



CANADA

Debates of the Senate

2nd SESSION

•

35th PARLIAMENT

•

VOLUME 135

•

NUMBER 25

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Tuesday, June 4, 1996

**THE HONOURABLE GILDAS L. MOLGAT
SPEAKER**

This issue contains the latest listing of Officers of the Senate, the Ministry,
Senators and Members of the Senate and Joint Committees.

CONTENTS

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

Debates: Victoria Building, Room 407, Tel. 996-0397

Published by the Senate

Available from Canada Communication Group — Publishing, Public Works and
Government Services Canada, Ottawa K1A 0S9, at \$1.75 per copy or \$158 per year.

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

THE SENATE

Tuesday, June 4, 1996

The Senate met at 2:00 p.m., the Speaker in the Chair.

Prayers.

PAGES EXCHANGE PROGRAM WITH HOUSE OF COMMONS

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, before I call for Senators' Statements, I should like to introduce to you two pages from the House of Commons who are participating in the exchange program with us this week. Charmaine Lee is from Cap-Pelé, New Brunswick.

[Translation]

She is a student at the University of Ottawa, where she specializes in political science. Welcome to the Senate.

[English]

Matthew Hayes is from Dalhousie, New Brunswick. He is enrolled in the School of Journalism at Carleton University. Welcome to the Senate.

SENATORS' STATEMENTS

LIBERAL INTERNATIONAL

HONORARY PATRON STATUS CONFERRED ON
THE HONOURABLE B. ALASDAIR GRAHAM

Hon. Richard J. Stanbury (Acting Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, you may have noticed that Senator Graham is not sitting in this seat today. Perhaps a word of explanation might be helpful.

Senator Graham has been a member of Liberal International for the past 20 years, during which time he has served as vice-president for several terms and as treasurer for several terms. He was also the Chair of the Human Rights Liberal International Congress, 1987, held here in Ottawa. This week he is being made an Honorary Patron of Liberal International in recognition of his dedication and hard work in the cause of human rights, and in promoting free and fair elections, and for his role in leading numerous international election-observing missions in various countries of the world.

He is the only individual to be so honoured at this year's biennial convention in Noordwijk, Netherlands. The last such honours were conferred in 1994 on Zheliou Zhelev, the President of Bulgaria, Simone Veil, the former President of the European Parliament, and Steingrímur Hermannsson, the former Prime

Minister of Iceland. Senator Graham will also be the guest speaker at a gala dinner on Friday night in Rotterdam.

The last time I had the opportunity to fill this role was when another deputy leader, who happens to be in another chair at the moment, was away leading a Canadian delegation to celebrate V-E day. I notice that these people manage to disappear just at the end of the session when it is most difficult. However, it gives me the opportunity once again to work with my good friend, Senator Eric Berntson. It is also a pleasure to have the opportunity of working with all of my colleagues.

THE HONOURABLE JOHN. M. MACDONALD

BEST WISHES ON RETURN TO CHAMBER

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I know it is impossible for the *Debates of the Senate* to record applause, but I should just like it noted that all honourable senators were applauding the return of our colleague and good friend, the Honourable Senator John Macdonald, who is back with us today after recovering from some illness.

Welcome back, Senator Macdonald.

THE SENATE

REMARKS OF MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT FOR
VANCOUVER QUADRA IN HOUSE OF COMMONS

Hon. Dalia Wood: Honourable senators, I wish to comment on remarks made by the member from Vancouver Quadra in the other place on May 28 last, and I quote:

I regret the interminable delays we have seen in this Parliament the Senate apply to measures adopted by the lower House... that it is a violation of the constitutional conventions...

• (1410)

He continued:

I say that with some regret and I put forward the suggestion that in the future this House should be more vigilant in assuring a prompt follow-up by the Senate to measures passed by the lower House where they have been fully debated.

I wish to inform the member that the Senate of Canada was created to protect the regional, municipal and minority rights in Canada, and to perform three basic functions: to legislate, to deliberate and to investigate. I wish to advise the member that his comments are of little value to this chamber.

NEWFOUNDLAND

CHANGES TO SCHOOL SYSTEM— AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION

Hon. Marcel Prud'homme: Honourable senators, it is coincidental that my comments today will add to what Senator Wood has said.

Last night the House of Commons, after only two days of very limited debate on Friday last and yesterday, passed the amendment to the Constitution requested by the Premier of Newfoundland. I am of the opinion that we will soon receive this resolution from the House of Commons. The Senate should uphold its constitutional duty and obligation to thoroughly consider this proposal by Newfoundland. We should take into consideration that the House of Commons can, at times, do things in haste, and the Senate should take the time to look into what is being proposed. I hope that when the time comes, the Senate of Canada will definitely hold hearings on this very important debate.

Honourable senators, in conclusion, I am not urging you to vote either for or against the bill. I do not want to start the debate in that way. I simply urge honourable senators to read the two days of debate that took place in the House of Commons. To be honest, after having attended the meetings Friday and yesterday, I am amazed. The more we talk about this matter, the more questions arise. New developments are taking place in Newfoundland all the time, and I would hope that my honourable colleagues will pay attention to them so that when the time comes for deliberation on this matter in this chamber, we will give the matter a fair hearing and listen to representations by Canadians who have a lot to say about it, while remembering that the Senate has an obligation to defend minority rights and regional rights in this country.

CANADA-CHINA RELATIONS

SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF TIANANMEN SQUARE MASSACRE

Hon. Consiglio Di Nino: Honourable senators, "Lest We Forget." One of the darkest days, one of the darkest periods in recent memory, and one of the worst examples of a nation's atrocities against its own people occurred on the night of June 3 and the night and day of June 4, 1989. It will be forever remembered in infamy as the treachery of Tiananmen Square.

Jan Wong, a reporter for *The Globe and Mail*, witnessed first-hand the horrors of those eventful hours. Here are a few selected quotes from her book, *Red China Blues*.

I did not know that the massacre had already begun. That Saturday evening, Deng Xiaoping had ordered the army to take the square by using "all necessary measures."

...the troops rolled in from the west side, the armored personnel carriers roaring easily over makeshift barricades. Protesters hurled stones. A cyclist gave impotent chase. I

could hear the crackle of gunfire clearly now. I watched in horror as the army shot directly into the crowds, who stampeded screaming and cursing down the Avenue of Eternal Peace. At first, some protesters held blankets and jackets in front of them, apparently believing the army was using rubber bullets....

As the soldiers massacred people, the loudspeakers broadcast the earlier government message warning everyone to stay home. I leaned over the balcony to watch some people cowering in the parking lot. The crowd ran away after each heavy volley, then to my amazement crept back slowly, screaming curses and weeping with rage. Perhaps like me, they couldn't believe that the People's Liberation Army was shooting them. Or perhaps the decades of propaganda had warped their minds. Perhaps they were insane with anger....

I learned later that about five thousand students, many from the provinces, huddled that night around the Monument to the People's Heroes. Chai Ling led them in singing the "Internationale". Many had joined the hunger strike as a springtime lark. Now they were sure they were going to die on a cool night in June. When the lights went out, many students started weeping....

With daylight, I could see better. At 6:40, a tank plowed into the Goddess of Democracy, sending her plaster torso smashing to the ground....

I saw a couple of people use their own blood to smear slogans on a sheet of plywood propped against a barricade at the intersection. 'Kill Li Peng!' said one slogan. 'Blood debts will be repaid with blood,' read another....

After the third barrage, I counted more than twenty bodies. One cyclist was shot in the back right below our balcony. There were two big puddles of blood on the Avenue of Eternal Peace. People carried the body of a little girl toward the back of the hotel. After twenty-three more minutes, a few people gathered up enough courage to approach the wounded. The soldiers let loose another blast, sending the would-be rescuers scurrying for cover. The crowd was enraged. I grimly kept track of the time. An hour later, the wounded were still on the ground bleeding to death.

For the rest of the morning, and throughout the afternoon, the scene repeated itself again and again. In all, I recorded eight long murderous volleys. Dozens died before my eyes. By midafternoon —

The Hon. the Speaker: I hesitate to interrupt the honourable senator on this matter but, unfortunately, the three-minute period is up. Is leave granted to continue?

Hon. Senators: Agreed. I

Senator Di Nino: Jan Wong goes on to say:

By midafternoon, the crowd was down to about five hundred maniacs who stood on the corner screaming, 'Kill Li Peng! Kill Li Peng!' Only when a steady rain began to fall at 4:15 did they finally drift away. The rain cleansed the street of the blood. When it stopped, the crowds returned, and the soldiers fired again, and again, and many more people died.

I thought how strange it was that Beijingers didn't want to get wet, but they weren't afraid of getting killed.

Honourable senators, Mao said, "political power grows out of the barrel of a gun." The barbarians who perpetuated this heinous and unspeakable crime against their own people are now our friends whom we embrace, and with whom we dine.

Honourable senators, in memory of the thousands and thousands of innocent Chinese whose blood stained the streets of Beijing and Tiananmen Square, let us resolve that we will always remember and honour their courage and their ultimate sacrifice, and that their efforts were not in vain.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

NEWFOUNDLAND

CHANGE TO SCHOOL SYSTEM— NOTICE OF MOTION TO AMEND CONSTITUTION

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I give notice that on Thursday next, June 6, 1996, I will move:

Whereas section 43 of the *Constitution Act, 1982* provides that an amendment to the Constitution of Canada may be made by proclamation issued by the Governor General under the Great Seal of Canada where so authorized by resolutions of the Senate and House of Commons and of the legislative assembly of each province to which the amendment applies;

Now therefore the Senate resolves that an amendment to the Constitution of Canada be authorized to be made by proclamation issued by His Excellency the Governor General under the Great Seal of Canada in accordance with the schedule hereto.

SCHEDULE

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF CANADA

I. Term 17 of the Terms of Union of Newfoundland with Canada set out in the Schedule to the Newfoundland Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

"17. In lieu of section ninety-three of the Constitution Act 1867, the following shall apply in respect of the Province of Newfoundland:

In and for the Province of Newfoundland, the Legislature shall have exclusive authority to make laws in relation to education but

(a) except as provided in paragraphs (b) and (c), schools established, maintained and operated with public funds shall be denominational schools, and any class of persons having rights under this Term as it read on January 1, 1995 shall continue to have the right to provide for religious education, activities and observances for the children of that class in those schools, and the group of classes that formed one integrated school system by agreement in 1969 may exercise the same rights under this Term as a single class of persons;

(b) subject to provincial legislation that is uniformly applicable to all schools specifying conditions for the establishment or continued operation of schools,

(i) any class of persons referred to in paragraph (a) shall have the right to have a publicly funded denominational school established, maintained and operated especially for that class, and

(ii) the Legislature may approve the establishment, maintenance and operation of a publicly funded school, whether denominational or non-denominational;

(c) where a school is established, maintained and operated pursuant to subparagraph (b)(i), the class of persons referred to in that subparagraph shall continue to have the right to provide for religious education, activities and observances and to direct the teaching of aspects of curriculum affecting religious beliefs, student admission policy and the assignment and dismissal of teachers in that school;

(d) all schools referred to in paragraphs (a) and (b) shall receive their share of public funds in accordance with scales determined on a non-discriminatory basis from time to time by the Legislature; and

(e) if the classes of persons having rights under this Term so desire, they shall have the right to elect in total not less than two thirds of the members of a school board, and any class so desiring shall have the right to elect the portion of that total that is proportionate to the population of that class in the area under the board's jurisdiction."

Citation

2. This Amendment may be cited as the Constitution Amendment, year of proclamation (Newfoundland Act).

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Richard J. Stanbury (Acting Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, with leave of the Senate, and notwithstanding rule 58(1)(h), I move:

That when the Senate adjourns today, it do stand adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 5, 1996, at one thirty o'clock in the afternoon.

• (1420)

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, is leave granted?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE BILL

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY AT KINGSTON—
PRESENTATION OF PETITION

Hon. Lowell Murray: Honourable senators, I have the honour to present a petition from Queen's University of the City of Kingston, in the Province of Ontario, praying for the passage of an act respecting Queen's University at Kingston.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO MEET
DURING SITTING OF THE SENATE

Hon. John B. Stewart, with leave of the Senate and notwithstanding rule 58(1)(a), moved:

That the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs have power to sit at four o'clock today, Tuesday, June 4, 1996, even though the Senate may then be sitting, and that rule 95(4) be suspended in relation thereto.

He said: The Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs is trying to complete its report on the reference with regard to the relations between Canada and the European Union. That work was interrupted by the prorogation of Parliament earlier, and we have since been scrambling to complete our deliberations.

This afternoon, we propose to have as a witness the Minister of International Trade, Mr. Arthur Eggleton. After we hear from Mr. Eggleton, we have one more witness, and we hope to hear from that witness tomorrow. With that behind us, it is hoped that we will be able to finalize our report.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS

COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO MEET
DURING SITTING OF THE SENATE

Hon. Sharon Carstairs, with leave of the Senate and notwithstanding rule 58(1)(a), moved:

That the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs have power to sit at 3:30 p.m. on Wednesday, June 5, 1996, even though the Senate may then be sitting, and that rule 95(4) be suspended in relation thereto.

She said: Honourable senators, it was our hope that Mr. Gerald Chipeur, a witness suggested by Senator Nolin, would be able to appear on Monday next. Unfortunately, he cannot do so. Therefore, we have yet to hear from the panel on NAFTA as well as Mr. Chipeur.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

NEWFOUNDLAND

CHANGES TO SCHOOL SYSTEM—AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION—
PRESENTATION OF PETITION

Hon. Marcel Prud'homme: Honourable senators, I have the honour to present a petition in the name of Mrs. Alice Furlong, Carpasian Road, St. John's, Newfoundland, of the Alliance for Choice in Education, which states:

The undersigned hereby request the Senate of Canada to hold public hearings into the proposed amendment to Term 17 put forward by the Province of Newfoundland.

• (1430)

NEONATICIDE

NOTICE OF INQUIRY

Leave having been given to revert to Notices of Inquiries:

Hon. Anne C. Cools: Honourable senators, pursuant to rule 57(1) and (2), and 58(2), I give notice that I will call the attention of the Senate to an attempted neonaticide, being the brutal attempted homicide of a newlyborn infant who was born in a private home and then shot in the head in Carleton Place, Ontario, and who was sent to the Children's Hospital of Eastern Ontario in Ottawa a few days ago; and to the work of Dr. Charles Smith, a pediatric forensic pathologist with Toronto's Hospital for Sick Children's Ontario Pediatric Forensic Pathology Unit et al. on neonaticide in the province of Ontario.

JUSTICE

MEETING BETWEEN ASSOCIATE DEPUTY MINISTER AND CHIEF
JUSTICE OF FEDERAL COURT—STATEMENTS OF MINISTER IN
HOUSE OF COMMONS—NOTICE OF INQUIRY

Hon. Anne C. Cools: Honourable senators, pursuant to rule 57(1) and (2), and 58(2), I give notice that I will call the attention of the Senate to:

The statements of the Minister of Justice Allan Rock in the other place on May 28, 1996, that:

... the Department of Justice regards the meeting that was held as inappropriate, and it ought not to have occurred...

regarding a meeting between Associate Deputy Minister of Justice Ted Thompson and Chief Justice Julius Isaac, Federal Court of Canada;

and to the very hurtful and damaging consequences of the Minister's statements for the personal and professional reputations of the well respected Mr. Justice Julius Isaac and others;

and to the Minister's initiatives inviting Mr. Justice Charles Dubin and the Law Society of Upper Canada to review these matters;

and that such review is a political matter and not a legal question and is a matter which properly belongs to Parliament and not to the Bench or the Bar;

and to the Office of the Minister of Justice as the guardian of the public interest in the management and administration of justice; and to the principles of judicial independence and ministerial responsibility in parliamentary government;

and to Parliament's rights, powers, and privileges in all these matters.

QUESTION PERIOD

NATIONAL UNITY

COMMENTS OF MINISTER OF HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT
IN HOUSE OF COMMONS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. John Lynch-Staunton (Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, I would ask the Leader of the Government in the Senate to follow up on an exchange that she and Senator Di Nino had on comments made by the Minister of Human Resources Development in the House of Commons, and I will read the quotation now that I have it here. Perhaps we could have the exchange on the exact quotation rather than impressions left by it at the time. Mr. Young said, and I quote from the May 28, 1996 *House of Commons Debates*, page 3081:

Everything I said yesterday, I repeat today. Someone coming to Canada — who is elected, who enters Parliament and who defends separatism by attacking the system that enabled him to become a citizen — that is unacceptable.

The implication here is quite clear. The minister was referring to someone coming to Canada. He did not extend his criticism to all Canadians who support separatism, but only to those who are naturalized citizens.

My question to the minister is: Why is it unacceptable only for naturalized citizens to support separatism?

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I do not have a quotation to give to my honourable friend, but I am certain I can find one, not just from Mr. Young but from many others who find it unacceptable that anyone in this country should choose to break it up. This is one of the issues that is engaging us most profoundly at the moment.

As I say, I do not have a quotation to give to my honourable friend from Mr. Young specifically, but undoubtedly I could find one. That particular minister has been consistently outspoken in his views on this country, on national unity and in his battle against the forces of separation that would destroy Canada.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: That is a very eloquent statement on behalf of this country, honourable senators, but it has nothing to do with the question.

The question is: Why does a minister of the Crown, supported by the Prime Minister, single out immigrants who, having become naturalized citizens, now espouse a cause that we all deplore and take a position which is unacceptable? Why did he not immediately say, "I apply my feelings to all Canadian citizens who want to break up this country"?

I make a point of this because on the same day — and if there has been a correction, I have looked for it diligently but have yet to find it — according to the *House of Commons Debates*, Mr. Chrétien says:

However, I accept the political debate and the opinion expressed by an Acadian, a francophone outside Quebec, who knows that the separation of Quebec would endanger the cultural life of his fellow francophone citizens in New Brunswick or elsewhere in Canada. His feelings are true.

He goes on to say:

I believe that he is describing a reality, which is that there is a member of this House who is an immigrant and who is working to break up Canada.

In other words, he repeated the statement; he reiterated the fact that the member of Parliament was an immigrant.

What difference does it make whether or not he is an immigrant? Why single out one class of citizens and, by the confirmation of the minister's statement, turn them into second-class citizens?

Senator Fairbairn: I was endeavouring to answer that question.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: I know, but you did not succeed.

Senator Fairbairn: The Prime Minister's views on this country are very well known. As I said, I will check and, if possible, find any comments from the minister in question.

I have been listening to the Prime Minister, from one end of this country to the other, talking about the task we face in fighting separatism from wherever and whomever it comes. In the case of the quote that my honourable friend has read, the Prime Minister is speaking undoubtedly in the context of the questions that were being asked on that particular issue.

The Prime Minister himself has made it very clear that his fight is with those who espouse the cause of separatism, whether they are native-born Canadians or naturalized Canadians. The entire basis of the Prime Minister's tenure in public life is to have a united, strong and independent Canada. He is fighting against separatism from whomever and whatever corner it comes in this country. He is not, as my honourable friend would suggest, putting a particular burden on any one segment of our population. I cannot say that more strongly.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: I am not asking the minister to have the Prime Minister repeat his oath of loyalty to this country. That is not the issue. The issue is that the Liberal government has divided our citizenry into two. Had they said all separatists should find their own country if they are unhappy here —

Senator Perrault: You have chewed on this long enough.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: No, we have not. We have not chewed on this enough. When, on the night of the referendum, Mr. Parizeau blamed ethnics for the Yes side having lost the referendum, the entire country dumped all over him. This is exactly the same kind of narrow thinking.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

Senator Lynch-Staunton: If certain immigrants or ethnics — the code word is the same — are espousing this time a philosophy which is in disagreement with that of the federal government, it is all right to single them out, but it was not all right on the night of the referendum to single them out when they supported the federal government. That is what I call hypocrisy.

Senator Fairbairn: Honourable senators, I have used the word “offensive” in other circumstances, but I find it quite offensive to hear the words of the Prime Minister on this issue equated with those of Mr. Parizeau on the night of the referendum.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: Not at all. They are saying the same thing. The message is the same.

• (1440)

Senator Fairbairn: The message is not the same, Senator Lynch-Staunton. The Prime Minister of Canada, the Right Honourable Jean Chrétien, deplors the espousal of separatism by any individuals in this country, not because it is against government policy but because keeping Canada together is within the heart and soul of every member in the opposition of the Senate, as well as every member on this side of the house, and that is a fact.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

COMMENTS OF MINISTER OF HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT
IN HOUSE OF COMMONS—POSSIBILITY OF APOLOGY TO
IMMIGRANTS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Consiglio Di Nino: Honourable senators, the minister has heard publicly from senators on this side, and perhaps even privately from senators on her side, that there is a concern that a message was sent out to those people who have become Canadians but who were not born in Canada, some of whom sit in this chamber. Would it not be a simple solution for Minister Young and the Prime Minister to say, “Look, we made a mistake”? Why do they not apologize for having created that confusion in the minds of many of us, and thereby eliminate the need for these kinds of questions? Will the Leader of the Government in the Senate ask the Prime Minister and Minister Young to apologize?

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, the other day when my honourable friend raised this question in the Senate, and properly so, I made the point of stating and restating the value that is placed by this government, and by the Prime Minister in particular, in the contribution that is made to Canada by those who have come from other lands to make this country their home, and who support the values of this country and contribute to it. That is absolutely fundamental to the beliefs of this government, and certainly to the man who leads this government. There is no question of apologies and mistakes. The Prime Minister supports most profoundly that for which my honourable friend and others on this side of the house stand. He shares with them their devotion to a united Canada, not a Canada which is separated by the will of those who have come from wherever or of those born here.

There is absolutely no question of the support, admiration and affection of the Prime Minister, Mr. Young or anyone else in this government for those who have chosen Canada as their home and who want to keep it a strong and united country.

CANADA-CHINA RELATIONS

HUMAN RIGHTS AND COMMERCIAL RELATIONS— GOVERNMENT POLICY

Hon. Consiglio Di Nino: Honourable senators, in a May 1993 document entitled, “The Liberal Foreign Policy Handbook,” it was stated, in part:

We will seek to lead the international community in a revitalization of the concept of human rights as a principle for action and enforcement.

Despite the noise at the Commonwealth Summit, human rights have been downplayed by this government, particularly when it comes to China. Is it the intention of the government to call for the ouster of China from international organizations if it does not clean up its act, as it did for Nigeria, or does the government stand by the remarks made by the Foreign Affairs Minister, as reported in *The Toronto Star* on June 1, 1994, in which he is reported to have said:

I reject this idea that we have to link issues of human rights with all other aspects.

Does the government stand by the remarks made by the Prime Minister when he said in the other place on March 17, 1994, just before going to China:

If we refuse to do business with every country having a political system that is not to our liking, then we will not be doing business with very many countries.

Why is this promise to pay attention to human rights kept only when it suits the government but broken when it does not?

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I listened to the statement my honourable friend made when he rose under Senators' Statements. It is a good thing to remember the events that occurred in Tiananmen Square seven years ago. My honourable friend knows that Canada has deplored the actions that took place in China at that time, and similar actions anywhere else in the world. The Prime Minister has said, over and over again, that he raises on every occasion that he can the question of human rights, particularly when he discusses issues with Chinese authorities, as do others in this administration.

The Prime Minister also has said that in order to bring the attention of the world to human rights in China, not just how they are and have been abused but how they can be strengthened, we must not isolate China but engage with and assist China, as we have been doing, no matter the kind of communication, whether it be in terms of trade, business or diplomacy.

All those levels of discussion with the People's Republic of China are a concerted effort to bring China into focus in the world. In so doing, we reduce the element of human rights abuse in that country. That is one of the efforts in which my colleague Senator Austin has been engaged, and it is one about which the Canadian government feels very strongly.

Senator Prud'homme: I agree.

Senator Di Nino: I am delighted that Senator Prud'homme is in total agreement.

Honourable senators, the minister talked about action being taken. I should like to remind her that in the same "Liberal Foreign Policy Handbook," it is stated:

A Liberal government will seek to produce an annual human rights report on all countries that receive aid from Canada, with the assistance of Canadian diplomatic personnel posted abroad. This report will be tabled in Parliament for discussion and parliamentary committees will be encouraged to review its contents and formulate recommendations to the government.

However, on July 1 of last year, *The Globe and Mail* reported:

Citing costs, Canadian officials say they don't know if or when Ottawa will ever proceed with the issue. "No clear-cut

decision has been made. It is out there in limbo," said Yves Brodeur, spokesman for Foreign Affairs Minister André Ouellet.

Can the minister advise the Senate as to whether the government has made a decision to honour or not to honour this promise, or whether it is still "out there in limbo"?

Senator Fairbairn: I will take that question to my colleague the Honourable Lloyd Axworthy and obtain a response for my friend.

JUSTICE

INVESTIGATION INTO SALE OF AIRBUS AIRCRAFT TO AIR CANADA—CIVIL ACTION FOR LIBEL—CHANGE OF VENUE FROM QUEBEC SUPERIOR COURT—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Marjory LeBreton: Honourable senators, 10 days ago when lawyers acting for the Government of Canada attempted to postpone the filing of a defence in the Mulroney libel case, one of the government lawyers, Claude Armand Sheppard, warned that pursuing the case could lead to "judicial guerrilla warfare" — and this is in Canada, if you can believe it. At the same time, the defence claimed that the Quebec Superior Court "doesn't have jurisdiction in this matter," noting that the acts that led to the libel suit were committed in Ontario.

In view of the comments of the government's lead lawyer, Mr. Sheppard, is the government seriously considering making a request to move this case out of the Quebec Superior Court?

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I have no knowledge of that proposal. I will pass the question on. Clearly, the issue is before the court in Montreal, where it is proceeding.

[Translation]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BILL

MOTION FOR COMMITTEE TO ADJOURN FROM PLACE TO PLACE—DELAY IN DEBATE—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Jean-Maurice Simard: Honourable senators, my question is for the Leader of the Government in the Senate. What is the government's strategy or position with respect to the motion tabled in this house two weeks ago? The motion was adjourned by Senator Rompkey. Its purpose is to instruct the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology to adjourn from place to place in Canada when it begins consideration of Bill C-12.

I would like the government to stop playing hide-and-seek and making a mockery of standard democratic processes.

Last week, both sides of this chamber were expecting to vote on two questions. The whips had made the necessary arrangements to have the greatest possible number of senators present for a vote on these two bills, C-28 and C-12.

The people of the Atlantic provinces, among others, are most anxious to find out the government's position in this chamber. While they look favourably upon, and agree with, the importance of the bill respecting certain agreements concerning Pearson International Airport, Maritimers realize that the employment insurance bill will have significant and devastating effects on the Atlantic provinces.

The expectation was that senators would provide us with their points of view on these two bills. I would like to know, and to know now, the government's strategy and position concerning the employment insurance bill. The people of the Atlantic provinces attach as much importance to the bill on employment insurance as they do to the bill on the Pearson Airport Agreements, if not more.

[English]

• (1450)

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, Senator Rompkey asked that the adjournment of debate on the motion stand in his name. He is not in the chamber at this point and I will not speak for him. However, I believe the motion of my honourable friend will be dealt with, if not today then certainly this week.

[Translation]

Senator Simard: I will try once again to clarify this mystery. It is all very well to wait for the order to be called at some other time, but —

[English]

— it is the duty of the Leader of the Government in the Senate to come clean once and for all and not to play games. We know that a couple of weeks ago the committee abdicated its responsibility and denied senators on this side of the chamber the authority to travel to meet face to face with the citizens of Atlantic Canada, and of New Brunswick in particular.

My motion has been before this chamber for more than two weeks. Senator Rompkey adjourned the debate. Not one senator from Atlantic Canada has stood up and stated his or her position on the motion.

Last Thursday, when so much effort was expended by both whips, the government won both votes on the Pearson Airport Agreements bill by 44 to 42. They needed the support of three independent senators to win that victory.

Was the Leader of the Government afraid that a New Brunswick Liberal senator might stand up and vote in favour of this motion? Alternatively, were those senators told not to cast a vote?

The time to come clean is now, not in two hours' time or next week. The committee is already sitting. Yesterday they heard the minister, Mr. Doug Young. It is not too late to instruct that committee, as my motion suggests, to travel to Atlantic Canada

to hear from seasonal workers and from other categories of workers who will be drastically and negatively affected by passage of this legislation.

Senator Fairbairn: My honourable colleague has asked me if I am afraid that a New Brunswick senator on my side of the chamber might vote a certain way. I have no fear of any of my colleagues in this house, including my honourable friend. I respect him and I have enormous respect for his concerns.

I will not interfere with the deliberations and the work of that committee.

Senator Simard: Please show some leadership!

Senator Fairbairn: It would be a misplaced leadership on either side of this house that told a committee of this chamber what to do. The committees make their own decisions.

My honourable friend disagrees with that process, and there is a motion now before the house under his name. That motion will be addressed.

I cannot speak for Senator Rompkey, but I see that he has re-entered the chamber, so perhaps he can tell you whether he intends to speak today on the motion of Senator Simard. The adjournment stands in his name.

In any event, as I said, honourable senators, we will deal with that motion, if not today, certainly this week.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

HARMONIZATION WITH PROVINCIAL SALES TAX—POSSIBLE CHANGE IN GOVERNMENT POLICY—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. J. Michael Forrestall: Honourable senators, my question is for the Leader of the Government in the Senate.

One of the results of the recent British Columbia election was a rejection on the part of the voters of harmonization as a partial solution to the particular tax problem which we have in this nation.

As a result, over the weekend, tax analysts were featured in the national media. One news account indicated that the government was clearly beginning to hesitate on, or perhaps even reject, harmonization as part of the ongoing process with respect to the GST.

Given the obvious implications this has, not just for my part of the world, Atlantic Canada, but for the rest of the country, would the minister care to comment on it?

• (1500)

Is this just speculation on the part of the national press? To my knowledge, there is no substantive evidence to put forward. Perhaps the minister would clarify this because it is causing some concern back east.

[Senator Simard]

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, the government strongly maintains its efforts not only to confirm the agreements entered into with the three Atlantic provinces, but also to negotiate with other provinces across the country. The Minister of Finance is soon to meet with provincial finance ministers. This is a topic of considerable importance. The federal government remains firm in its commitment.

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BILL

MOTION FOR COMMITTEE TO ADJOURN FROM PLACE TO PLACE—DELAY IN DEBATE—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Eric Arthur Berntson (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, I should like to return to the question raised by my colleague Senator Simard as to whether this chamber should or should not direct committees at various times in their deliberations. We know, in fact, that at least twice in the last session this chamber did just that. This chamber instructed the committees to report the former Bill C-22 and to report the boundaries bill, Bill C-69. Therefore, this is not an entirely unheard of situation.

I do not think it is at all unfair of my colleague Senator Simard to be curious about when a vote on this very important motion will take place, particularly when one takes into account the fact that the committee is studying the bill as we speak. If the committee were to report the bill, and this motion was subsequently passed, then the committee would have to reconsider its position in any event.

My first question is to clarify whether or not the house can, in fact, direct the committee. I believe the answer to that question will be yes. Second, would the minister encourage her colleagues to conclude the debate on this motion so we may call the vote and determine the will of our fellow colleagues?

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I agree completely with Senator Berntson. Of course this chamber can offer both advice and direction to committees. My point to Senator Simard was that, as an individual senator, I was not prepared to do that. Certainly the chamber can do that; it has, and perhaps it will. I will discuss the matter with my colleague, and perhaps we can ascertain when that can be done.

NEWFOUNDLAND

CONSTITUTIONAL RESOLUTION ON CHANGES TO SCHOOL SYSTEM—ASSURANCE OF NORMAL PROCEDURAL TREATMENT IN PARLIAMENT—REQUEST FOR ANSWER

Hon. Marcel Prud'homme: Honourable senators, last week I asked the Leader of the Government in the Senate if she would consider, when the time comes, sending the Newfoundland

amendment to committee for study. This matter has now been disposed of in the House of Commons. I am not requesting any particular decision from my colleagues or urging honourable senators to vote for or against, but only to have hearings.

Will the minister tell us, prior to her tabling the motion on Thursday, if this very important amendment will be sent to committee for hearings and report to the Senate?

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, as I indicated last week, I believe in response to Senator Doody, we would be seeking the views of senators as to an appropriate method of hearings. There are a variety of options, as my honourable friend knows. I believe some preliminary discussions have already taken place. We will pursue those and come up with a process where both sides can be heard.

Senator Prud'homme: I would not object to being privy to the secret deliberations which take place between the two parties.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

CANADIAN HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

BILL TO AMEND—THIRD READING—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. Rose-Marie Losier-Cool: Honourable senators, I move third reading of Bill C-33, to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act.

Hon. Eric Arthur Berntson (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, I apologise, but I was distracted while His Honour was speaking. Are we now dealing with third reading of Bill C-33?

The Hon. the Speaker: Yes.

Senator Berntson: Has the question been put?

The Hon. the Speaker: No, the motion is still open for discussion, if you wish to speak.

Senator Berntson: Out of an obligation to my colleagues who do not happen to be in the chamber at this moment, I feel compelled to ask for an adjournment at this time.

The Hon. the Speaker: Is the honourable senator requesting an adjournment to later this day or to the next sitting?

Senator Berntson: I move that the matter be adjourned to the next sitting.

On motion of Senator Berntson, debate adjourned.

CRIMINAL CODE

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming the debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Cools, seconded by the Honourable Senator Haidasz, P.C., for the second reading of Bill S-4, to amend the Criminal Code (abuse of process).—(*Honourable Senator Kelly*).

Hon. William M. Kelly: Honourable senators, I think Senator Cools has done a great service by raising a very serious and pressing issue through her private member's bill, Bill S-4. In her remarks on March 26, she referred to a number of cases where legal counsel had either themselves made, or allowed or encouraged their clients to make, egregiously false and defamatory allegations against individuals in court proceedings. One example she mentioned, of course, was the case of *Casey Hill v. the Church of Scientology and Morris Manning*, a landmark case because the courts awarded substantial financial compensation to Mr. Hill for the damages caused to him and to his reputation and career as a result of public statements made by the defendants and their legal counsel. I understand that the defendants have appealed the decision, however.

As Senator Cools indicates, such behaviour is regrettably becoming more commonplace in our increasingly uncivil society. I also think it important that we guard against the Americanization of our judicial system. We have all watched the O.J. Simpson trial, and trials like it, where attorneys on both sides make the most outrageous statements in order to manipulate public opinion and thus influence the jury or set the stage for an appeal. We have seen some of that in Canada.

I therefore give my wholehearted support to Bill S-4.

However, honourable senators, the more I thought about it, the more questions I had in terms of similar situations which have emerged in recent years.

Bill S-4, as Senator Cools clearly recognizes, constitutes an all-out assault on self-governance for the legal profession in Canada. In fact, in her remarks, Senator Cools stated:

The recent scandals in the Law Society of Upper Canada provide sufficient proof that the legal profession in Ontario is incapable of self-regulation.

I recognize that the regulation of professions is a matter within provincial jurisdiction, but if Senator Cools' assessment is accurate, then Bill S-4 plays only at the margins. There is no doubt that we should revisit the efficacy of professional self-governance for the legal profession.

However, we must also recognize that we, as parliamentarians, are not without sin. It is all well and good to criticize lawyers for

hiding behind judicial privilege, but from time to time we have also seen parliamentarians hiding behind their parliamentary privileges in making false and defamatory statements that are subsequently taken up by the media and protected by the convention of qualified privilege.

It is true that such carelessness or callousness is rare indeed in this chamber. Unfortunately, such has not always been the case in the other place. I recall at least two instances of allegations, later withdrawn, of certain persons being spies or moles for foreign governments. One particular instance involved a member of Parliament reading out a list of individuals he claimed were CIA operatives in Canada. He stoutly resisted making the same remarks outside the precincts of Parliament, where he would no longer be "immunized" by parliamentary privilege.

• (1510)

There will be those who will suggest, therefore, that we parliamentarians should moderate our own ability to hide behind parliamentary privilege and that we should do so before we preach to other professions. This is a suggestion for which I have some sympathy.

Let me now return more specifically to Bill S-4. The bill would criminalize the knowing advancement of false allegations in court proceedings by lawyers. Why stop there? Why should not the same criminal sanctions apply to members of the media, or to police who knowingly propagate false allegations relating to a legal proceeding, whether civil or criminal?

Recently, there have been several instances where, to put it gently, police have overstated the evidence they had in order to obtain a search warrant or to obtain criminal charges. Yet the information sworn often immediately becomes a public document to which the media has access and, particularly if a public figure is involved, upon which the media gleefully bases its reports. This is what Ben Bradley, in his autobiography, refers to as "kerosene journalism" — that is, making a public conflagration out of a spark of an allegation; making a fire when there is a hint of smoke. I find it particularly reprehensible when the police, unable to obtain sufficient evidence from a proper investigation, leak their suspicions to the media. Some police officers cynically refer to this as "shaking the tree to see what falls out." The expectation is that the publication of the suspicions will put pressure on the target, who will panic and make a mistake that will incriminate him.

I have a strong suspicion that a case that is particularly prominent these days came about in exactly this way. Even when no charges are laid or the allegations are found subsequently to be groundless, the damage to the individual's reputation has been done.

I spoke in the Senate about one year ago on a book that I thought fell within this category. It was called *Above the Law*, and consisted largely of the revelations of two former RCMP officers about the crooks, in their estimation, who got away. Very

serious allegations were made about a number of people, many of whom have never been charged with a criminal offence or, if charged, have been found not guilty. There have also been instances where the media has simply manufactured evidence of wrongdoing knowing that it could hide behind Charter protections for the media or behind the common law protection of fair comment. Truth, balance and fairness appear to be secondary.

I think Bill S-4 is on to something. However, I think it should be carried further, to wherever professionals or authorities of power and influence misuse their privileged positions to defame or slander. It should be carried to wherever constitutional and legal protections have fostered carelessness or cynicism about making, condoning or reporting defamatory allegations. I see Bill S-4 as an extremely important initiative. It deserves the full support of this house.

While I suspect that there will be stout opposition from the legal profession and that there are a number of technical details to be worked out, I see Bill S-4 as an overdue response to the misuse of the judicial process to defame and slander innocent Canadians. Senator Cools deserves our gratitude and support in passing Bill S-4.

On motion of Senator Watt, debate adjourned.

CAPE BRETON DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

SPECIAL SENATE COMMITTEE—NOTICE OF MOTION TO EXTEND DATE OF FINAL REPORT

Leave having been given to revert to Notices of Motions:

Hon. Bill Rompkey: Honourable senators, I give notice that on Wednesday, June 5, 1996, I will move:

That notwithstanding the Order of the Senate adopted on April 25, 1996, the Special Committee of the Senate on the Cape Breton Development Corporation be authorized to present its final report no later than June 18, 1996 and that the Committee retain all powers necessary to disseminate and publicize its final report until June 30, 1996.

[Translation]

TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ADOPTED

The Senate considered the fourth report of the Standing Senate Committee on Transport and Communications (budget—study on communications in Canada) presented to the Senate on May 30, 1996.—(Honourable Senator Bacon).

Hon. Lise Bacon moved the adoption of the report.

Motion agreed to and report adopted.

[English]

STATE OF FINANCIAL SYSTEM

CONSIDERATION OF REPORT OF BANKING, TRADE AND COMMERCE COMMITTEE—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming the debate on the consideration of the second report of the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce entitled, *Crown Financial Institutions*, deposited with the Clerk of the Senate on April 1, 1996.—(Honourable Senator Berntson).

Hon. Lowell Murray: Honourable senators, I begin by expressing my regrets on two counts: first, that I was not in my seat when the chairman of the committee, Senator Kirby, opened debate on this report; and, second, that the Honourable Senator Kirby is not in his seat now when I am continuing this debate. I am sure, however, that he will seize the opportunity to read my speech in the *Debates of the Senate*, as I read his very attentively.

Senator Kirby's speech was very comprehensive in dealing with the background and recommendations in the report. His speech did touch on the particular concerns I wish to raise today, but it did not, in any way, satisfy those concerns.

Honourable senators, I should also note for the record — because I will be fairly critical about some aspects of the report — that the report comes into the chamber with the unanimous approval of all its members, Liberal and Conservative. I simply find myself in disagreement with those colleagues, whether they are on this side or the other, on their recommendations concerning the regional agencies.

I am not at liberty, of course, to state what goes on in our caucus but I think — and, I see the Deputy Leader of the Opposition listening attentively here — that I am at liberty to say what has not taken place at our caucus. One thing that has not taken place was any prior discussion, let alone approval, of the recommendations of the Banking Committee in the report that is now before us.

In due course, some on the other side of the chamber may wish to make a similar disclaimer on behalf of their caucus. I say that not by way of criticism of any members of the committee. It is probably impractical to caucus every report and every recommendation of every committee, but it needs to be said on a matter of this importance, especially to some of our regions, that so far as this side is concerned, the recommendations do not have the imprimatur of Conservative Party policy.

Honourable senators will have gathered that my concern is with recommendation number 9 of the report, which is to the effect that the functions and the funds of the regional agencies be absorbed into a single corporate structure, together with the federal financial agencies now known as the Export Development Corporation or EDC, the Canadian Commercial Corporation or CCC, the Business Development Bank of Canada or BDC, and the Farm Credit Corporation or FCC. The regional agencies are the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency or ACOA, the Western Diversification Office or WD, and the Federal Office of Regional Development (Quebec) or FORD(Q). The recommendation of the committee that these agencies should disappear into an overall Crown financial agency betrays, on the part of the committee, a woeful lack of knowledge or understanding of these regional agencies. The consideration given by the committee to the regional agencies was cursory and limited to only one aspect; namely, their lending activity, and even on this subject, in my humble opinion, the committee did not get it quite right.

• (1520)

There is nothing in the testimony heard by the committee to warrant a recommendation as extreme as the absorption of these regional agencies, with their broad mandates for regional development and job creation, into a single Crown lending institution. As a matter of fact, there is nothing in the testimony heard by the committee to justify any very definitive comment about regional policy or the regional agencies, much less any substantial recommendation concerning them.

The three paragraphs in the report which led into recommendation number 9 and the three paragraphs which followed and sought to elaborate on the recommendation, served only to point up the limited nature, indeed the superficiality of the committee's treatment of this matter.

Honourable senators, the chairman of the committee outlined something of the background to this study by his committee. As it happens, there has been legislation over the past three or four years dealing with the mandates of individual lending agencies such as the Farm Credit Corporation, the Export Development Corporation and the Business Development Bank. All these pieces of legislation and these changes of policy were considered in a piecemeal fashion. Therefore, the committee decided that it should do a fundamental examination of the mandates of those four lending agencies and of the broader questions of public policy that arise.

When the committee started, its purpose was to deal with the Farm Credit Corporation, the Business Development Bank, the Export Development Corporation and the Canadian Commercial Corporation. The report states that once the study was under way, it became clear to the committee that the regional agencies "were engaged in activities strongly related to those of the BDC and FCC and should be included in the study." When or how this became clear to the committee is certainly not clear from a reading of the transcripts of the committee's deliberations.

Between October 3 and December 12, 1995, the committee held nine meetings. Two academic specialists were heard, as well as representatives of 23 organizations, including several private sector companies, business and industrial associations and federal government departments and agencies. I shall list the references to the regional agencies that I was able to find in a reading of the committee transcripts.

On October 17, during the appearance of the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, there was a passing reference to the regional agencies to be found at page 13 of the committee proceedings of that date. On October 19, the president of the Tourism Industry Association of Canada, in answer to a question, made a favourable comment about the role of the regional agencies, notably ACOA, in promotion and marketing of tourism. The reference is at page 16 of the proceedings of this date.

On November 2, there are passing references to the regional agencies at pages 17 and 19, and a reference at page 28 by an expert in venture capital as to the availability of so-called free equity from ACOA. On November 28, at page 57, the Caisse centrale Desjardins spoke of the possibility of a risk-sharing fund with the regional agency for Quebec. On December 7, at page 18, the president of the Canadian Bankers Association, in answer to a question, said there is an overlap between the operations of the regional agencies and the Business Development Bank. ACOA and the BDC, she said, would be targeting similar or identical markets. On page 23, the same witness referred favourably to the efforts of WD to forge a private partnership with the private lending community, and unfavourably of the EDC, the FCC and ACOA in that regard.

There were other references to the regional agencies, but they were all of the same nature; a casual or passing reference, here or there, sometimes elicited by a question. The mandate and operations of the federal financial agencies; the BDC, the CCC, the EDC and the FCC, and their relationships to the private sector, were covered in considerable detail as the committee intended. Not so the regional agencies. They were an afterthought in the committee's study and an afterthought in its report.

I trust it will not be argued that the evidence and, therefore, the conclusions relating to the four Crown financial agencies are somehow applicable, *mutatis mutandis*, to the regional agencies. Even when it comes to their lending activity, the federal financial institutions and the regional agencies are a different breed of cat. Take ACOA, for example. That agency provides loans to small- and medium-sized enterprises. Those loans are interest free, while BDC loans typically charge higher interest than the chartered banks. Unlike the BDC, ACOA makes unsecured loans, and with repayment schedules as long as 10 years. The borrower can take this kind of arrangement to the banks, which regard it as a form of equity, when considering a loan application.

Whether ACOA's lending program is appropriate for a government agency is a matter for quite legitimate debate. I am not debating it today, and I emphasize that the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce did not debate it either; nor did the issue play any part in its eventual recommendation regarding the regional agencies.

As I noted earlier, the rationale of the committee for including the three regional agencies in a study intended to cover four Crown financial institutions was that of alleged overlap and duplication between the activities of the regional agencies on the one hand and the BDC and FCC on the other. With that rationale in mind, one would expect that the alleged overlap, these similar or identical markets, would be extensively probed when witnesses for the FCC and the BDC came before the committee.

The Business Development Bank of Canada appeared on November 23. One has to search the transcript very carefully for any mention of the alleged overlap and duplication between the BDC and the regional agencies. On pages 15 and 16, in answer to a question, the president of the BDC spoke of a memorandum of understanding between the bank and ACOA and referred to what he described as the "extremely good" relationship which has existed between the bank and that regional agency. It often happens, he said, that both the BDC and ACOA are involved in projects in the Atlantic region, each playing a different role. There was a question by the committee chairman on page 29 suggesting that if the funds now allocated to the regional agencies by the government were to be consolidated in the Business Development Bank, these funds could be leveraged up, making more money available for loans. The committee report subsequently incorporated this as an argument in support of the absorption of the regional agencies into a new Crown financial agency, and Senator Kirby repeated their arguments in his speech here the other day.

The president and the executive vice-president of the Farm Credit Corporation testified on November 28. There was one reference to a regional agency and it was in the president's opening statement. It was in a reference to the alliance between the FCC, the WD and the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce in a value-added agricultural investment. Apart from that one reference, I could not find a word uttered by the witnesses about regional agencies or their supposed overlap with or relationship to the FCC, nor could I find a single question directed to the FCC witnesses by any member of the committee on that subject.

• (1530)

The conclusion I draw from reading the transcripts of the committee is that the committee received virtually no evidence to support its recommendation that the regional agencies be absorbed by a new Crown financial institution. Even if one accepts the arguments advanced by the committee about rationalization of the delivery system for assistance to small business and savings of overhead expenses, these by themselves are a completely inadequate basis for such a drastic recommendation.

The regional agencies themselves appeared before the committee on November 23. Western Diversification no longer makes individual loans to firms, but the Acting Deputy Minister of the agency, Ms Flumian, spoke of the activities of WD in attempting to leverage capital from banks, from the Crown financial agencies, and from venture capital funds to set up investment funds for various purposes into western provinces. The Assistant Deputy Minister of FORD(Q), Mr. Bourgeois, spoke of the complementarity between the activities of his organization and the Business Development Bank.

It was the vice-president of ACOA, Mr. Gordon Slade, who addressed most directly the issue of so-called overlap and duplication of his regional agency with the Business Development Bank and other Crown financial institutions. ACOA, he said, is supportive of these institutions and encourages its clients to use their services wherever possible,

...but they and ACOA are not in the same business. They do not aim to fill the same financial gap.

ACOA and the Business Development Bank, he said,

...complement each other. They have formed very effective arrangements in the areas of management services and project financing.

However, 75 per cent of the clients of the Business Development Bank would not be eligible for ACOA programs.

Mr. Slade identified three factors which differentiate ACOA from agencies such as the Business Development Bank:

First a focus on economic development of Atlantic Canada, a region where economic disparities must be addressed; second, a small and medium size business focus on value added manufacturing and tradeable services; and third, a focus on job creation and business development.

This leads me, honourable senators, to a word on the vast difference between the mandates of the regional agencies and those of the Crown financial institutions. The mandate of the regional agencies is to promote the economic development or diversification of their regions. They are also responsible for the coordination of the activities of other federal departments relating to economic development in the region. They represent the interests of their respective regions in the national decision-making process. They form partnerships in economic development with provincial governments, educational and research institutions, and with the private sector, and they lend financial and other assistance to business, particularly small- and medium-sized enterprises. The latter activity is the one area they have in common with some of the Crown financial institutions and, as the committee should have learned from the testimony of the regional agencies, there tends to be more complementarity than conflict in the activities of the financial institutions, on the one hand, and the regional agencies on the other.

Most of what the regional agencies do was not touched on in the committee report. It was not discussed by the witnesses, nor considered by the committee. It is in this respect that the committee went most seriously wrong. Most of what the regional agencies do is not and could not be carried on by the Crown lending agencies.

The Hon. the Speaker: I am sorry to interrupt you, Senator Murray, but the 15-minute time period is up. Is leave granted to allow the honourable senator to finish?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Senator Murray: ACOA, for example, brought the governments of the four Atlantic provinces together in a tourism marketing endeavour. ACOA is leading a program to get more Atlantic businesses into international trade. It supports the Cold Ocean Research Centre in Newfoundland and a telecommunications alliance in Nova Scotia, and of course there are the federal-provincial economic development agreements with each of the provinces in areas ranging from agriculture to transportation to manufacturing to forestry. These agreements help finance plans and strategies for sectoral economic development that are negotiated by the federal and provincial governments, and they have contributed importantly for more than 20 years to the formulation of better economic policy and programs in the Atlantic provinces. These are not activities that the federal financial institutions are equipped to undertake.

Honourable senators, I have taken some time on this report because I believe the recommendation to absorb the regional agencies into the Crown financial institutions would be a setback for regional development, and because regional development is such an important part of national unity.

The existence of the regional agencies, and therefore the concept of regional development, is already threatened, in my opinion, because of the decision taken by the Prime Minister at the time of reorganizing his cabinet in January to place ACOA, WD and Ford(Q) under a single minister, the Minister of Industry. This is the latest move in a struggle that has engaged political and bureaucratic Ottawa for almost 30 years.

There are central institutions and centralizing forces in Ottawa which have a congenital aversion to the very idea of regional agencies with their own ministers, distinct mandates, and decentralized and somewhat autonomous operations, and so they resist. There was resistance in 1969 when the Trudeau government created DREE, the Department of Regional Economic Expansion.

Tom Kent, who became the first deputy minister of DREE, describes in his 1988 memoir *A Public Purpose* the centralist views prevailing in official Ottawa in 1968 as he and the Honourable Jean Marchand, who became the first minister of DREE, went about the business of designing and creating the

new department. Here is what he wrote about the official mentality in Ottawa:

The concern of national policy was the overall good, measured by the growth of the gross *national* product. Where in the nation development took place was the business of the market. Ottawa might intervene to help the "natural" economic forces, but not to counter them. That would be a distortion which would hamper the total national progress.

From this viewpoint, regional policies were local politics, to be resisted by the wise managers in Ottawa. If some parts of the country lagged in economic growth, people could and should move to take advantage of the glorious opportunities open to them elsewhere in Canada. Such mobility was the contemporary equivalent of the stern pioneer virtues that had built our society.

This viewpoint had not been seriously shaken by the mild measures for regional development adopted during the Pearson years. Ottawa men were practical. They knew that Victorian family virtues could not have flourished without some occasional discreet prostitution. But to have regional development put front and centre on the 1968 election stage, otherwise empty, was rather different. The effect, as Mr. Trudeau organized his new government, was of an illegitimate baby that otherwise quite proper politicians had brought from the hustings and dumped on the Ottawa doorstep.

Honourable senators, the views referred to by Mr. Kent largely lost the battle in 1969, but they regained the upper hand in 1982-83 when DREE was amalgamated with the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce — I recall speaking on that debate in this place at that time — to form the Department of Regional Industrial Expansion.

When that experiment was seen to be cumbersome and frustrating for people in the regions, centralization had to give way in 1987 to the creation by the Mulroney government first of ACOA, then of WD, and then of Ford(Q).

Now that the regional agencies have been brought under the wing of Mr. Manley, we wait to see whether what is almost surely the next move contemplated by the centralist forces comes to pass — that is, the disappearance of regional agencies into Mr. Manley's department or, as suggested by the Senate Banking Committee, their absorption by a central, federal, financial institution. Either way, honourable senators, they and we are in for a fight.

On motion of Senator Berntson, for Senator Angus, debate adjourned.

[Translation]

• (1540)

NATIONAL UNITY

MOTION TO CREATE SPECIAL SENATE COMMITTEE—
DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming the debate on the motion by the Honourable Senator Beaudoin, seconded by the Honourable Senator Lynch-Staunton:

That a special committee of the Senate be appointed to examine and report upon the issue of Canadian unity, specifically recognition of Quebec, the amending formula and the federal spending power in areas of provincial jurisdiction;

That the committee be composed of twelve senators, three of whom shall constitute a quorum;

That the committee have power to send for persons, papers and records, to examine witnesses, to report from time to time and to print such papers and evidence from day to day as may be ordered by the committee;

That the papers and evidence received and taken by the Special Committee of the Senate on Bill C-110, An Act respecting constitutional amendments, during the First Session of the Thirty-fifth Parliament be deemed to have been referred to the committee established pursuant to this motion;

That the committee have power to sit during sittings and adjournments of the Senate;

That the committee submit its final report no later than December 15, 1996; and

That, notwithstanding usual practices, if the Senate is not sitting when the final report of the committee is completed, the committee shall deposit its report with the Clerk of the Senate, and said report shall thereupon be deemed to have been tabled in this Chamber.—(*Honourable Senator Gigantès*).

Hon. Philippe Deane Gigantès: Honourable senators, I have made Senator Beaudoin wait because this is a matter requiring very serious thought. I have done my best. This is purely my personal opinion. I am not speaking on behalf of my party.

It would not be a good idea right now to strike a special committee on constitutional affairs. I am not saying such a committee would not be a good thing in itself. I just do not believe the time is right. Mr. Bouchard said yesterday in New

York, for example, that he wants to avoid the constitutional issue and is being pushed into it.

It goes without saying that, in today's journalism, particularly on television, where the person quoted is given seven seconds, the natural tendency, regardless of a journalist's political view, is to look for conflict because that is what makes front page news. Conflict draws attention.

I fear that if we struck a special committee, we could end up with this sort of problem. The usual witnesses, because there is a set of constitutional experts, very learned individuals, people well versed in the field, are not all, unfortunately, as wise and moderate as our colleague Senator Beaudoin. There will be those who, from one side or the other, will provide the seven provocative seconds at some point. This is what the press will grab. As soon as a statement hits the front page, someone will retort with something equally provocative.

The time is not right. There will be a first ministers' conference later this month. Inevitably, even though it is not a constitutional meeting, the subjects under discussion will have constitutional overtones. There is no avoiding it. Senator Beaudoin will be the first to admit that, in this federation, certain matters cannot be raised without the constitutional issue coming into play. The press will overlay each contradictory statement. I believe we need calm at this point.

I think a situation like this one is best handled by shared reflections and private conversations on the matter, without making it a public event that could give some individuals an opportunity to make things worse. The country really needs calm.

Senator Beaudoin will no doubt remember that the committee he so ably chaired, the Beaudoin-Edwards committee, established a spirit of cooperation very early on. People who, at first, regarded one another with mistrust were eventually able to share their views. Nevertheless, the press looked for and found something that could be taken out of context and presented as a fight. I think we have had enough fighting for the time being. We need calm. Therefore, I would say that a committee such as the one proposed by Senator Beaudoin would not be a good thing.

On motion of Senator Stanbury, for Senator Petten, debate adjourned .

[English]

POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

INQUIRY—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming the debate on the inquiry of the Honourable Senator Bonnell, calling the attention of the Senate to the serious state of post-secondary education in Canada.—(*Honourable Senator Berntson*).

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, this matter is adjourned in the name of the Honourable Senator Berntson. Did you wish to speak on it, Senator Losier-Cool?

Hon. Rose-Marie Losier-Cool: Yes.

The Hon. the Speaker: Does the Honourable Senator Berntson give leave to have another senator speak to the matter?

Hon. John Lynch-Staunton (Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, we understand that Senator Losier-Cool wishes to speak to this matter, which is perfectly acceptable.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, the order will remain standing in the name of the Honourable Senator Berntson.

[*Translation*]

Senator Losier-Cool: Honourable senators, I wish to congratulate and support Senator Bonnell in his undertakings relating to post-secondary education in Canada. I will do so by offering a brief overview of post-secondary education in Acadia.

For a number of decades, the Acadian population in the Atlantic provinces has been developing its French-language post-secondary educational institutions. The francophones in that region of our country have focused determination and perseverance on creating and improving these institutions.

Now the communities are also profiting from the services offered by these institutions, which are the heart and soul of many francophone communities. Creation of these francophone institutions has done much toward safeguarding and promoting French culture, language and education.

Honourable senators, I cannot tell you how vitally important these institutions have been to the francophones in my part of the country. The Université de Moncton, with its three campuses, offers university courses in French to thousands of students. It is unceasing in its efforts to provide quality education that is accessible to the more than 260,000 francophones in New Brunswick. Its reputation as a French language university has gone beyond provincial and even national boundaries. Our students come from everywhere in the world. The Université de Moncton is the only Canadian university outside of Quebec to offer common law in French. Large numbers of francophone youth have taken advantage of its services, and continue to do so.

In addition, New Brunswick's community colleges are spread throughout the province to provide services to francophone post-secondary students. Community colleges can be found in Bathurst, Dieppe, Campbellton and Edmundston serving the francophone population, and are of great importance to the well-being of those francophone communities.

The approximately 40,000 francophones living throughout Nova Scotia are served by the Collège de l'Acadie, a community

college established in 1988 as part of a five-year federal-provincial agreement. The final link in that province's francophone education system, the Collège de l'Acadie is there for the whole Acadian and francophone community.

It is a French language, post-secondary institution established to further the economic development of these regions. The Collège de l'Acadie uses every available means to reach out to Nova Scotians as close as possible to their place of residence.

Unfortunately, as we approach the turn of the century, young people are having increasing difficulty finding the money necessary to pay for their education. I appeal to you, honourable senators, in the hope that we can unite our efforts and our energies. We must preserve what we have built for future generations. The youth of this country can no longer survive without a post-secondary education in the present climate.

However, too many young people cannot look forward with pleasure to pursuing their studies. They are faced with exorbitant fees, which keep going up year after year. Post-secondary education is essential to the future of our young people and to the economic future of this country. It is everyone's problem. It has an impact on the future of our children, our grandchildren and their children. The time has come for discussion and consultation so that we may find solutions to help the youth of this country. Honourable senators, the situation is urgent.

[*English*]

• (1550)

Hon. Raymond J. Perrault: Honourable senators, I support most enthusiastically the initiative of our colleague Senator Bonnell to have the Senate consider the state of post-secondary education in Canada.

One of the great priorities of Canada at the present time is a consideration of education in all its forms, including academic and skills training education. There is an urgent need to find some place in the economy for unemployed young people. We are not performing well enough in that area. Today's young people make up the best-trained generation in the history of Canada, yet thousands of them are unable to find employment — a productive place in society. I suggest that this whole unemployment dilemma contains the seeds of social revolt. Young people will not be left on the side of the road when it comes to finding a future for themselves.

Honourable senators, when we consider in this chamber the future of education, and in terms of the committee work which we are about to undertake, let us look at the innovations taking place in education today. I attended a computer conference less than one year ago, at which I was introduced to a new digital technology which now makes it possible to close down residential schools in the northern part of Canada. Instead, they have one or several highly skilled instructors located at a central

communications point. Those instructors provide lessons by satellite for young people in remote communities. Technology makes it possible for the pupils to have an interactive relationship with their teacher. They are able to ask questions and to have a dialogue with the teacher. After the lesson is over, an assistant teacher in each of the remote communities carries on with the paperwork. It is an absolute revolution, one to which some of you may not have been introduced.

For example, in the city of Prince George, which is located in the exact centre of British Columbia, highly motivated and skilled teachers communicate interactively with young people in many northern communities. This is how these young people are getting their education. No longer are they required to leave their families for months at a time to stay at some boarding or residential school. It is a communications and educational revolution, as far as indigenous peoples are concerned.

However, the revolution goes beyond this process — which is described as “long-distance education.” This entire Canadian concept offers the possibility of extensive export sales. This kind of Canadian expertise and technology could help many other countries in the world. In this regard, negotiations are under way with the government of Indonesia, for example, which is a country made up of several thousand small islands. It is a difficult task for that government to provide education for all parts of the country. Canadian long-distance technology is now under consideration by the Indonesian government and by other governments in the world. We Canadians have developed a special expertise in this area, an expertise which can provide and enhance education for all age groups, whether at the post-secondary level, or whether for young people just beginning the learning process. This long-distance technology can be used to educate and to re-educate.

Some 600 years ago this year, in the city of Mainz, Germany, Gutenberg invented moveable type. It was a revolution at the time. It opened up vast resources of knowledge to new generations.

Another communications revolution is under way right now. Some honourable senators already know that we now have a worldwide Internet which is accessed by 50 million people, and millions more are being added every year. By the end of this year, I have been advised that every parliamentarian will have an Internet connection here on the Hill. Surely this will constitute a revolution.

It is now possible for an assistant teacher in northern British Columbia to access, via the Internet, the art treasures of the Louvre and the Hermitage of St. Petersburg, directly on-line and in full colour. He or she can access for the students music from a limitless number of sources.

I was surfing the Internet the other day when I received a message from a young man in Kiev, Russia. He said, “I want to become active in politics. I understand you are in politics in Canada. Can you send me some information to enable me to organize a political party in Kiev?” Since then, I have been in

continuing contact with this young man, and we have provided him with some organizational material. I will not suggest, of course, which party authored the material.

Here is an incredible way to make possible an ease of communication and the possibility to remove some of the communications barriers which have plagued humankind for generations. We can now talk to people all over the world on the Internet. Some of you have already done that.

We can integrate the Internet with our educational process here in Canada. It is already being done by some institutions. In terms of graduate and post-graduate training, Simon Fraser University in British Columbia has now established a degree-granting program on the Internet. A wide range of subjects and material is provided via the Internet for students. A way has been developed by Simon Fraser University to enable students to write examinations and qualify for degrees.

This is a revolution infinitely more profound than the revolution which began in Mainz, Germany, 600 years ago. In our committee deliberations, let us go beyond the formal process of talking to current educators about ways in which we can improve the system. That is important, of course, but the entire communications revolution should be considered in relation to education and the way in which we are educating our people in this country.

Canada has developed some of the best software and hardware in the computer industry, as honourable senators know. Some of the great programs have been developed right here in Ottawa, such as CorelDRAW and the Corel family of products. They are splendid examples of Canadian enterprise and inventive genius.

These new programs can help to re-educate the victims of “downsizing.” I am concerned, as are some other honourable senators, about the plight of those people who are the victims of “downsizing.” Frankly, I am getting tired of reading stories in the newspaper about executives who are honoured and receive huge bonuses from their company directors because they were able to terminate the employment of several thousand workers over the previous year. The traumatic process is held by some to constitute real corporate management. There is a great deal of despair out there. We are all acquainted with someone who has been laid off in mid-career. These people require retraining. They need the sympathetic attention of not only this level of government but of other levels as well, together with the private sector.

• (1600)

It is all very well for some companies to boast of record corporate profits, but when some areas in Canada have an unemployment rate of 12 per cent, 14 per cent or more, it is no laughing matter for the people adversely affected. What I am saying is not an indictment of any one political party, but an echoing of a concern that is out there. I am sympathetic to the views of some people who wonder whether the free trade agreement, to this point, has been a real advantage for Canadians in terms of jobs and in terms of security.

It was mentioned in this chamber today that there is a good deal of despair out there; that people are pessimistic about the future. Improved education and training can help. That is why we should undertake this study on education, including post-graduate studies and all the other aspects of education. The opportunities for a comprehensive study of education are limitless. I commend Senator Bonnell for his enterprise in bringing forward this resolution.

Hon. Philippe Deane Gigantès: Honourable senators, I too would commend Senator Bonnell. However, listening to my colleague Senator Perrault, with whom I share this passion for computers and the new technology, I would like to say that there are some education issues which still must rely on repetitious exercise.

The most successful remedial program in mathematics is one written on cheap paper, invented by the Japanese. The student begins below his or her level of competence and works through exercises, repetition after repetition, at graduated levels of competence. Gradually, over many hours, in the same way that one learns the piano or the violin, the student moves from a low level of competence to a high level of competence. Students who are supposedly "bad" at mathematics are transformed into good mathematicians.

The same is true of writing. The elegant phrase, "the concise expression of thought through language," which is the most high-tech thing there is, cannot be taught by computer. It can only be taught by rewriting. Anyone who has written professionally will tell you that writing is rewriting, whether it is done on computer or on paper. The computer certainly has many advantages for editing.

The effort, the sweat, the willingness to sit down and do the same thing over and over again may not have much in common with technological innovation. However, it is the only way to gain a feeling of mastery over your subject-matter.

Another factor in success is the inspiring teacher who has the patience to treat each student individually, to emphasize the strengths of the student, to exploit those strengths, to encourage, to be a true friend and a good comedian also. Teaching is drama. Until we solve the problems associated with the lack of the things that I have addressed, I am afraid we will be bypassing the advantages of this great technological revolution.

We live in a country which defines an illiterate as someone who has undergone only nine years of schooling. That is a terrifying thought. Those of us who are older around here were expected to be able to write without spelling errors, to read and understand certainly before we had finished grade 9. We also needed a certain level of mathematical competence, otherwise we would not reach grade 9.

These are problems to which the technological revolution may contribute some solutions. For instance, it would be easy to teach probability, using a monopoly game on a computer program into

which are added oil properties, and the student would have to decide how much to invest, based on different chances of finding oil on the property. Very soon, under the impulsion of the monopoly game, the children would be practising the laws of probability. When you present the laws later as a classroom discipline, the students are able to understand the classroom discipline immediately because it has already been introduced through the computer.

That is something which can be done through the computer, but we cannot replace the willingness to sit down and do repetitive tasks over and over again. That applies to every field. Ask anyone who has become extremely rich how he did it. It is a willingness to do often dull things over and over again. That is why some of us have never become rich.

I admire what Senator Bonnell had to say, but I feel that the thirst for knowledge must be cultivated in the elementary school by teachers who have a rapport with children. That is where we should turn our attention. If we want teachers to be improved by the new technology, we should encourage the development of software that can help genius teachers who can act as dramatic actors and real friends, with a real sense of humour and a lot of love, to make our country better.

The Hon. the Speaker: As agreed, the motion will remain standing in the name of the Honourable Senator Berntson.

On motion of Senator Berntson, debate adjourned.

INTER-PARLIAMENTARY UNION

NINETY-FIFTH CONFERENCE, ISTANBUL, TURKEY

Hon. Peter Bosa rose pursuant to notice of Tuesday, May 28, 1996:

That he will call the attention of the Senate to the Ninety-fifth Inter-Parliamentary Conference held at Istanbul, Turkey, from April 13 to 21, 1996.

He said: Honourable senators, it was my privilege to table in the Senate on May 27 last the report of the 95th Inter-Parliamentary Conference. My distinguished colleague Senator Forrestall and I attended this conference along with four members of the House of Commons, namely Mr. Peter Adams, the Honourable Sheila Finestone, Mrs. Beryl Gaffney and Mr. Mac Harb.

Before dealing with the conference itself, I would like to speak briefly about Turkey. Interesting political developments have been taking place in our host country. Our conference took place a little more than three months after the last election in Turkey in which there was no clear winner. After extensive negotiations, Mr. Mesut Yilmaz was appointed as the new Prime Minister of Turkey in mid-March. He is heading a minority coalition formed of his own party, the Motherland Party, and the party of former Prime Minister Tansu Ciller, the True Path Party.

The premiership will be rotational. Under the coalition protocol, Mr. Yilmaz will be the Prime Minister until the end of 1996, followed by Mrs. Ciller for two years, then another year for Mr. Yilmaz. A third person will be Prime Minister for the fifth and final year. The cabinet is split between the two parties and neither leader will serve in each other's cabinet. One afternoon during the conference, Prime Minister Yilmaz addressed the delegates, outlining the plans of his coalition government and his views about strengthening democracy.

On the economical front, the outlook is cautious. Turkey's economy is faltering. The very high inflation rate — 79 per cent in 1995 — and heavy service payments on the national debt are the main causes. Although privatization has been an official government policy since the 1980s, very little progress has been made until now. However, despite these grave problems, Turkey's economy grew by 7.1 per cent in 1995.

• (1610)

Trade between our two countries is growing. Canada's exports to Turkey were \$140.6 million in 1994, and increased to \$286.4 million in 1995. Among our exports were lentils, wheat, tobacco and asbestos. Turkey's exports to Canada were \$82.5 million in 1994, and increased to \$150.1 million in 1995. Among our imports were fruit, vegetables, hazelnuts and spices.

I should like to mention a special relationship between Canada and Turkey. Although the Turkish-Canadian community in Canada is very small, about 25,000 people, we have a special connection to Turkey. Each spring in Ottawa, more than 1 million tulips bloom as a symbol of friendship between Canada and the Netherlands, but the true home of this beautiful flower is Turkey. About 400 years ago, an Austrian ambassador visiting Turkey sent these flowers back to his homeland and later they were transplanted to the Netherlands. Although the Turkish word for tulip is "lale," the ambassador referred to the flowers as "tulipan" from the Turkish word for turban. Later this word became "tulip." In 1994, the Canadian Tulip Festival presented a "Turkish Tulip Tribute" to honour the original country of the tulip.

I would like now to turn to the conference itself. At the outset, I want to express our thanks and appreciation to the officials from Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada who briefed our delegation prior to its departure, as well as to the researchers in the Library of Parliament who provided background papers. I would also like to thank the Canadian ambassador, Mr. Peter Hancock, and his colleagues for their assistance and support during the conference. Shortly after our arrival in Istanbul, Mr. Hancock spoke to us about the current political situation in Turkey, particularly since the election last December. Throughout the conference, Mr. Arif Lalani, Second Secretary, assisted the delegation. We should like to express our thanks and appreciation for their hard work.

[Translation]

Before taking up the topics on the agenda of the conference, I would like to say a few words about the work of women

parliamentarians at these inter-parliamentary conferences. At the conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union held in Ottawa in 1985, it was decided that female delegates would meet before the inaugural session to discuss matters of mutual interest and ways to enhance the role of women parliamentarians within the union as well as their participation in its various activities.

As part of its ongoing efforts to correct the imbalance between the two sexes in relation to their involvement in political life, the union decided last year to review its statutes and regulations to ensure that the terminology used contained no suggestion of one gender's superiority over the other.

Representatives of national groups from Cameroon, Canada, Egypt and India were part of a task force reviewing in detail every section of the statutes and regulations. The Canadian group played a leading role in this regard, as it is already common practice in this country to ensure that government laws, regulations and documents contain no sexist language. Some of the manuals produced by Status of Women Canada were used to establish the appropriate terminology.

I am happy to inform you that the conference approved the report prepared by the task force and that the Inter-Parliamentary Union will now use a non-sexist terminology in its statutes and regulations.

In February 1997, the Inter-Parliamentary Union will hold in New Delhi a symposium entitled "Toward a Partnership of Men and Women in Politics." In preparing for this symposium, Mrs. Finestone suggested that the Canadian group prepare a special presentation on sexual analysis to show how government policies should be analyzed to determine if their impact is the same on both genders. Her proposal was well received.

[English]

The first topic on the agenda of our conference was the protection of minorities as a global issue and a prerequisite for stability, security and peace. Mrs. Finestone spoke in the debate at the First Committee on Political Questions, International Security and Disarmament. As the former Secretary of State for Multiculturalism, she provided a strong voice on the need for tolerance and understanding, outlining various aspects of Canada's multicultural policy.

The second topic on the agenda was the conservation of world fish stocks in order to provide an important source of protein and ensure the continued viability and economic stability of fishing around the world. Honourable colleagues will be interested to know that at the Madrid Inter-Parliamentary Conference in March of 1995, which was held in the midst of the fishing dispute between Canada and Spain, the Canadian and Spanish IPU groups jointly proposed this topic. That our two groups were able to work together, at a time when our governments were unable to do so, demonstrates, I believe, the value of parliamentary diplomacy and provides yet another example of the value of international parliamentary gatherings.

During debate at the Fourth Committee on Education, Science, Culture and Environment, Mr. Adams spoke on behalf of the Canadian group. Senator Forrestall also participated in the discussions. Thirteen countries, including Canada, were selected to serve on the drafting committee, and Mr. Adams served as our representative. I am pleased to report that he was elected "rapporteur."

At each conference, there is an opportunity to vote on a supplementary item to be included on the agenda. Subjects are selected because they are topical and of international concern. The Canadian group, together with the Belgian, British and Swiss groups, proposed a debate on land mines, namely, "the urgent need to move towards a world-wide ban on the use, production, stockpiling and all forms of transfer of anti-personnel mines." We proposed this subject because the final review conference for the 1980 Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons was taking place in Geneva immediately following our conference, and we felt it was important for parliamentarians to contribute to this major review.

Unfortunately, this item was not selected, having lost by four votes. Nevertheless, the Twelve Plus Group — the caucus of western democracies — felt that delegates should make a statement to the negotiators at the review conference. Thus we prepared a petition and collected the signatures of over 250 parliamentarians from all parts of the world.

In addition to anti-personnel mines, the other subjects proposed as supplementary items were: terrorism, the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, and the Helms-Burton Law.

"Fighting terrorism, an international phenomenon which threatens democracy and human rights as well as international peace and security and which hampers development: measures needed on the national and international levels to prevent acts of terrorism" was the subject selected as the supplementary item. Mr. Harb and Mrs. Gaffney represented Canada at these meetings and reiterated the position taken by the Prime Minister at the recent Summit on Terrorism held in Sharm el Sheik, Egypt, earlier this year.

As the major plenary debate was on the general political, economic and social situation in the world, delegates were able to focus on those issues which they felt were most urgent. Thus I used this opportunity to speak about anti-personnel mines, in particular noting the comprehensive unilateral moratorium on the production, export and operational use of anti-personnel mines announced by the Canadian government in January 1996. This moratorium places Canada at the forefront of a growing number of countries seeking a ban on these weapons.

• (1620)

I should also like to mention the report of the IPU committee on the human rights of parliamentarians. One of the most significant activities of the union has been its continued pressure in the defence of the human rights of parliamentarians who have been subjected to arbitrary actions because of their work as legislators. At each conference, this committee provides a status report on the cases currently under consideration — at this time,

it is 135 in number. During the first phases of examination, the committee's work is strictly confidential. If, however, an acceptable settlement is not reached within a reasonable period of time, the cases are brought before the Inter-Parliamentary Council so that they may make public appeals on their behalf.

Violations of the human rights of 58 members or former members of Parliament in 13 countries were formally raised in Istanbul, including 90 cases from our host country. These cases concerned persons, all of Kurdish origin, who were elected members of the Turkish Parliament in 1991, representing the southeastern region of Turkey. All belong to the People's Labour Party. As part of its work, the committee undertook a two-day fact-finding mission immediately prior to the conference, which included visiting five Turkish parliamentarians currently in prison in Ankara, four others sentenced and the wife of an assassinated MP. The committee also met with the MP's lawyer, the Turkish Minister of Justice and the President of the Turkish IPU group.

The Inter-Parliamentary Union was established to serve as the focal point for worldwide parliamentary dialogue. It is a forum where parliamentarians can consider questions of international interest and work towards joint action. Sometimes when governments negotiate difficult and complex issues, they are unable to move beyond their official positions to seek new and innovative solutions. At these meetings, parliamentarians are able to work together to develop new ways of addressing these problems. Furthermore, all the national groups participating in these conferences have agreed to transmit these resolutions to their respective governments. Delegates are expected to continue to work on behalf of these issues after they return to their countries. It is my firm belief that the Inter-Parliamentary Union is a valuable international institution. That is why I am reporting here today in the Senate of Canada.

On motion of Senator Prud'homme, debate adjourned.

[*Translation*]

SOCIAL AFFAIRS, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BILL—MOTION TO AUTHORIZE
COMMITTEE TO ADJOURN FROM PLACE TO PLACE
DURING STUDY—ORDER STANDS

Leave having been given to revert to Motion No. 28:

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion by the Honourable Senator Simard, seconded by the Honourable Senator Kinsella:

That it be an instruction of this House that the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology adjourn from time to time from place to place in Canada when it begins consideration of Bill C-12, An Act respecting employment insurance in Canada.—(*Honourable Senator Kinsella*).

Hon. Jean-Maurice Simard: Honourable senators, may I ask you to please revert to Motion No. 28, which was called earlier, before Senator Bosa spoke?

The Hon. the Speaker: Senator Simard, you are the mover, and if you speak now, this will effectively close the debate.

Senator Simard: Perhaps, without making a speech, I could ask the Leader of the Government a question?

The Hon. the Speaker: The Honourable Senator Simard requests leave to revert to Motion No. 28, in order to put a question to the Leader of the Government. Is leave granted, honourable senators?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Senator Simard: In the absence of Senator Rompkey, could the Acting Leader of the Government in the Senate give an idea of what the side of this chamber he represents has in store for the motion I put forward 10 days ago? Not one Liberal or independent senator has spoken to it. Yet I have invited senators from the Liberal majority —

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senator, I regret to interrupt, but you are putting me in an impossible position.

Senator Simard: In that case, I shall proceed to my question. That is what you want me to do, is it not?

The Hon. the Speaker: That is correct.

Senator Simard: What are the prospects of this motion? When can we expect the Liberal majority in this place to show the colour of its opinions on this motion?

[*English*]

Hon. Richard J. Stanbury (Acting Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, that motion has already been stood.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, the Honourable Senator Simard wishes to ask a question regarding Motion No. 28. In order to revert, he needs the permission of the Senate. Is leave granted?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Senator Simard: If I am told tomorrow that the government side is continuing to make a mystery out of its position on this matter, I will not hesitate, with leave from the Senate, to close the debate. This would give me an opportunity to condemn the Liberal senators' foolish strategy. The people of Atlantic Canada will then remember what position Liberal senators and the Liberal Party of Canada had taken on this matter.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senator, I cannot allow you speak to several times on the same motion.

[*English*]

Senator Stanbury: Honourable senators, I do not know where the confusion might be, because my leader answered the same question earlier, indicating that we might not be able to reach that matter today but that we would get to it before the end of the week. That is about as definitive an answer as I should think the Honourable Senator Simard would require.

Hon. Mabel M. DeWare: Honourable senators, the committee has been advised that the minister would like the bill reported by June 13, one week from Friday. If that is to happen, the committee will not have time to travel. It is imperative that we have the answer to Senator Simard's motion.

Order stands.

The Senate adjourned until Wednesday, June 5, 1996 at 1:30 p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, June 4, 1996

	PAGE		PAGE
Pages Exchange Program with House of Commons		Justice	
The Hon. the Speaker	519	Meeting between Associate Deputy Minister and Chief Justice of Federal Court—Statements of Minister in House of Commons—Notice of Inquiry. Senator Cools	522
<hr/>		<hr/>	
SENATORS' STATEMENTS		QUESTION PERIOD	
Liberal International		National Unity	
Honorary Patron Status Conferred on The Honourable B. Alasdair Graham. Senator Stanbury	519	Comments of Minister of Human Resources Development in House of Commons—Government Position. Senator Lynch-Staunton	523
The Honourable John. M. Macdonald		Senator Fairbairn	523
Best Wishes on Return to Chamber.	519	Comments of Minister of Human Resources Development in House of Commons—Possibility of Apology to Immigrants—Government Position. Senator Di Nino	524
The Senate		Senator Fairbairn	524
Remarks of Member of Parliament for Vancouver Quadra in House of Commons. Senator Wood	519	Canada-China Relations	
Newfoundland		Human Rights and Commercial Relations—Government Policy. Senator Di Nino	524
Changes to School System—Amendment to Constitution. Senator Prud'homme	520	Senator Fairbairn	525
Canada-China Relations		Justice	
Seventh Anniversary of Tiananmen Square Massacre. Senator Di Nino	520	Investigation into Sale of Airbus Aircraft to Air Canada—Civil Action for Libel—Change of Venue from Quebec Superior Court—Government Position. Senator LeBreton	525
<hr/>		Senator Fairbairn	525
ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS		Employment Insurance Bill (Bill C-12)	
Newfoundland		Motion for Committee to Adjourn from Place to Place—Delay in Debate—Government Position. Senator Simard	525
Change to School System—Notice of Motion to Amend Constitution. Senator Fairbairn	521	Senator Fairbairn	526
Adjournment		Goods and Services Tax	
Senator Stanbury	522	Harmonization with Provincial Sales Tax—Possible Change in Government Policy—Government Position. Senator Forrestall	526
Private Bill		Senator Fairbairn	527
Queen's University at Kingston—Presentation of Petition. Senator Murray	522	Employment Insurance Bill (Bill C-12)	
Foreign Affairs		Motion for Committee to Adjourn from Place to Place—Delay in Debate—Government Position. Senator Berntson	527
Committee Authorized to Meet During Sitting of the Senate. Senator Stewart	522	Senator Fairbairn	527
Legal and Constitutional Affairs		Newfoundland	
Committee Authorized to Meet During Sitting of the Senate. Senator Carstairs	522	Constitutional Resolution on Changes to School System—Assurance of Normal Procedural Treatment in Parliament—Request for Answer. Senator Prud'homme	527
Newfoundland		Senator Fairbairn	527
Changes to School System—Amendment to Constitution—Presentation of Petition. Senator Prud'homme	522	<hr/>	
Neonaticide		ORDERS OF THE DAY	
Notice of Inquiry. Senator Cools	522	Canadian Human Rights Act (Bill C-33)	
		Bill To Amend—Third Reading—Debate Adjourned. Senator Losier-Cool	527

	PAGE		PAGE
Senator Berntson	527	Post-Secondary Education	
Criminal Code (Bill S-4)		Inquiry—Debate Continued.	534
Bill to Amend—Second Reading—Debate Continued.		Senator Losier-Cool	534
Senator Kelly	528	Senator Lynch-Staunton	534
Cape Breton Development Corporation		Senator Perrault	534
Special Senate Committee—Notice of Motion to Extend		Senator Gigantès	536
Date of Final Report. Senator Rompkey	529	Inter-Parliamentary Union	
Transport and Communications		Ninety-fifth Conference, Istanbul, Turkey. Senator Bosa	536
Report of Committee Adopted. Senator Bacon	529	Social Affairs, Science and Technology	
Banking, Trade and Commerce		Employment Insurance Bill—Motion to Authorize Committee	
Crown Financial Institutions—Report of Committee—		to Adjourn from Place to Place During Study—Order Stands.	
Debate Continued. Senator Murray	529	Senator Simard	539
National Unity		Senator Stanbury	539
Motion to Create Special Senate Committee—Debate Continued.		Senator DeWare	539
Senator Gigantès	533	Appendix	i



If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:
Canada Communication Group — Publishing
Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9