). Or if the person obtained their citizenship status through naturalization, and the Home Secretary considers that deprivation is conducive to the public good because the person has conducted themselves “in a manner which is seriously prejudicial to the vital interests of the United Kingdom, any of the islands, or any British overseas territory,” and the Home Secretary has reasonable grounds to believe that the person is able to become a national of another country or territory under their laws. That is section 40, subsection 4(a).

Colleagues, the United Kingdom has had 27 citizenship revocations of dual nationals on national security grounds since 2006.

In New Zealand, the Minister of Internal Affairs has broad executive discretion under section 16 of the Citizenship Act, 1977, to deprive a person of New Zealand citizenship who is over 18 years of age and:

- (a) acquired the nationality or citizenship of another country by any voluntary and formal act, and acted a manner that is contrary to the interests of New Zealand; or
- (b) voluntarily exercised any of the privileges or performed any of the duties of another nationality or citizenship possessed by him in a manner that is contrary to the interests of New Zealand.

Colleagues, as you can see, our closest allies revoke citizenship for acts of terrorism. Having the power to revoke citizenship for terrorism crimes does not make Canada an outlier. We are alongside our Five Eyes allies: the United Kingdom, the United States, Australia and New Zealand. We would also be in step with our European allies: France, The Netherlands and others.

To remove this power altogether, as the bill proposes, will weaken Canada in the eyes of the world, including to our Five Eyes allies.

Colleagues, some have suggested during second reading debate that if we send these dual nationals who are convicted terrorists back to the country of their residence, we would be putting them at risk and allowing them to continue in support of terrorism. I don’t see that, colleagues, as an issue. These individuals who have been convicted will only be allowed through parole if and when they prove to be no threat no society.

We already deport dual nationals for criminality and we should, as a country, act to ensure that our justice system can, at its discretion, impose the harshest sentence and the harshest consequences for the acts of terrorism.

[Senator Lang]

Another argument we have heard, colleagues, is that the convicted terrorist should have the right to appeal. I agree. I want to assure you, colleagues, that in my amendment, which will be tabled here soon, we guarantee the right of appeal for citizen revocation in all cases. This is a reasonable and fair process, and it respects fundamental rights. In fact, it is a significant improvement on what is currently in the legislation.

Colleagues, in the amendment I will propose, Canada will maintain the power to revoke citizenship. We will be voting to grant the discretion to a sentencing judge in matters relating to terrorism — the most serious cases, in which an individual is sentenced for more than five years — to revoke the citizenship for a dual national Canadian. For these individuals who plotted to commit mass murder in Canada and have been convicted by our courts, there will be one option available to the sentencing judge.

I would also like to quote again retired Supreme Court Justice John Major, Chair of the Commission of Inquiry into the Investigation of the Bombing of Air India Flight 182:

Terrorism is an existential threat to Canadian society in a way that murder, assault, robbery and other crimes are not. Terrorists reject and challenge the very foundations of Canadian society.

Colleagues, I want to bring to your attention the seriousness of the terrorist threat that we face. Of the 218 counter-terrorism targets under investigation by the Canadian Security Intelligence Service today, approximately 60 are either dual nationals or permanent residents; and also, approximately 180 individuals with a nexus to Canada are engaged in terrorist activity abroad and an additional 60 have returned and are on our streets.

Colleagues, I ask you to join with me in rejecting terrorism and in sending the strongest message to those who are seeking to destabilize our country and murder our fellow citizens. Join with me to ensure that Canada can, like our allies, continue to revoke citizenship for fraud, misrepresentation, criminality and, with this amendment, terrorism.

Putting Canada first is not a partisan issue; it’s about what type of country we wish to have and what values we wish to remain intact. About 86 per cent of Canadians support the revocation of citizenship for terrorism.

Colleagues, I ask you to join me on Canada’s team by ensuring that we can revoke the citizenship of convicted dual national terrorists like 34 other countries presently do.

MOTION IN AMENDMENT

Hon. Daniel Lang: Therefore, honourable senators, I move:

That Bill C-6, as amended, be not now read a third time, but that it be further amended

(a) on page 4,

- (i) in clause 4 (as replaced by decision of the Senate on April 4, 2017), by replacing sub-clause (2) with the following:

“(2) Subsection 10.1(2) of the Act is replaced with the following:

(2) Any court that sentences a person to at least five years of imprisonment for a *terrorism offence* as defined in section 2 of the *Criminal Code* or for a *terrorism offence* as defined in subsection 2(1) of the *National Defence Act* may, in its discretion, make a declaration that the person was so sentenced.”,

(ii) in clause 5, by replacing line 7 with the following:

“5 Section 10.3 of the Act is replaced by the following:

10.3 A person whose citizenship is revoked under paragraph 10.1(3)(b) becomes a *foreign national* within the meaning of subsection 2(1) of the *Immigration and Refugee Protection Act*.

5.01 Section 10.4 of the Act is replaced by the following:

10.4 (1) Subsection 10.1(2) does not operate so as to authorize any declaration that conflicts with any international human rights instrument regarding statelessness to which Canada is signatory.

(2) If an instrument referred to in subsection (1) prohibits the deprivation of citizenship that would render a person stateless, a person who claims that subsection 10.1(2) would operate in the manner described in subsection (1) must prove, on a balance of probabilities, their claim.”, and

(iii) by adding after line 13 the following:

“6.1 Section 10.7 of the Act is replaced by the following:

10.7 (1) An appeal to the Federal Court of Appeal may be made from a judgment under subsection 10.1(1) or section 10.5 only if, in rendering judgment, the judge certifies that a serious question of general importance is involved and states the question.

(2) An appeal from a judgment under subsection 10.1(2) lies to the Court Martial Appeal Court in the case of a judgment of a court martial or, in any other case, to the court of appeal of the province in which the judgment is rendered.”;

(b) on page 5, in clause 10,

(i) by replacing lines 14 to 17 with the following:

“(3) Paragraphs 22(1)(f) and (g) of the Act are replaced by the following:”, and

(ii) by replacing line 23 with the following:

“or paragraph 10.1(3)(a); or

(g) if the person’s citizenship has been revoked under paragraph 10.1(3)(b).”; and

(c) on page 8, by replacing clause 26 (as replaced by the decision of the Senate on April 4, 2017) with the following:

“26 Paragraphs 46(2)(b) and (c) of the Act are replaced by the following:

(b) subsection 10(1) of the *Citizenship Act*; or

(c) paragraph 10.1(3)(a) of the *Citizenship Act*.”.

• (1510)

The Hon. the Speaker: In amendment, it was moved by the Honourable Senator Lang, seconded by the Honourable Senator Martin, that Bill C-6 as amended be not now read a third time but that it be further amended on page 4 — may I dispense?

Hon. Senators: Dispense.

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

(On motion of Senator Campbell, debate adjourned.)

[Translation]

NATIONAL SECURITY AND INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEE OF PARLIAMENTARIANS BILL

BILL TO AMEND—SPEAKER’S STATEMENT

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I would like to read a statement that was made by the Speaker of the House of Commons yesterday:

I wish to inform the House of an administrative error that occurred with regard to Bill C-22, An Act to establish the National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians and to make consequential amendments to certain Acts.

[English]

Members may recall that the House studied a number of motions at report stage. On March 20, 2017, the House adopted some of those motions and rejected others. One of the rejected motions was Motion No. 7, moved by the honourable member for Victoria, which was intended to delete clause 31 of the bill.

[Translation]

The House concurred in the bill, as amended, at report stage with further amendments and eventually adopted the bill at third reading on April 4, 2017.

[English]

As is the usual practice following passage at third reading, House officials prepared a parchment version of the bill and transmitted this parchment to the Senate. Due to an administrative error, the version of the bill that was transmitted to the other place was prepared as if Motion No. 7 had been adopted and clause 31 had been deleted, with the renumbering of another clause in the bill as a result. Unfortunately, the mistake was not detected before the bill was sent to the other place.

[Translation]

I wish to reassure the House that this error was strictly administrative in nature and occurred after third reading was given to Bill C-22. The proceedings that took place in this House and the decisions made by the House with respect to Bill C-22 remain entirely valid. The records of the House relating to this Bill are complete and accurate.

[English]

However, the documents relating to Bill C-22 that were sent to the other place were not an accurate reflection of the House's decisions.

Speaker Milliken addressed a similar situation in a ruling given on November 22, 2001, found on page 7455 of Debates. My predecessor also dealt with a similar situation in a statement made on September 15, 2014, found on page 7239 of Debates. Guided by these precedents, similar steps have been undertaken in this case.

First, once this discrepancy was detected, House officials immediately communicated with their counterparts in the Senate to set about resolving it. Next, I have instructed the Acting Clerk and his officials to take the necessary steps to rectify this error and to ensure that the other place has a corrected copy of Bill C-22 that reflects the proceedings that occurred in this House. Thus, a revised version of the bill will be transmitted to the other place through the usual administrative procedures of Parliament. Finally, I have asked that the "as passed at third reading" version of the bill be reprinted.

The Senate will, of course, make its own determination about how it proceeds with Bill C-22 in light of this situation. I wish to reassure members that steps have been taken to ensure that similar errors, rare though they may be, do not reoccur.

I thank honourable members for their attention.

Honourable senators, as the Speaker of the other place noted in his statement, we have had to deal with such errors before.

Honourable senators will recall that the defective version of the bill was given first reading and is currently on the Orders of the Day for consideration. I believe that Senator Harder is prepared to ask for leave for a motion to declare the proceedings on the bill thus far null and void. If this proposal were accepted by this

[The Hon. the Speaker]

Chamber, we could then read the new message and give the corrected bill first reading. Subsequent proceedings would then depend upon the will of the Senate.

BILL TO AMEND—MOTION TO WITHDRAW BILL AND
DECLARE ALL PROCEEDINGS TO DATE
NULL AND VOID

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

That all proceedings to date on Bill C-22, An Act to establish the National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians and to make consequential amendments to certain Acts, be declared null and void.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to and bill withdrawn.)

[Translation]

BILL TO AMEND—FIRST READING

The Hon. the Speaker informed the Senate that a message had been received from the House of Commons with Bill C-22, An Act to establish the National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians and to make consequential amendments to certain Acts.

(Bill read first time.)

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

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

[English]

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

MOTION FOR ADDRESS IN REPLY—
DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Jaffer, seconded by the Honourable Senator Cordy:

That the following Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General of Canada:

To His Excellency the Right Honourable David Johnston, Chancellor and Principal Companion of the Order of Canada, Chancellor and Commander of the Order of Military Merit, Chancellor and Commander of the Order of Merit of the Police Forces, Governor General and Commander-in-Chief of Canada.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY:

We, Her Majesty's most loyal and dutiful subjects, the Senate of Canada in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Excellency for the gracious Speech which Your Excellency has addressed to both Houses of Parliament.

Hon. Rosa Galvez: Honourable senators:

One's Offering

I may not have seen the Buffalo roam.

I may not have seen the Eagle fly.

But deep inside my soul the Great One planted a seed to grow.

Oh how I wish I had been able to roam like the Buffalo and fly like the Eagle so High

So I may too, touch the mountain tops that reach for the sky.

Just as I see all people here today.

All of different Shades and Creeds

Not one Person, but all People have added color to my eyes, so that I too may See.

So glorious is every day, that we all have another day to Breathe.

This poem was written by Cheri Jubinville, a First Nations member of the Enoch Cree Nation.

Dear senators, I rise in this chamber today to speak to the motion of the Speech from the Throne. In my first address to the Senate and in tribute to Earth Day on April 22, I want to honour Mother Nature because planet earth is our only home. Without nature, we have no city, no state and no society. From space, the only visible divisions are mountains, rivers and oceans, all of which were naturally created.

• (1520)

On December 4, 2015, the Governor General, His Excellency the Right Honourable David Johnston, stated:

. . . the Government will prove to Canadians and to the world that a clean environment and a strong economy go hand in hand. We cannot have one without the other.

Protecting the environment and growing the economy are not incompatible goals; in fact, our future success demands that we do both.

My path has led me to understand that without a clean, flourishing environment, we as humans cannot thrive. Let me describe to you what the path was that led me to this conviction.

My paternal grandfather worked as an architect and engineer in Peru. As a teenager, I would visit housing construction where he supervised well drilling for drinking water. My maternal

grandmother was a wise woman. She did not know how to write or read, but she was rich with traditional knowledge. I hiked the Andes with her into the Amazon jungle in search of medicinal plants. I assisted her in delivering babies. I loved and admired both my grandparents. They showed me that we must seek equilibrium between learning from nature and development at its expense.

I'm very lucky. At 10 years old, I knew what I wanted to do. Shocked by pictures of air pollution in Beijing and Mexico City, I envisioned myself creating mechanical tools to clean air and oceans. So I studied engineering, which was very demanding. I had to bring my strong stubborn head to school. Five hundred students, one woman, me. It was, however, a good preparation for the realm of scientific research. Still today, only a few women succeed in this field.

[Translation]

I was very excited to come to Canada when I was 24 years old. Now, 32 years later, I am just as excited to be once again outside my comfort zone as I learn to become a senator. My grandfather used to say that it is our willingness to take risks that determines our success in life. Those who take big risks will see big results.

[English]

So now, how can my knowledge and experience be useful to the Senate? I reflect aloud: How does a nation reach its full potential? Some meet the basic needs of people — government, health care — within an infrastructure that supports public access to these services. Nations that aspire for more develop arts and culture, maintaining equality and human rights through a functional justice system. How does a nation reach enlightenment? For that, we must deploy greater efforts for the elevation of humanity through the observation and exploration of nature by science and art.

[Translation]

The philosopher Seneca said:

True wisdom consists in not departing from nature and in moulding our conduct according to her laws and model.

Professor Covey added, and I quote:

The centuries have been marked by those who, like Seneca, spent considerable time exploring and thinking about not only the laws of nature but also man's desire to bring his own existence in line with those laws and live in harmony with them. The urgent need we feel as humans to renounce certain practices comes from a global threat that seems to be on the horizon because of incivility.

Canada is on the verge of a renaissance, and we must not let that opportunity pass us by. As senators who were appointed to serve Canadians, we must move in that direction. The path is clear. We must promote the acquisition of knowledge in order to protect our planet.

Every scientific discovery begins with a question. The challenge is to ask the right questions. Big questions require big answers. Finding those answers requires commitment, dedication, and

perseverance. We conduct experiments to prove or disprove our hypotheses. We talk to colleagues. A rigorous process is used to examine our results and try to validate them, to increase knowledge through debate, and to always challenge the status quo in favour of progress and innovation. Knowledge is infinite.

[English]

As I say, knowledge is infinite. This process is the scientific method. This is what I have done for my entire professional life. The most beautiful part of the scientific method is that it doesn't care about beliefs or opinions. They are just hypotheses on which to base or start our analysis. Without science, hypothesis remains a debate, a discussion. But to progress we need facts and evidence on which to base decisions and actions. This is the thinking that I want to bring to the Senate.

Knowledge increases with education, and it should never be viewed as a privilege, because it is a right, fundamental to our growth as individuals and as a society. In an advanced society, the selection is not made based on fitness; it's made based on knowledge and wisdom.

I echo the words of brave Malala in yesterday's speech: Those with knowledge must demand access for those without. We have a remarkable authority as senators, and we must help break the barriers to the diffusion of knowledge.

It is only through education that we can stimulate shifts in thoughts and paradigms and effect necessary changes to our lifestyles. Education must be democratized, consistent with how we have democratized society. Isn't it remarkable and yet confusing that we have had so many technological advances that have changed our lives so dramatically in medicine, space exploration, armament, communication, but we still teach using desks and blackboards? Even more dramatic, let me illustrate this by analogy. If the 4.5 billion year history of Earth was to be condensed into one year, we could say that dinosaurs appeared on December 16 and were extinct only nine days later. Humans appeared at 23 hours on December 31, so in relative terms, we are just one hour old.

We are so young and have walked this planet for such a little time, yet arrogantly, we have inflicted dramatic changes to our entire planet.

[Translation]

Nature is the greatest source of knowledge and wisdom. Nature is efficient, adaptable, and able. We must work in harmony with her. Our future depends on this symbiotic relationship.

[English]

Further, nature is the greatest teacher. She taught humans the master tool for development: trial and error. For that to work, we must learn from our mistakes.

[Translation]

However, our approach to using natural resources is inconsistent with the principles of sustainable development. Our insatiable desire to consume and expand has damaged our home.

[Senator Galvez]

We have become victims of our own success. We are now experiencing unprecedented extreme climate events.

[English]

A fundamental cause is that present economic models are based on infinite production supposing infinite growth, which again is incoherent with finite resources. Production models are linear, based on extract, transform, produce, use and throw. We are wasting unique and irreplaceable resources. Almost half of what is extracted is thrown as waste.

Growth has had large hidden costs: scarcity of natural resources and environmental damage. Does it make sense to burn, in brief minutes, litres of gasoline while driving alone in our vehicles, when we know that nature took millions of years to fabricate this resource? Our routines are inconsistent with common sense.

• (1530)

We have knowledge, but we are not wise.

[Translation]

We must conserve and protect our non-renewable resources and reclaim degraded environments.

My logic moves me in that direction. My ethics and the code of engineers compel me to protect public health and safety. My cultural and spiritual practices move me in the same direction. My maternal instinct urges me to protect my offspring. You will understand that my beliefs are very deeply rooted.

I am here before you, as a scientist who has become a senator, to ask you to work together to promote the changes necessary for our survival.

[English]

My science, moral or ethical pressures may not move all of us — but maybe economics will.

Corporations sought lower production costs by moving their manufacturing to countries with cheaper labour. Now the air in many manufacturing cities is unbreathable and their water is not drinkable. The World Bank and Chinese government have estimated that the hidden cost of China's growth reached US 148 billion. That is almost 6 per cent of China's GDP.

[Translation]

This movement towards cheaper labour has had a series of negative and harmful impacts such as job losses, at times the loss of quality of life, and socio-economic imbalance, all of which only fuels the growing mistrust of the working class towards the politicians and democratic institutions such as ours.

[English]

We urgently need a change in approach. Wiser societies are changing economic models based on non-renewable resources to a knowledge economy. Remember, knowledge is infinite.

Canada is almost there. By embracing an emerging knowledge economy, we are creating exportable skills based on innovation and advancements in technology. Future growth will not be based on low production costs but, rather, on offering clean environments in which to live. Production must stop its linearity and become circular through reusing, recycling and reduction of natural resources extraction. Waste should be eliminated or seen as a new resource.

Canada is well placed to say that climate change is not an inconvenient truth but could be a convenient opportunity. Canada can leverage its institutional structures, advanced learning, communications networks, clean energy resources, agricultural potential, female workforce, diplomatic approach and incredible government-private effective partnerships in commerce, research and technology, to become and remain a leader in the knowledge economy.

The last World Economic Forum predicted that 5 million jobs will be lost before 2020, as artificial intelligence, robotics and nanotechnology will replace the need for human workers. But those same advances will create 2.1 million new jobs. The manual and clerical workers who find themselves out of work are unlikely to have the required skills to compete, as most new jobs will be in specialized areas such as computing, mathematics, architecture and engineering, and an increasing need for arts and creativity.

A recent report by international energy agencies stated that limiting global warming to 2 degrees is technically possible but will require an energy transition of exceptional scope, depth and speed. It will need an unparalleled ramp-up of all low carbon technologies to be used in all countries. The means to achieve are there: increased awareness, technological advances and a time frame of 30 years. Specifically, it can be done by increasing energy and material use efficiencies, higher deployment of renewable energy and a fundamental reorientation of investments, together with concerned and consistent policy to facilitate energy transition.

The Hon. the Speaker: Excuse me, senator. I'm very sorry, but your time has expired. Are you asking for five more minutes?

Senator Galvez: Yes, please.

The Hon. the Speaker: Is it agreed, honourable senators?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Senator Galvez: Further, the energy sector could create more than 6 million additional jobs by 2050. Improvements in economic, social and environmental aspects could generate benefits far beyond "business as usual."

One of the roles of the Senate is to reveal verified information and develop policies and bills that can unlock the described benefits. Evidence exists which shows that a responsible private sector is activated but needs clear and credible long-term policy frameworks that will provide the right incentives. In sum, the message is clear: Equate carbon reduction with clean technology in a circular economy and with job creation.

A number of experts are courageously asking: What is the cost of continuing to do business as usual, and whom does it benefit? If the planet warms by 2 degrees by 2100, the U.K. Royal Society

expects to see a third of the world's currently cultivated agricultural land disappear, and an increase in water stress for 410 million people. The UN estimates that one person every second has been displaced by a disaster, with an average of 22.5 million people displaced by climate- or weather-related events since 2008.

Choosing to solve pollution problems and climate disasters rather than preventing them is largely more expensive. The damages are paid by citizens and not necessarily by polluting corporations. Among a multitude of examples, let me provide two.

Enbridge was fined \$61 million as part of an overall \$177-million settlement for the massive oil spill into Michigan's Kalamazoo River. The spill requires more than a billion dollars to clean up.

Closer to us, the Quebec government submitted a claim against the rail company behind the deadly train disaster in Lac-Mégantic, estimating a cost of \$400 million. The spill reached 189 kilometres downstream to the Chaudière River, where fish still present deformations and tumours.

I was there that night in Lac-Mégantic. I witnessed the devastation of a city, its citizens and its environment.

[*Translation*]

I understand that politics is pervasive. I am not immune to its influence. However, you will find that it holds little sway over my decisions. I am, above all, a scientist who analyses and evaluates the facts. I am an independent senator. My decisions will not be influenced by the person who argues, but rather by the veracity and soundness of the evidence presented.

[*English*]

Now, I am called "honourable senator." It is quite a title, and I want my thoughts and actions to be deserving of such an honour. I want to earn respect by reflecting values and principles that account for themselves. It is so much easier to live each day with certainty in one's convictions, and to act in accordance with them — to treat others with respect, to show fairness by being just, to make decisions others can hopefully perceive as wise, and to both seek and keep peace in harmony with nature.

(On motion of Senator Martin, debate adjourned.)

[*Translation*]

THE SENATE

MOTION TO AFFECT QUESTION PERIOD ON MAY 2,
2017, ADOPTED

Hon. Diane Bellemare (Legislative Deputy to the Government Representative in the Senate), pursuant to notice of April 12, 2017, moved:

That, in order to allow the Senate to receive a Minister of the Crown during Question Period as authorized by the Senate on December 10, 2015, and notwithstanding rule 4-7, when the Senate sits on Tuesday, May 2, 2017, Question Period shall begin at 3:30 p.m., with any proceedings then

before the Senate being interrupted until the end of Question Period, which shall last a maximum of 40 minutes;

That, if a standing vote would conflict with the holding of Question Period at 3:30 p.m. today, the vote be postponed until immediately after the conclusion of Question Period;

That, if the bells are ringing for a vote at 3:30 p.m. today, they be interrupted for Question Period at that time, and resume thereafter for the balance of any time remaining; and

That, if the Senate concludes its business before 3:30 p.m. today, the sitting be suspended until that time for the purpose of holding Question Period.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to.)

• (1540)

[*English*]

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION ADOPTED

Hon. Diane Bellemare (Legislative Deputy to the Government Representative in the Senate), pursuant to notice of April 12, 2017, moved:

That, when the Senate next adjourns after the adoption of this motion, it do stand adjourned until Tuesday, May 2, 2017 at 2 p.m.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to.)

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN JEWISH HERITAGE MONTH BILL

SECOND READING

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Frum, seconded by the Honourable Senator Pratte, for the second reading of Bill S-232, An Act respecting Canadian Jewish Heritage Month.

[Senator Bellemare]

Hon. Marc Gold: Honourable senators, I rise today in support of Bill S-232, An Act respecting Canadian Jewish Heritage Month. I am proud of my community, and it was a great honour for me to represent it. However, I must admit that I had a hard time deciding which aspects of this subject that is so near and dear to my heart I should focus on.

You have already heard about the history of the Jewish presence in Canada, the arrival of Esther Brandeau in 1738, disguised as a boy, as well as the waves of Jewish immigrants that arrived throughout the 19th and 20th centuries and that continue to settle here today.

You also heard about the role Canadian Jews have played in all sectors of Canadian society. When you can eat a smoked meat hamburger in Yellowknife, or a smoked meat poutine at La Banquise in Montreal — as a Montrealer, I am a little biased — and when you can go into any Tim Horton's and order a bagel —

[*English*]

— or something that passes for a bagel, no disrespect —

[*Translation*]

— you don't need me to explain the importance of Jewish food in the everyday lives of Canadians.

[*English*]

Nor, need I add, do I have to spend much time talking about the contribution of Canadian Jews to the arts. We listen to Leonard Cohen and to Drake. Yes, Drake is Jewish. We watch Sonia Benezra on TV. We go to see films by Ivan Reitman and now Jason Reitman in the theatres, and we tune into "Saturday Night Live" every week to see what Lorne Michaels has in store for us. Many of us — and I date myself here — grew up watching Wayne and Shuster on "The Ed Sullivan Show" or Lorne Greene on "Bonanza." I could go on and on.

The fact is that the very elegant and — allow me to say — moving speeches from Senators Frum, Wetston, Fraser and Jaffer simply make it unnecessary for me to catalogue the history of the Jewish presence in Canada, our struggles for equality, our achievements and our contribution to the social fabric of our country.

That said, I would encourage you to check out a wonderful website. It's called juifsdici.ca. It's an initiative of the Montreal Jewish federation, Federation CJA, to mark its one hundredth birthday.

[*Translation*]

On this site, you can learn more about Jewish Canadians who may be lesser known but nevertheless made their mark on Canadian history.

For example, you will meet Sigismund Mohr, an engineer credited with discovering hydro-electricity. He created the first urban electrical grid and introduced telephones to Quebec City in the 1880s. As the senator for Stadacona, I am particularly pleased to have a connection to this innovative pioneer.

You will also meet Jules Helbronner, who was the editor of *La Presse* from 1892 to 1908. You can even meet Harry Davis and other notorious Jewish gangsters. Yes, we also made a name for ourselves in more dubious circles.

[English]

On a sadder note, you'll also get a chance to learn about the life of a great Canadian who passed away tragically yesterday, Dr. Mark Wainberg, a friend and colleague, a world-renowned AIDS researcher, a discoverer of the antiviral drug 3TC, a fierce champion to make that drug accessible in Africa and elsewhere where people are suffering, accessible at an affordable price, and also an advocate for the opportunity of his colleagues in Quebec to share their scientific work in French. As you'll see from the remarks that follow, the late Dr. Wainberg exemplified the highest and best qualities that we expect of citizens of Canada and the contribution and values that underscore the Jewish contribution to Canada.

But I return to my question: What should I talk about? Because you know all of this. In true Jewish fashion, let me answer a question with another question, and the question is this: Why should we celebrate a heritage month or Jewish Heritage Month in particular? What can it teach us about who we are as Canadians? To answer this, let me begin by sharing a bit of my tradition with you. It is customary in Jewish circles to start an important meeting with some teachings from our Jewish texts as it provides a context for the issues to be discussed.

When I last rose in this chamber, I quoted a well-known religious leader who lived in Jerusalem some 2,000 years ago. Allow me to cite him again. Rabbi Hillel asked three questions:

If I am not for myself, who will be for me? And if I am only for myself, what am I? And if not now, when?

These three questions — and we Jewish people love asking questions — contain the key to understanding the contributions of the Jewish community to Canada and the significance of the bill that is before us today. The first question, “If I am not for myself, who will be for me,” what does that mean? To me, it speaks of the Jewish belief in individual responsibility and the value of self-sufficiency. It helps us to understand why Jewish communities in every city and every town in this country and, indeed, around the world develop organizations and groupings to take care of fellow Jews in need. But it also explains Jewish entrepreneurship and the remarkable success that many Canadian Jews have enjoyed in a broad variety of business endeavours, and it also helps to explain the strong value that we place on education and on the pursuit of excellence, whether in the sciences, the arts or the professions.

The second question, “. . . if I am only for myself, what am I?” is the key to understanding how we view our responsibilities, not only to our own community but to the world at large. Our tradition teaches us that we have a responsibility to repair the world, a world that's broken, a world that is unjust, a world where too many people still don't live in freedom. How else to explain the large number of Jewish Canadians who have taken up progressive causes, like Lea Roback, a fearless human rights and social justice activist, feminist and labour organizer in Montreal during the 1930s and 1940s?

[Translation]

How can I explain how important philanthropy and helping one's neighbour are to us? The Hebrew word for charity is *tzedakah*, which shares the same etymological root as the Hebrew word for justice. Words are important. In Jewish tradition, helping others is not a matter of choice. It is a moral obligation, pure and simple.

• (1550)

[English]

The third question — “If not now, when?” — is subject to several interpretations, but I tend to view it as connected with another well-known teaching a few centuries after Hillel, when Rabbi Tarfon wrote the following:

You are not obligated to complete the task, but neither are you free to desist from it.

Our tradition focuses on our relationships with our fellow human beings here on earth. Rewards there may be in an afterlife. It is a concept that is present but not very well developed in Jewish religious thought. The focus of Jewish tradition is on the here and now. We have a responsibility to act in the world, to seek justice for all, to be kind to strangers — for we were strangers in foreign lands — and, above all, to try to do our part to make the world a better place, and every day counts.

This may explain how impatient — some might, unkindly, say pushy — we sometimes can be, but it also explains our drive and determination to get things done.

I return to my question. Why should we support this bill to establish a Jewish heritage month in Canada? It is because it will give us an opportunity to reflect upon the underlying core values that have characterized the Canadian Jewish experience: respect for individual rights and beliefs, the importance of education and self-improvement; and the obligation to care for our family, our friends and all those who are less fortunate than us.

[Translation]

These values are deeply rooted in the Jewish tradition, but they are also part of the Canadian tradition. Although we may not always live up to those ideals, they deserve to be pursued, nourished, and yes, finally recognized.

I would like to conclude my remarks with the idea of a challenge and with the hope that establishing Canadian Jewish heritage month will be an opportunity for us to work together toward a fairer, more prosperous and more inclusive Canada.

[English]

Hon. George Baker (The Hon. the Acting Speaker): Are honourable senators ready for the question?

Hon. Senators: Question.

The Hon. the Acting Speaker: It is moved by the Honourable Senator Frum, seconded by Honourable Senator Pratte, that this bill be read the second time.

Is it your pleasure, honourable senators, to adopt the motion?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

(Motion adopted and bill read second time.)

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

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

(On motion of Senator Frum, bill referred to the Standing Senate Committee on Human Rights.)

RULES, PROCEDURES AND THE RIGHTS OF PARLIAMENT

FIFTH REPORT OF COMMITTEE— DEBATE ADJOURNED

The Senate proceeded to consideration of the fifth report (interim) of the Standing Committee on Rules, Procedures and the Rights of Parliament, entitled *Dividing Bills*, presented in the Senate on April 6, 2017.

Hon. Joan Fraser moved the adoption of the report.

She said: Colleagues, this report from the Rules Committee is our response to the order of reference that we were given in February relating to omnibus bills in the Senate, and that order of reference, in turn, grew out of the Modernization Committee's consideration of what to do about omnibus bills.

I think there is fairly widespread recognition in this chamber and elsewhere that some bills that come before us are not just more complex but more wide-ranging than many of us would consider desirable, that too much is packed into one steamer trunk of a bill.

The Modernization Committee wished the Rules Committee to develop a process for the division of bills — its focus was on omnibus bills — into their separate parts for separate consideration. I, at least, thought at first that this was going to be a no-brainer. We all agreed and all we had to say was, “Yes, do it.” Well, no element of the *Rules of the Senate* turns out to be a complete no-brainer. There are always ramifications and complexities that arise that we hadn't considered before.

One of the elements that we had to consider when we were thinking about whether and how to divide bills was which bills should be divided. The Modernization Committee referred to omnibus bills, which we normally take to refer to bills that address quite a wide range of elements, everything from the Judges Act to environmental policy to whatever you can think of. Such bills have frequently been budget implementation bills.

But there are other bills that the Senate has on occasion considered to be in need of division. A famous one was Bill C-10 in 2002, I think, relating to cruelty to animals and firearms. Those were the only two subjects. Many people might think that they were related, but the Senate, after considerable study and debate, decided that that bill should be divided into its sections relating to cruelty to animals and firearms. I could go on discussing the complexities involved.

One of the elements that influenced the committee was the fact that we were reminded that the Senate already has a process for dividing bills. This is not an innovation that came from the deliberations of the Modernization Committee like a bolt from the blue. We have established in precedent a process for the division of bills, but it's used very rarely. I was once taught you should never use the word “very,” but on occasion it seems to me appropriate, and in this case truly the use of the procedure to divide bills is very rare. Let me summarize it for you.

• (1600)

First, the Senate must empower the committee to which a bill has been referred or will be referred to divide the bill. So there has to be a debate in the Senate and a decision by the Senate. Then the committee examines the bill, reports on how it should be divided and returns it, or part of it, to the Senate. The Senate considers the committee's report, and then, at that point we are looking at more than one bill. There was one bill; it has been divided. Now we're looking at two or maybe more bills.

If the report is agreed to, the part of the bill — or presumably the parts of the bill — that has been reported by the committee go on to third reading. And if that part of the bill that has been divided off is adopted at third reading, we send a message to the House of Commons asking it to agree to the division of the bill and pass the part that we have adopted. And the Commons may or may not agree. If the Commons agrees, then it's a done deal and the part that has been approved by both chambers can go on to Royal Assent.

As you can see, it's a fairly complex process and it does involve initially and then again later, but most important I think is the initial decision by the Senate to authorize division of a bill because the Modernization Committee's report basically boiled down to that. It was to have the Senate debate whether a bill should be divided and then follow a procedure to authorize a committee to examine it and report back to the Senate; in other words, a procedure not that different from what already exists in our practices, not specifically in the Rules but in our practices.

Your committee thought about this and then we thought about adding layers of complexity. If we build specifically into the Rules references to dividing bills, particularly if we build specifically into the Rules references to omnibus bills, we have to define what an omnibus bill is, and thereby hangs many contentious debate, I can assure you. You have to determine some criteria for the decision that is to be made about whether to divide a bill.

In the end, your committee decided that, at least for now, it was appropriate to stick with the procedure we have. The report that is before you and that I hope you will support recommends that the Rules not be amended at this time specifically in relation to

omnibus bills. The committee undertakes to continue to keep an eye on the issue as necessary, and we also make note of a couple of other things.

One is that we already also have practices whereby very complicated bills involving several topics can be sent for pre-study by various committees. We can do a pre-study in the National Finance Committee of the budgetary implications and in the Legal and Constitutional Committee if there are Criminal Code implications and so on. So we do have the capacity to inform ourselves about the various disparate elements of a bill, even if we don't vote to divide them separately.

I would also note that in the past we have found it sometimes frustrating not to be able to divide a bill, but that in the end it has always depended upon the will of the chamber. I may believe passionately that a bill should be divided but if I cannot persuade a majority of members in the chamber to agree with me, then I'll just have to live with the consequences. And that will be maddening and frustrating for me, but it's the basis of the democratic system upon which we rely.

It's a little bit frustrating maybe to think that maybe now is not a good idea to sweep a whole new system into being, but it may also be the most appropriate way for us to address the issue now; that is to say, let's remind ourselves of the process that does exist and try living with that for a while longer to see what works.

The other element, of course, is that the House of Commons is thinking about thinking about what to do about omnibus bills. We might be able to learn something from them. Certainly we would not, I think, want to adopt a new process that would automatically for some reason put us in conflict with whatever procedures they might or might not adopt.

So there you are colleagues. This report stands firmly for the status quo, at least for now. But I hasten to add this does not mean that we did not appreciate the work of the Modernization Committee. That committee drew our attention again in this chamber in a systematic way to a practice that has on occasion seemed to many senators to verge on the abuse of the parliamentary process. We must all guard against such abuse, whether through new rules or through the use of procedures that we have but perhaps have not used as often as we should.

I commend this report to your favourable consideration, colleagues.

Hon. Yonah Martin (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, I want to thank Senator Fraser for the explanation of the report that is before us. I can appreciate the complexity of really reaching a certain consensus, as I know how the Rules Committee works very collegially and thoughtfully to conclude a report.

Having said that, I wish to take adjournment so that our caucus may have that discussion after the break and look at how we will go forward. Thank you.

(On motion of Senator Martin, debate adjourned).

NATIONAL SECURITY AND DEFENCE

BUDGET AND AUTHORIZATION TO ENGAGE SERVICES AND TRAVEL—STUDY ON NATIONAL SECURITY AND DEFENCE POLICIES, PRACTICES, CIRCUMSTANCES AND CAPABILITIES—NINTH REPORT OF COMMITTEE ADOPTED

The Senate proceeded to consideration of the ninth report of the Standing Senate Committee on National Security and Defence (Budget—Canada's national security and defence policies, practices, circumstances and capabilities — power to hire staff and to travel), presented in the Senate on April 11, 2017.

Hon. Daniel Lang moved the adoption of the report.

He said: Honourable senators, this is a request to the Senate for a total of \$72,810 for the cost of going to visit the West Coast for the purposes of our National Security and Defence Committee. We're obviously going to be meeting with the navy. We'll also be going to Gaagetown. We'll be travelling to the Marine Security Operations Centre. There are four days of meetings to be arranged and at the same time we will be viewing the various installations, equipment and technology that we have for our military.

I think this is very important, especially due to the fact there are quite a number of new members on the committee; this will be a firsthand look at what we actually do have for the purposes of the military and going forward this would provide a knowledge base to individuals when they have to make decisions with respect to the requirements of the military.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to and report adopted.)

[Translation]

NATIONAL FINANCE

BUDGET—STUDY ON THE DESIGN AND DELIVERY OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S MULTI-BILLION DOLLAR INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING PROGRAM—FIFTEENTH REPORT OF COMMITTEE ADOPTED

The Senate proceeded to consideration of the fifteenth report of the Standing Senate Committee on National Finance (Budget—study on the federal government infrastructure funding program) presented in the Senate on April 11, 2017.

Hon. Percy Mockler moved the adoption of the report.

He said: Honourable senators, I will probably not be as colourful as my colleague, Senator Maltais.

• (1610)

First, I must say that as chair of the committee, I have some big shoes to fill. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Senator Smith on his new responsibilities as leader of the Conservative Party in the Senate. I also want to mention that Senator Smith's predecessor in the role of committee chair also comes from New Brunswick. He was chair for at least 10 years. I am certainly fortunate enough to have the support of these two experienced people who will help me choose the right path so as to ensure that the accountability and transparency of the government are always my primary objective as senator and parliamentarian.

On that, I will read an excerpt from the letter signed by the then chair of the committee, the honourable Larry W. Smith, addressed to the Estimates Subcommittee:

[*English*]

All the funds requested are for the services of a database consultant who had already set up a database for the committee allowing members to query, track and follow up on all infrastructure projects across all departments, from coast to coast to coast, that have funds allocated in that particular area. The database, which we call the Infrastructure Program Analyzer, or IPA, is up and running and committee members are already using it.

Honourable senators, the new funds requested are for improvement and maintenance of the IPA system in the year ahead. The maintenance of the IPA, and the addition of the new data sets, as they become available from government sources or from the Parliamentary Budget Officer, is critical to being able to follow and track the progress of spending on infrastructure across 31 government entities that deliver funds for the infrastructure program from coast to coast to coast.

That said, honourable senators, the committee needs this database to fully accomplish its special study on infrastructure. Thank you.

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

Hon. Diane Bellemare (Legislative Deputy to the Government Representative in the Senate): Would the Honourable Senator Mockler answer a question?

[*Translation*]

Senator Mockler: Of course, senator.

Senator Bellemare: I would like to know how the data you gathered differs from the data that Infrastructure Canada is currently publishing on its own website.

Senator Mockler: That is an excellent question that will allow us to clarify the methodology used by Infrastructure Canada. In fact, it enables us to make the link with 31 different departments so we can complete the information that Infrastructure Canada is posting on its site.

[Senator Mockler]

Senator Bellemare: Infrastructure Canada was using the same approach. The difference may be that in your case, you indicate the riding in which the projects are being undertaken while in the other case the regions are presented in a broader fashion. Do I have that right?

Senator Mockler: The work done by our committee makes it possible to retrieve more detailed information about the project to be carried out or, as they say, "the shovel-ready projects to be completed."

Senator Bellemare: I saw some very specific information on your site about infrastructure projects completed under the previous government in 2007-08. There is very specific data. Are these the same criteria that you want to apply in future or are there differences? Can you talk about some of these elements? You must have some idea of the headings for the data that you want to post on the site.

Senator Mockler: Thank you, Senator Bellemare. If you have any recommendations for us, do not hesitate to make them. The objective of this database is to ensure accountability and transparency, so that Canadian taxpayers can see exactly how their money is being spent, and to have better performance indicators.

[*English*]

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

Hon. Senators: Question.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to and report adopted.)

TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

MOTION TO AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE TO STUDY ISSUES RELATED TO FEDERAL PUBLIC MONEY ON LOAN TO BOMBARDIER INC.—MOTION IN AMENDMENT—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Housakos, seconded by the Honourable Senator Smith:

That the Standing Senate Committee on Transport and Communications be authorized to examine and report on issues related to the 373 million dollars of federal public money on loan to Bombardier Inc., including but not limited to the overall value for investment on behalf of Canadians; and

That the committee submit its final report to the Senate no later than June 7, 2017 and that the committee retain all

powers necessary to publicize its findings until 180 days after the tabling of the final report.

And on the motion in amendment of the Honourable Senator Pratte, seconded by the Honourable Senator Mitchell:

That the motion be not now adopted, but that it be amended:

- (a) by replacing the words “Transport and Communications” by the words “National Finance”;
- (b) by replacing all the words in the first paragraph following the words “related to” by the words “public assistance provided to multinational companies by the Government of Canada, including the 350 million dollar loan provided to Bombardier Inc. in 2008 and the 373 million dollars loaned to Bombardier Inc. in 2017, taking particular account of, but not limited to, the overall value of such investment on behalf of Canadians; and”; and
- (c) by replacing the words “June 7” by the words “December 31”.

Hon. Leo Housakos: Honourable senators, I rise today to speak to Senator Pratte’s amendment to my motion to have the Transport and Communications Committee study the Trudeau government’s recent loan to Bombardier.

While my motion seeks to focus solely on Bombardier, I do realize the value in looking at other financial arrangements of this nature between the government and private companies.

My motion never asserted that any such study shouldn’t look at other loans or other means of financial assistance of this nature made by past governments, and certainly there is much that can be learned and weighed against the Bombardier loan.

As a matter of fact, I did mention one such arrangement in my original speech on my motion, one that was noticeably missing from my honourable friend Senator Pratte’s speech, by the way, and that was the 2013 Air Canada arrangement.

As I said in my speech last Thursday, Air Canada was looking down the barrel of a gun, facing the very real possibility of being grounded as they struggled to deal with deficits in their pension plan.

The government at that time had to act. The difference, however, was that Finance Minister Jim Flaherty did not let the urgency of the situation force him to act irresponsibly or flippantly with taxpayers’ money. Minister Flaherty attached conditions in the government’s deal with the airline, including a freeze on executive compensation tied to the rate of inflation, a ban on special bonuses and limits on executive incentive plans.

As I also went on to say:

If we’re going to continue making loans or agreements like this, we must be both strategic and responsible about it. We are talking about public money — taxpayers’ money —

here. Governments not only have to be truly transparent about the terms of these types of deals, but they also have to do the responsible thing and put covenants in place on the use of the funds.

So, contrary to what so many believe, you will get no argument from me that it would be helpful for the Senate to broaden the scope of our study, as Senator Pratte has suggested, and I’m all in favour of that. And that includes the auto industry. We should take a look at the conditions that were applied in the deals with Chrysler and General Motors, conditions like the fact the repayment was not tied to the performance of a specific product and that the government received shares in these companies that allowed us on the boards of directors of those companies.

• (1620)

All of that is to say that I fully support Senator Pratte’s amendment to my motion. The only difference is that Senator Pratte suggested in his amendment that it be sent to Finance. However, after consultation with the Chair of the Finance Committee, it has been brought to my attention that they are so overloaded with the study of the budget, they would not be able to look at this study until six or seven months from now. So if the intention is to broaden the scope, which we’re all in favour of, to look at all aspects of these types of deals, and the desire of my honourable friend is to get that done expeditiously, the Chair of the Banking, Trade and Commerce Committee has offered to undertake this study if there is agreement between myself and Senator Pratte in order to move as expeditiously as possible.

I will support Senator Pratte’s amendment to the motion if he would be agreeable to sending it to the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce. Given the broader scope of this study, I think that would be the more appropriate committee rather than what is proposed in my original motion, which is the Standing Senate Committee on Transport and Communications.

At the end of the day, I’m seeking answers for Canadians about their tax dollars, how they’re spent and some assurance that when we make loans like this, they will be done prudently.

If seeking those answers, colleagues, makes me partisan, I will be glad to accept that title. If looking after job security and proper compensation for thousands of Bombardier employees and middle-class workers instead of high-level executives is being partisan, well, then I’m guilty as charged.

The Hon. the Acting Speaker: Senator Bellemare has a question.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Diane Bellemare (Legislative Deputy to the Government Representative in the Senate): Would Senator Housakos agree to broaden the scope of the study to what is being done internationally? With regard to the study on deals for assistance to companies in difficulty, I am worried that the way we are conducting the study will harm their international competitiveness.

In order to counteract that effect, it might be a good idea to compare what is being done in Canada with what is done in other countries in similar situations, so that we can place the assistance

the Canadian government provides to our companies in the context of other countries that have faced similar difficulties.

Senator Housakos: The answer is yes.

[*English*]

Very simply, I don't want to narrow any parameters on this study. I want the committee to have free rein in order to study all the scopes and aspects that touch these kinds of loans, grants and bursaries to all private sectors in this country and, of course, looking at the international competitiveness and the scope and all the other economic factors that need to be weighed in. Like I said, I'm in favour of a wide, broad-scope study as proposed in the amendment by Senator Pratte, with no parameters or restrictions.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Éric Forest: Honourable senators, I move the adjournment of the debate in my name.

[*English*]

The Hon. the Acting Speaker: Senator Ringuette has a question.

Hon. Pierrette Ringuette: Would the honourable senator please answer a question?

Senator Housakos: Sure.

Senator Ringuette: This is very interesting. I'm a long-standing member of the Banking Committee, and yesterday we had exactly that — a discussion on the work that we have to do until we adjourn at the end of June. I've argued that we have a very urgent issue to study at Banking with regard to the state of consumer protection in the federal government. The discussion was that the committee has so much work to do until the end of June that we may only be able to start when we come back in the fall.

So my question to you, honourable senator, is when did you talk to the chair and how come all of a sudden the Banking Committee has all this time on its hands to do your study?

Senator Housakos: I spoke to the Chair of the Banking Committee this afternoon after I spoke to the Chair of the Finance Committee and after I spoke to my colleague Senator Pratte. I don't sit on the steering committee of the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce, so if you have any questions, you can bring it up to your steering committee.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Renée Dupuis: Senator Housakos, I don't see the period of analysis that you want to use anywhere in your original proposal or in the amendment. I don't imagine the study will cover all 150 years of Canada's history.

[Senator Bellemare]

Could you give us a better idea of what time frame will be covered by your proposed analysis?

Senator Housakos: I take a very specific position in my proposal, but Senator Pratte's amendment broadens the scope. I am prepared to allow the committee to determine what it wants to do. I don't want to set any parameters. I think we need to keep it open and let the committee have all the freedom it needs.

[*English*]

Hon. Joseph A. Day (Leader of the Senate Liberals): I have a comment. I am on the steering committee of Banking, and I wasn't aware of this. I just wanted to let you know that. I was sitting here listening to the debate, and it seems to me that Finance would be the appropriate committee to send this to.

Senator Housakos: For the honourable members opposite, I think there's an important issue on the table. There is \$1.3 billion of taxpayer money over the last few weeks that I think we all agree have been used inappropriately by a private company. There are serious questions on the table that need to be addressed. I think we have a responsibility to taxpayers in the province of Quebec and across the country to make sure that these types of arrangements that are put into place by the government are being put into place in an effective manner, respecting the basic covenant of any type of financial arrangement of this nature.

We as parliamentarians and senators have an obligation, I think, to look at this in an expeditious, fair, just and open fashion. I'm of the opinion, Senator Day, that the committee best suited for this would be Transport because, of course, it's in the transportation industry. Regardless of which committee we send it to, we need to send it to a committee that's prepared to accept it and take it.

I've been told by the chair of your committee that they would be able to manage that quicker than six or seven months from now. The Chair of the Finance Committee has explained to me they could not get to this sooner than October. If the Senate is indeed interested in getting to the bottom of some of these important questions on behalf of taxpayers in an expeditious fashion, we should do that. If the objective is to drag the puck and drag our feet, that's whole other story. This chamber will take that decision and I'll live by that decision.

[*Translation*]

Senator Forest: Your Honour, I would inquire as to the status of my request to adjourn debate in my name. As I am seated quite far, I didn't understand.

Some Hon. Senators: Oh, oh!

[*English*]

The Hon. the Acting Speaker: It has been moved several times by the Honourable Senator Forest and seconded by the Honourable Senator Galvez that further debate be adjourned until the next sitting of the Senate.

Is it your pleasure, honourable senators, to adopt the motion?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

(On motion of Senator Forest, debate adjourned.)

EFFECTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE ON HUMAN RIGHTS

INQUIRY—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the inquiry of the Honourable Senator Jaffer, calling the attention of the Senate to the human rights implications of climate change, and how it will

affect the most vulnerable in Canada and the world by threatening their right to food, water, health, adequate shelter, life, and self-determination.

Hon. Jane Cordy: I'd like to adjourn the debate in my name, please, for the balance of my time.

The Hon. the Acting Speaker: Honourable senators, is it your pleasure to adopt the motion?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

(On motion of Senator Cordy, debate adjourned.)

(The Senate adjourned until Tuesday, May 2, 2017, at 2 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 13, 2017

	PAGE		PAGE
SENATORS' STATEMENTS		QUESTION PERIOD	
National Volunteer Week		Justice	
Hon. Terry M. Mercer	2843	Cannabis Legalization Legislation.	
World Figure Skating Championships 2017		Hon. Larry W. Smith	2847
Congratulations to Kaetlyn Osmond and Gabrielle Daleman on		Hon. Peter Harder	2847
Winning Silver and Bronze Medals.		Hon. Claude Carignan	2848
Hon. Elizabeth Marshall	2843	Finance	
Thomas "Tommy" Ricketts		Office of the Parliamentary Budget Office.	
Hon. Fabian Manning	2843	Hon. Joseph A. Day	2848
Battle of Vimy Ridge		Hon. Peter Harder	2848
One Hundredth Anniversary.		International Development	
Hon. Mobina S. B. Jaffer	2844	Assistance for Women's Organizations.	
Symposium150		Hon. Renée Dupuis	2849
The Hon. the Speaker	2845	Hon. Peter Harder	2849
<hr/>		Foreign Affairs	
ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS		Taiwan—Participation at World Health Assembly Meetings.	
Study on the Policies, Practices and Collaborative Efforts of the		Hon. Yonah Martin	2849
Canada Border Services Agency in Determining Admissibility to		Hon. Peter Harder	2849
Canada and Removal of Inadmissible Individuals		Canadian Heritage	
Sixteenth Report of the National Security and Defence		Absence of Reference to Francophone Content in CBC	
Committee Tabled during the Second Session of the		Program—"Canada The Story of Us".	
Forty-first Parliament—Government Response Tabled.		Hon. Pierre-Hugues Boisvenu	2849
Hon. Peter Harder	2845	Hon. Peter Harder	2850
Controlled Drugs and Substances Bill (Bill C-37)		Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship	
Bill to Amend—Fourteenth Report of Legal and Constitutional		Refugee Programs—Trauma Support—Yazidi Women.	
Affairs Committee Presented.		Hon. Mobina S. B. Jaffer	2850
Hon. Bob Runciman	2845	Hon. Peter Harder	2850
Study on Issues Related to the Government's Current Defence		Justice	
Policy Review		Cannabis Legalization Legislation.	
Tenth Report of National Security and Defence Committee		Hon. Josée Verner	2851
Tabled.		Hon. Peter Harder	2851
Hon. Daniel Lang	2846	Canadian Heritage	
Fisheries and Oceans		CBC Program—"Canada The Story of Us".	
Budget and Authorization to Travel—Study on Maritime Search		Hon. Ghislain Maltais	2851
and Rescue Activities—Sixth Report of Committee Adopted.		Hon. Peter Harder	2852
Hon. Fabian Manning	2846	Speaker's Ruling	
Rules, Procedures and the Rights of Parliament		The Hon. the Speaker	2852
Sixth Report of Committee Presented.		<hr/>	
Hon. Joan Fraser	2846	ORDERS OF THE DAY	
The Senate		Citizenship Act (Bill C-6)	
Notice of Motion to Resolve into Committee of the Whole to		Bill to Amend—Third Reading—Motion in Amendment—Debate	
Receive Patrick Borbey, President of the Public Service		Continued.	
Commission, and that the Committee Report to the Senate No		Hon. Peter Harder	2853
Later than One Hour After it Begins.		Hon. Daniel Lang	2855
Hon. Peter Harder	2847	Motion in Amendment.	
Palliative Care		Hon. Daniel Lang	2856
Notice of Inquiry.		National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians	
Hon. Jane Cordy	2847	Bill (Bill C-22)	
<hr/>		Bill to Amend—Speaker's Statement.	
		The Hon. the Speaker	2857

	PAGE
Bill to Amend—Motion to Withdraw Bill and Declare All Proceedings to Date Null and Void.	
Hon. Peter Harder	2858
Bill to Amend—First Reading	2858
Speech from the Throne	
Motion for Address in Reply—Debate Continued.	
Hon. Rosa Galvez	2859
The Senate	
Motion to Affect Question Period on May 2, 2017, Adopted.	
Hon. Diane Bellemare.	2861
Adjournment	
Motion Adopted.	
Hon. Diane Bellemare.	2862
Canadian Jewish Heritage Month Bill (Bill S-232)	
Second Reading.	
Hon. Marc Gold	2862
Hon. George Baker (The Hon. the Acting Speaker).	2863
Referred to Committee	2864
Rules, Procedures and the Rights of Parliament	
Fifth Report of Committee—Debate Adjourned.	
Hon. Joan Fraser	2864
Hon. Yonah Martin	2865

	PAGE
National Security and Defence	
Budget and Authorization to Engage Services and Travel—Study on National Security and Defence Policies, Practices, Circumstances and Capabilities—Ninth Report of Committee Adopted.	
Hon. Daniel Lang	2865
National Finance	
Budget—Study on the Design and Delivery of the Federal Government’s Multi-Billion Dollar Infrastructure Funding Program—Fifteenth Report of Committee Adopted.	
Hon. Percy Mockler	2865
Hon. Diane Bellemare.	2866
Transport and Communications	
Motion to Authorize Committee to Study Issues Related to Federal Public Money on Loan to Bombardier Inc.—Motion in Amendment—Debate Continued.	
Hon. Leo Housakos	2867
Hon. Diane Bellemare.	2867
Hon. Éric Forest	2868
Hon. Pierrette Ringuette	2868
Hon. Renée Dupuis	2868
Hon. Joseph A. Day	2868
Effects of Climate Change on Human Rights	
Inquiry—Debate Continued.	
Hon. Jane Cordy	2869

Published by the Senate

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