

2016/04/28

Senate

[N]1. As you may be aware, the trial of Senator Mike Duffy recently ended. Duffy was facing 31 charges of fraud, breach of trust and bribery related to a \$90,000 payment from Stephen Harper's former chief of staff, Nigel Wright, to repay Duffy's Senate expenses. Recently, Duffy was acquitted of all charges.

How closely would you say you have been following this issue? Would you say you are:

Following it in the news and discussing it with friends and family
Seeing some media coverage and having the odd conversation about it
Just scanning the headlines
Haven't seen or heard anything about it

2. In the past couple years there have been a number of changes to the way the Senate and Senators operates. As a result of the Duffy trial and the larger expense scandal, rules about expenses have become more explicit and transparent - while other changes were aimed at making the Senate more effective generally.

Do you think each of the following changes improve the Senate or make no difference?

[ROWS]

Senators may no longer charge the Senate for international travel
Must annually provide copies of their tax returns, drivers licenses and health care cards if they maintain a second residence
Appointing new Senators as independents rather than as members of a political party
Posting Senate attendance records online

[COLUMNS]

Don't know
No difference
Improvement

3. Do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the senate:

The reforms weren't needed there wasn't much wrong with the Senate in the first place
These changes will help solve the problems with the Senate
The Senate is an important institution
The Senate is too damaged to ever earn my goodwill

[COLUMNS]

Strongly disagree
Moderately disagree
Moderately agree
Strongly agree

[T] 4. There are three broad choices in terms of the future of the Canadian Senate. Overall, which of the following would you say would be the best outcome? Would you say the Senate should be:

Abolished

Reformed

Left as is

5. One of the difficulties of reforming or abolishing the Senate is that it requires changing the Canadian constitution, which requires the approval of a least seven provinces representing 50% of the population. With this in mind, which is closest to your point of view:

Senate reform/abolition is important enough that we should try to change the constitution

Senate reform/abolition is not enough of a priority that we should try to change the constitution