



CANADA

# Debates of the Senate

---

2nd SESSION

•

35th PARLIAMENT

•

VOLUME 135

•

NUMBER 26

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Wednesday, June 5, 1996**

—

THE HONOURABLE GILDAS L. MOLGAT  
SPEAKER

## 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

Wednesday, June 5, 1996

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

Prayers.

### SENATORS' STATEMENTS

#### THE HONOURABLE JOHN M. MACDONALD, Q.C.

##### FELICITATIONS ON NINETIETH BIRTHDAY

**Hon. John Lynch-Staunton (Leader of the Opposition):** Honourable senators, if there is anything rarer than a day in June, it must be finding a subject which one could introduce in this chamber with the expectation that, as colleagues stand up and cheer, it will receive 104 per cent approval.

Today, such a subject is before us: Felicitation on the ninetieth birthday of the Honourable John Michael Macdonald, Q.C., B.A., LL.B.

**Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear!

**Senator Lynch-Staunton:** Where to begin? I have looked back upon tributes to senators past whom we have liked and said so, loudly and often. I have looked back upon those to senators past whom we have barely endured and hardly survived, and upon the tributes we have spoken loudly and with good intention. I have found no pattern, no direction, no clue for today's festivities. Should I mention Senator Macdonald's directorships? There are many, here and abroad, I suspect; even beyond Cape Breton, where he is on a first-name basis with everyone beyond the age of six. Still, such dull stuff should be left to fill the posthumous tributes that will be unneeded until the first decades of the next millennium have passed into Scottish history.

Nor is there need at this point in time to list the names of illustrious companions, associates, cohorts, fellow travellers, buddies, comrades, cronies and senators who have shared, 15 minutes at a time, the fame of John M's spotlight. I could mention the universities honoured by his presence, or those like Oxford, Harvard and the Sorbonne, which he chose to ignore. Leave them to the final chapter, along with the time spent school "principaling" in Antigonish or serving King and country in the wartime army. I will let others, on other occasions, tell of his single-handed reform of the Nova Scotia legislature. I will not on this occasion, one of a series, attempt anything like a one-time whip's Senate career.

What I will speak of, honourable senators, is the strength of character, the commitment of purpose and the dedication to principle which are the hallmarks of this most senior of our colleagues. He stands tall among us as a Canadian, as a Roman Catholic and as a Conservative. He is slavish to none of these

faiths, but honest to all of them, even when they seem to be in conflict with each other.

It is not usual for those of us who value the Senate to dwell upon matters that have divided us politically and emotionally in the past. Nevertheless, I feel drawn today to recall how the Senate and, in particular, how Senator John M. Macdonald, dealt with Bill C-43 when it came to us from the Mulroney government a few years ago.

On the afternoon of June 14, 1990, Senator Macdonald, who described himself as a practising Roman Catholic who did not always subscribe to the views of his bishop, reminded his colleagues that abortion had been discussed in the Senate on other occasions but none as important as this one.

He then said this:

No matter what happens to this bill, no government within the foreseeable future will want to arouse such emotion, controversy and bitterness again....

As you know, I am a supporter of the government, and in the normal course of events, I would support a government bill. However, as I intend to vote against the passage of Bill C-43, I would like to give the reasons why I will do so.

He continued:

I believe Bill C-43 to be a deceitful bill in that it gives the impression and the illusion of protecting the unborn when in fact it does no such thing....

There are those who feel that any bill is better than no bill at all. They feel that it still calls abortion a crime, even if it would come under the Criminal Code only in rare and isolated cases, if ever. In effect, Bill C-43 states that abortion is permissible if a doctor recommends it.

That was pretty well it. The rest were supporting quotations and repetition for effect, and all of it sternly delivered.

When the vote came on Bill C-43, the Senate divided 43 to 43, and for a long time there were recriminations to be nursed and fondled; but no one — certainly no one that I know of — whether they agreed with his position or not, found fault with the way Senator Macdonald considered his loyalties and stated his case in a very sober second thought.

• (1340)

Long may we have his lucid opinion, instructively delivered and generously offered.

**Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, it is indeed a distinct pleasure for me to add a few words to those of Senator Lynch-Staunton about our esteemed colleague Senator John Macdonald on this special occasion as we honour his ninetieth birthday, which he celebrated on May 3. We may be a little bit late, perhaps, but our congratulations and our good feelings are strong and vibrant.

We have missed Senator John Macdonald in this place recently, and are very happy to see him back. We welcome the opportunity to honour his long service to this chamber and to this country.

“John M.,” as we affectionately know him, is a true example of excellence and dedication in the Senate, in the public life of his province and on his beloved island of Cape Breton. He has been in the business of public service for a very long time, since his North Sydney roots led him to a term as an MLA in the Nova Scotia legislature in 1956. After two unsuccessful attempts, I might say, he was elected to the House of Commons. Nonetheless, his Scottish, Catholic, Nova Scotia and impeccable Progressive Conservative credentials brought him to this chamber in 1960.

I am told that Mr. Diefenbaker, the prime minister of the day, searched long and hard for just the right candidate. Indeed, I am told that the seat remained vacant for several years, so keen was that Prime Minister to strike a perfect balance. He did so in our colleague Senator Macdonald.

Shortly after that appointment, a friend asked Senator Macdonald how he liked the post. He said, with a grin, “It’s a pretty good job. I think I’ll keep it!” And keep it he has.

For over three decades, colleagues have watched and admired the integrity with which Senator Macdonald has conducted himself in his dealings with both sides of this chamber, in government, in opposition, as a caucus chair of his party, and as the whip — a daunting task. He has never veered from his political moorings and his belief in the importance and validity of the political process, including the challenges of the campaign trail.

The Halifax *Chronicle-Herald* said of Senator Macdonald in 1966:

He is a mild, likeable bachelor who can set the heather afire at election time.

His insight into the workings of this country has been part of his life. In 1970, in the Senate, he said:

Solve Canada’s regional economic disparity problem, and a resolution of the constitutional issue won’t be far behind.

This comment is as relevant today as it was when he made it 26 years ago.

Honourable colleagues, since coming to the Senate, I have been grateful to Senator Macdonald for his generosity, his

kindness and his encouragement to me, a relative newcomer in his terms, and one from another political party to boot. I might add, while he takes his politics seriously, there is also a twinkle in his eye and a sharp sense of humour which I have grown to savour over the last 12 years.

However, when he said in an *Ottawa Citizen* article last May:

My life has not been spectacular in any way...I just keep on living...

— I really must challenge that remark.

John M., your life has been spectacular. It is not just a matter of your having lived it; it is how you have chosen to live it, and what you have chosen to do with your life. That has been done extraordinarily well, and to the benefit not just of the people you represent in Cape Breton and Nova Scotia, but also to the country through the work you have done in this chamber and in your party. You are much admired. We look forward to profiting more from your experience as a colleague and your dedication for years to come.

Your hair may be getting a little whiter, but I was over talking to you a minute ago and the dimple is still as good as new. You are an example to us all.

On behalf of all my colleagues, I extend our warmest wishes for the future to a good friend.

**Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. John M. Macdonald:** Honourable senators, as a politician of long standing like myself, it is not often that you find words difficult to come by, but after hearing all of these tributes, I cannot find words to thank you enough for what you have just said about me, especially my own leader and the Leader of the Government.

I greatly appreciate the tributes which have been paid to me. As a young man entering politics, I had one resolution, namely: Do not believe all of the things that are said about you, good or bad! The trouble is that after a while, especially when people are saying good things about you, you get to believe it yourself!

In any event, I do thank all honourable senators. Looking back over the years, of course, it has been a long time. I can only say this: I have enjoyed every day of it. It is my hope that I will have a few more years yet to be a member of this Senate of Canada. We hear a lot of criticism about the Senate, but it is unfounded. People do not know the history of the Senate and its value to our country.

I do thank all of you. Your kindness over the years has been wonderful. I think I can truly say that, in the past 50 years, I have felt animosity toward no one in the Senate at any time, and no one has expressed any animosity towards me. I am pleased about that. I know most senators by their first name. When I was more active than I am now, I knew them all. Everyone has always been kind to me, and I do appreciate their kindness to me over the years.

I must say it took me a long time to get a mention on the front page of the *Cape Breton Post* but I finally made it after 90 years.

The Lord has been good to me. I have had a good long life. I hope to have a few good years yet and I think I will!

Once again, I thank you, Your Honour, and through you, all the members of the Senate.

**Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear!

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### CIVIL AIR NAVIGATION SERVICES COMMERCIALIZATION BILL

#### FIRST READING

**The Hon. the Speaker** informed the Senate that a message had been received from the House of Commons with Bill C-20, respecting the commercialization of civil air navigation services.

Bill read first time.

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

On motion of Senator Stanbury, bill placed on the Orders of the Day for second reading on Monday next, June 10, 1996.

• (1350)

### AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

#### COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO PERMIT ELECTRONIC COVERAGE

**Hon. Leonard J. Gustafson**, with leave of the Senate, and notwithstanding rule 58(1)(f), moved:

That the Standing Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be authorized to permit coverage by electronic media of its public proceedings on June 6, 1996, on its consideration of the issues regarding raw milk products, with the least possible disruption of its hearings.

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

**Hon. Senators:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

### 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 3:15 p.m. today, Wednesday, June 5, 1996, even though the Senate may then be sitting, and that rule 95(4) be suspended in relation thereto.

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

**Hon. Senators:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

[*Translation*]

## FISHERIES

#### NOTICE OF MOTION TO AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE TO ENGAGE SERVICES

**Hon. Gerald J. Comeau:** Honourable senators, I give notice that tomorrow, Thursday, June 6, 1996, I will move:

That the Standing Committee on Fisheries have the power to engage the services of such counsel and technical, clerical, and other personnel as may be necessary for the purpose of its examination and consideration of such bills, subject-matter of bills, and other matters relating to fisheries, generally, as are referred to it.

[*English*]

## PRECINCTS OF PARLIAMENT

#### DESIGNATION OF ROOM 160-S AS ABORIGINAL PEOPLES ROOM—NOTICE OF MOTION

**Hon. Orville H. Phillips:** Honourable senators, I give notice that on Wednesday, June 11, 1996, I will move:

That the Senate committee room 160-S be designated the "Aboriginal Peoples Room" in honour and recognition of the contribution of aboriginal peoples to Canada.

**Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear!

## JUSTICE

#### INVESTIGATION INTO SALE OF AIRBUS AIRCRAFT TO AIR CANADA—NOTICE OF INQUIRY

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

The Airbus Affair and the accusations against former Prime Minister Brian Mulroney contained in a Department of Justice document that Mr. Mulroney was

...involved in a criminal conspiracy to accept payments for influencing Air Canada's decision to buy airplanes from Airbus;

and to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Commissioner Murray's meeting with the editorial board of *The Ottawa Citizen* newspaper on May 28, 1996, wherein Mr. Murray advanced the use of the national security provisions of the Canada Evidence Act in defence of their criminal investigation of Mr. Mulroney;

and to their assertion of the supremacy of the police in Canada;

and to their assertion that the collective rights of the police supersede the individual rights of a Canadian citizen, and that in a civil lawsuit, the rights of the police take precedence over the rights of the individual;

and to *The Toronto Star* article by Sandro Contenta on June 4, 1996 which said:

Justice Minister Allan Rock encouraged and supported the launching of a lax RCMP investigation into Brian Mulroney's alleged involvement in the Airbus affair...;

and to the fact that this affair is causing deformity, embarrassment to and suspicion of the system;

and to the handling of these matters;

and to the erosion of parliamentary process;

and to the damage caused to parliamentary government, to the Prime Minister's Office, to the principle of ministerial responsibility, and to Parliament, and to senators, including myself, who voted on Bill C-129, the bill to privatize Air Canada, on August 4, 1988, in the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce;

and to the belief that Parliament, in the interest of public confidence and integrity, should take cognizance of these matters and take these matters into Parliament's consideration.

## SOCIAL AFFAIRS, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO MEET  
DURING SITTING OF THE SENATE

Leave having been given to revert to Notices of Motions:

**Hon. Mabel M. DeWare**, with leave of the Senate and notwithstanding rule 58(1)(a), moved:

That the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology have power to sit at 2:30 p.m. tomorrow, Thursday, June 6, 1996, even though the Senate may be sitting, and that rule 95(4) be suspended in relation thereto.

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

**Hon. Senators:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

## CRIMINAL CODE OF CANADA

SECTION 43—NOTICE OF INQUIRY

**Hon. Sharon Carstairs:** Honourable senators, pursuant to rule 57(2), I give notice that on Tuesday next, June 11, 1996, I will call the attention of the Senate to section 43 of the Criminal Code of Canada.

## QUESTION PERIOD

### NATIONAL DEFENCE

FAILURE TO ESTABLISH MILITIA TRAINING CENTRE AT  
CORNWALLIS PARK, NOVA SCOTIA—GOVERNMENT POSITION

**Hon. Gerald J. Comeau:** Honourable senators, I should like to follow up on questions to the minister that I raised both here in the Senate and on the Order Paper regarding the designation of the new militia training centre at Camp Aldershot, Nova Scotia. Perhaps the Leader of the Government in the Senate could clarify some of the rather contradictory information that is being given out regarding this decision.

We were told initially, by way of a press release, that a training centre was being planned for Atlantic Canada. In response to a question that I raised here in the chamber, I was then advised that, in fact, these centres had been established in Aldershot, Nova Scotia, and CFB Gaagetown, New Brunswick.

We have now been informed that an amount of \$50 million has been awarded by the federal government to Camp Aldershot and to Gaagetown for the expansion of these facilities to accommodate the new training centres.

Although I completely support the operation of these two facilities, I have difficulty understanding the reasoning behind the government spending \$25 million at Camp Aldershot when the base at Cornwallis, which the government originally promised to keep open and then reneged upon that promise, is in the process of being demolished.

Could the minister explain why, in a period of fiscal restraint, her government is spending money to build new facilities while demolishing perfectly good facilities that are already available just a few miles away?

**Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, I appreciate the honourable senator's support for the activity at these two bases. I will seek information for him on the question he has asked today.

## GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

HARMONIZATION WITH PROVINCIAL SALES TAXES—  
REVIEW OF ISSUE ON AGENDA FOR FIRST MINISTERS  
CONFERENCE—GOVERNMENT POSITION

**Hon. J. Michael Forrestall:** Honourable senators, my question relates to the one I asked yesterday concerning the harmonization of taxes.

As the minister is no doubt aware, both Ontario Premier Mike Harris and Quebec Premier Lucien Bouchard have asked that a review of the GST issue be put on the agenda for the first ministers conference scheduled for June 20 and 21.

This request comes, of course, following the Prime Minister and Finance Minister's refusal to offer the same compensation package to some of the other provinces as has been done with three of the Atlantic provinces.

• (1400)

Could the Leader of the Government please tell us what decision, if any, has been taken by her colleagues regarding the request to have this tax harmonization issue on the table at the conference that is to take place in two weeks' time?

**Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, undoubtedly, this issue will be discussed first at the meeting of finance ministers, which is to take place within the next two weeks.

As far as the first ministers conference is concerned, I had hoped to have this week a precise answer for those who were interested in the agenda for that meeting. However, I do not have it. If first ministers wish to raise the matter, I am sure they will. It is certain that it will be a topic of conversation at the meeting of finance ministers, which precedes the meeting of first ministers.

As my honourable friend will know, the guidelines for the compensation package are open to all provinces which qualify for them.

**Senator Forrestall:** Honourable senators, that is an argument for another day. That is not quite a precise description of the situation as it exists today.

However, might I ask the minister by way of a supplementary question if she is suggesting that the issue is not on the formal agenda for the meeting of first ministers because it will be on the agenda at the meeting of finance ministers?

**Senator Fairbairn:** Honourable senators, I am sorry if I was not clear. I do not know what the agenda will be for the first ministers conference. It will be released when the minister has concluded it.

I simply made the observation that the premiers may wish to raise the matter themselves. I do not know what the agenda will be. I do know that the first ministers will be talking about it.

[*Translation*]

## NATIONAL UNITY

CREATION OF SPECIAL SENATE COMMITTEE—  
GOVERNMENT POLICY

**Hon. Gérald-A. Beaudoin:** Honourable senators, my question is for the Leader of the Government in the Senate. In the February 27 Throne Speech, the federal government stated, and I quote:

...the referendum result gave a clear message that Quebecers want change in the federation. This desire for change is broadly shared across Canada. The Government will act on a responsible agenda for change for all of Canada.

Yesterday, the Minister of Justice, the Honourable Allan Rock, expressed the hope that the amending formula would be reviewed as soon as possible.

I would like to know, if possible, what the government intends to do regarding the establishment of a special Senate committee on national unity and constitutional matters.

The question is already on the Order Paper and being debated, but it is not making much progress. I think such a committee could be quite helpful.

Could the government tell us what its intentions are in that respect?

[*English*]

**Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, I wish to thank the Honourable Senator Beaudoin for his question. This is a subject of interest to the government. It is also a subject of interest to senators on this side of the chamber. At this point in time, colleagues on this side are examining this issue.

[*Translation*]

**Senator Beaudoin:** Honourable senators, we are probably going to adjourn soon for the summer. Whether or not this committee ever sees the light of day, I think we should receive an answer one way or the other — and I hope it will be a positive one — before the house adjourns for the summer.

[*English*]

**Senator Fairbairn:** Honourable senators, I will do my best, in consultation with my colleagues, to get an answer before that time.

## FOREIGN AFFAIRS

### REDUCTION IN INTERNATIONAL AID—GOVERNMENT POLICY

**Hon. Consiglio Di Nino:** Honourable senators, I should like to continue with some questions on the Liberal handbook that formed part of their policy platform during the last election.

The May 1993 “The Liberal Foreign Policy Handbook” told Canadians:

Canada should make a commitment to meet the UN target of 0.7 per cent of GNP for international aid as soon as possible.

Mr. Chrétien himself told *The Edmonton Journal* on October 10, 1993:

Unlike Kim Campbell, who wants to slash another \$800 million from Canada’s foreign aid budget, Liberals do not intend to fight the deficit on the backs of the world’s poor. A Liberal government has made no plans to reduce current levels of aid during its first mandate.

Will the Leader of the Government confirm that instead of moving toward the 0.7 per cent of GNP, as was promised, the net effect of their foreign aid cuts will be to bring down the ratio from 0.37 to approximately 0.24 by 1997?

**Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, I cannot confirm the percentages mentioned by the honourable senator. However, I will confer with the Minister of Foreign Affairs for a more precise answer on the foreign assistance figures.

My honourable friend will know that this government, as well as governments preceding it, have placed a strong priority on assistance to countries, particularly those which are less fortunate than our own. A second priority of our government in the last two and one-half years has been the responsibility of looking within our own resources to reduce our deficit.

**Senator Di Nino:** Honourable senators, I appreciate that answer. Frankly, my problem is that we keep hearing all these nice words, but there is no substance. I understand that the Leader of the Government cannot necessarily answer all of the questions she is asked when she is asked them.

## HUMAN RIGHTS

### SIGNING OF CONVENTION OF ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES—GOVERNMENT POSITION

**Hon. Consiglio Di Nino:** Honourable senators, I should like to ask the Leader of the Government if she will ask her colleague to deal with another issue contained in the same handbook, which states:

We will speed up the process of ratification of the OAS Convention on Human Rights which Canada has yet to sign.

Honourable senators, Parliament has yet to see any legislation to ratify this treaty. The quotation was that “we will speed up the

process.” Could the minister confirm that this is because the government has yet to honour its promise to sign the OAS Convention on Human Rights?

**Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, I will consult my colleague on that issue as well.

## JUSTICE

### INVESTIGATION INTO SALE OF AIRBUS AIRCRAFT TO AIR CANADA—AUTHORIZATION FOR CORRESPONDENCE TO SWISS AUTHORITIES—PROCEDURE REQUIRED TO BE FOLLOWED—GOVERNMENT POSITION

**Hon. David Tkachuk:** Honourable senators, yesterday in the other place, the member from Saint-Hubert asked the Minister of Justice this question:

Mr. Speaker, how can the Minister of Justice explain his allowing a letter to the Swiss authorities on the Airbus affair to go out over the signature of Ms Kimberly Prost, a senior official in the department for which he is responsible, without a check of all of the pertinent information concerning this matter?

In response to that question, Minister of Justice Allan Rock said:

Mr. Speaker, that matter is before the court. I do not think the subject-matter of this question is necessarily before the court and therefore I feel at liberty to respond.

The minister then responded to the question.

Before Christmas, I asked questions concerning the procedure surrounding this matter, including how the letter was sent, who authorized the letter to the Swiss government from the police, as well as the involvement of the Attorney General’s Office, the Attorney General’s Department and the Minister of Justice. I asked those questions after the letter was sent. In light of what the minister said in the House yesterday, will I now receive answers to my questions?

• (1410)

**Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, there are a great many questions on the Order Paper dealing with issues pertaining to this matter. I certainly hope that Senator Tkachuk will receive responses to those he has authored. Whether they will be satisfactory is another question, however.

In the House of Commons yesterday, the Minister of Justice made clear that he was not aware of the letter. He did not know the contents of the letter, and he has not in any way been involved in the investigation, nor, as he stated very clearly in the other place yesterday, should he have had then or have now any role whatsoever in that investigation.

**Senator Tkachuk:** I did not ask that question.

**Senator Fairbairn:** I know you did not.



**Senator Tkachuk:** The question that I asked before Christmas in this place dealt with the procedure. This is not something that the government made up — or perhaps it is — for the purposes of writing a letter to a foreign government to attempt to gain the cooperation of that foreign government in a criminal investigation. The question was: What is the procedure?

In the exchange that we had, you mentioned that the Solicitor General's department asked someone in the Minister of Justice's office and a letter went out, but there must be a procedure. Human beings — if there are such people in those two departments — are involved in this, and someone must sign that off. Someone must say, "Yes, I am responsible for that. Yes, there is enough evidence to proceed. Yes, it has to go to a second authority." There must be a procedure to follow. If there is no procedure, then surely someone has been acting like a loose cannon. They could be asking questions and writing letters about any citizen in Canada, accusing them of criminal acts and asking to get into their bank accounts, things that they cannot do in this country without a search warrant.

I simply wish to know the procedure followed in sending a letter of that nature to a foreign government, starting with the RCMP and going forward through the Solicitor General's department to the Department of Justice and on to the foreign government itself.

**Senator Fairbairn:** Honourable senators, obviously there is a procedure. I will get in touch with those who work on these responses and ask them to respond as expeditiously as they can, not just to this question but to several others on the Order Paper.

**Senator Tkachuk:** Honourable senators, I assume that the answer on the procedure to be followed will be the same as the procedure that was followed in the case of the letter that went from Kimberly Prost regarding Mr. Mulroney.

**Senator Fairbairn:** I will do my best to obtain an answer for my honourable friend. I am not making any presumptions or assumptions on what the answer will be, but I undertake to get one for him.

[Translation]

## FOREIGN AFFAIRS

### INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEMOCRATIC DEVELOPMENT—TRAVEL PATTERN OF PRESIDENT—GOVERNMENT POSITION

**Hon. Roch Bolduc:** Honourable senators, my question is for the Leader of the Government in the Senate. The International Centre for Human Rights and Democratic Development is headed by Mr. Broadbent. The centre concentrates most of its activities in 13 target countries in Africa, Latin America and Asia. According to information obtained under the Access to Information Act, it says here that:

...in the past 7 years, Mr. Broadbent stayed on 83 occasions in the major capitals of Europe.

I do not understand the relationship between the fact that the centre must develop its activities in Latin America and in Asia, and the fact that its president has been in Europe 83 times in the last 7 years. Can you explain this to me?

[English]

**Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, I will need to ask for assistance to obtain a response for Senator Bolduc.

[Translation]

**Senator Bolduc:** Could you ask the officials of the Department of Foreign Affairs, which must have something to do with Canadian policy, if there might be a way, when Mr. Broadbent is leaving, to set a certain number of guidelines to avoid abuses and people travelling wherever, whenever and for whatever reason they wish? A minimum number of criteria are required.

Furthermore, the department had asked for a report in this regard. It criticized the centre for carrying out activities in too many countries. It described it as an ineffective and extravagant organization lacking clear policies. Does the Minister of Foreign Affairs intend to set guidelines for people travelling the globe in the name of Canada?

[English]

**Senator Fairbairn:** Honourable senators, I will ask my colleague to obtain an answer on that question for my honourable friend.

[Translation]

## EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BILL

### MOTION FOR COMMITTEE TO ADJOURN FROM PLACE TO PLACE—POSSIBILITY OF FREE VOTE—GOVERNMENT POSITION

**Hon. Jean-Maurice Simard:** Honourable senators, I would like to give the Leader of the Government in the Senate an opportunity to correct the statement she made yesterday in response to a question I asked her. This will be my first question. In responding to my question yesterday, the Leader of the Government said, and I quote:

[English]

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 deliberation and the work of that committee.

I interjected by saying:

Please show some leadership!

The leader went on to say:

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.

Since the Leader of the Government in the Senate is not afraid of a Liberal senator voting for my motion, does that mean the vote on my motion later today will be a free vote on her side of the house?

**Senator Atkins:** All votes on this side are free votes!

**Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government in the Senate):** Honourable senators, I am sure that my colleagues on this side of the house will vote on the merit of my honourable friend's motion, and we will pursue that later.

**Senator Simard:** Honourable senators, I have another question based on the same statement made by Senator Fairbairn yesterday.

The minister said that the committee makes their own decisions. Is she not aware of the many precedents, brought about by many motions and amendments to motions over many years, that indicate that committees, in many ways and on many occasions, have taken their instructions from this Senate and acted accordingly? I have known Senator Fairbairn for many years. I am sure she did not mean to mislead the house. This is my way of giving her an opportunity to correct the error in her statement caused by quoting bad precedent.

**Senator Fairbairn:** Honourable senators, I thank my honourable friend for that. Indeed, his colleague Senator Berntson yesterday gave me a similar opportunity. He raised the same point as my honourable friend, namely that there is precedent — as, of course, there is — for the Senate chamber to give instructions to a committee. That is perfectly proper.

I was responding as an individual; I was not giving instructions to the committee. The Senate, of course, has exercised its responsibilities in giving instructions to committees, and I agree with Senator Simard. That is perfectly within its rights, and it has been done. In some cases it has succeeded, and in others it has not, but certainly it is within the rights of the Senate to do that.

• (1620)

Senator Berntson has already raised this very point, and I responded to it. I am pleased to respond again today.

**Senator Simard:** I have another question on the same scheduling, and it will only require a short answer.

We have witnessed several free votes in the House of Commons here in Ottawa within the last two months on matters

that are important to Canadians. I recall in particular the human rights legislation of one month ago, and the question of the Newfoundland amendment, amendment 17. In both those cases, Prime Minister Chrétien saw fit to allow a free vote.

However, with respect to the Pearson International Airport Agreements Bill and my motion concerning Bill C-12, it appears that when the government is stuck, it can be very stubborn indeed and not allow a free vote.

Honourable senators, I am returning, indirectly, to my first question: Will the Leader of the Government in the Senate allow a free vote on my motion today dealing with the Employment Insurance Bill, a bill which will hurt many families, employers and employees in Atlantic Canada?

**Senator Fairbairn:** As I said in response to my honourable friend's first question, senators will vote on the merits of his motion. As soon as we get to that motion, we will know what the results of that vote will be.

**Senator Simard:** Very well; we will see.

#### DELAYED ANSWERS TO ORAL QUESTIONS

**Hon. Richard J. Stanbury (Acting Deputy Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, I have three delayed answers. The first is a response to a question raised in the Senate on November 20, 1995, by the Honourable Senator Consiglio Di Nino concerning the deportation of a member of an alleged terrorist organization; the second is a response to a question raised in the Senate on March 20, 1996, by the Honourable Senator Mira Spivak regarding bovine growth hormone; and the third is a response to a question raised in the Senate on May 27, 1996, by the Honourable Senator Brenda Robertson regarding the re-routing of the Trans-Canada Highway and the environmental impact of that on wetlands.

#### IMMIGRATION

##### DEPORTATION OF MEMBER OF ALLEGED TERRORIST ORGANIZATION—DECLARATION OF FEDERAL COURT OF CANADA

*(Response to question raised by Hon. Consiglio Di Nino on November 20, 1995)*

The government is concerned about potential terrorism. Consequently, officials were instructed to file an appeal of the Federal Court decision. The Federal Court decision, in this case, deals with only one section of the Immigration Act, a section of the Immigration Act which has been used sparingly — only 2 times within the last 10 years.

The decision did not say that the government is powerless to deal with the criminal element. The government still has the power:

- to detain;
- to have an inquiry; and
- to deport.

This recent decision does not change that. In fact, the government has already been able to prevent such people from getting into the country, through the implementation of measures such as:

- Criminal and security checks;
- Interdiction efforts abroad;
- Training other countries in detection;
- Airline and maritime carriers face stiff penalties; and
- Canada/U.S. MOU on our Shared Borders.

### HEALTH

#### BANNING OF SALES OF BOVINE GROWTH HORMONE BY OECD—LABELLING OF PRODUCTS CONTAINING HORMONE— GOVERNMENT POSITION

*(Response to question raised by Hon. Mira Spivak on March 20, 1996)*

It was the decision of the European Union (EU) to ban recombinant bovine growth hormones or bovine somatotropins (rBST) until the year 2000; the OECD is not a regulatory agency.

The EU based its decision on a number of concerns, namely an animal health question, milk surpluses already in existence, perceived disadvantages to small producers, and the anticipation that consumers would reject the use of rBST.

The EU has permitted member states to do tests using rBST to obtain information concerning mastitis. The EU's current position on rBST does not apply to imported dairy products and there will be no challenge to dairy products from countries using rBST. Member states of the EU are also permitted to manufacture rBST and export it to non-EU countries.

According to Canadian law, the full legal responsibility for determining whether rBST can be licensed for manufacture and/or sale in Canada rests with Health Canada. Since 1990, Health Canada has been conducting the necessary comprehensive review and critical appraisal of available scientific information on rBST, including the reference cited. This review is carried out under the *Food and Drugs Act*, which sets out the safety standards for both

food and drugs in Canada, and these products continue to be evaluated by the Bureau of Veterinary Drugs at Health Canada.

No decision has yet been made by Health Canada about rBST, nor is there any indication to date as to when a decision may be forthcoming. In the meantime, rBST remains unapproved and unlicensed in Canada. No other federal department has a decision-making role in the licensing process. According to criteria set out in law, it is ultimately for Health Canada to determine whether or not to issue a Canadian license for rBST.

At this time, Health Canada has no reasons for human safety concerns related to the consumption of meat and milk of cows treated with rBST. Health Canada will continue to monitor human safety aspects of rBST and IGF-1 based on experimental data and relevant scientific information.

If, in the future, rBST is approved by Health Canada for commercial manufacture and sale in Canada as a veterinary drug, it will be because its use will be deemed to pose no health or safety risk to Canadian consumers. Health Canada's health and safety review of rBST is ongoing and, since no decision has been made, rBST remains unlicensed for use in Canada.

Current Canadian labelling regulations cannot require mandatory labelling concerning rBST on food labels. The *Food and Drugs Act* requires a list of ingredients for food products, but substances used in agricultural production such as veterinary drugs are not considered ingredients. Furthermore, no practical means now exist to identify milk from rBST-treated herds since rBST is a synthetic product produced through genetic engineering. It is virtually identical to bovine somatotropin, a hormone naturally produced by cows which increases milk production.

If rBST were approved, the current law and regulations would apply. In cases where rBST is not being used, Canadian producers or dairies might voluntarily choose to label their products as not having been derived from milk from cows treated with rBST. Such a negative claim could be made under the terms of the existing labelling regulations on condition that the wording is not misleading or deceptive and the claim itself is factual.

This approach to labelling parallels that of other countries. To date, no country in the world has required mandatory labelling of milk or dairy products derived from milk from rBST-treated cows. In the absence of a decision from Health Canada, any discussion concerning the impact of the use of rBST on the labelling of dairy products is purely speculative.

The Honourable Senator refers to an article in the *Globe and Mail* (February 6, 1996) in which it was reported that the NewLeaf™ potato, a genetically-engineered product, was marketed to Canadian consumers before approval. This report is untrue, and Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada responded with a letter to the editor which underscored the fact that this product had met all regulatory requirements prior to both field trials and commercial production. A copy of this letter is attached to this response.

This case illustrates how a genetically-engineered food product — as opposed to a veterinary drug like rBST — can be approached in terms of labelling. The labelling requirements for this product were based on Health Canada's published opinion in November 1995 that:

the introduction of genetic information (DNA) into these potatoes to make them resistant to Colorado Potato Beetles does not result in any differences in composition or nutritional quality of the potatoes...these potatoes are as safe and nutritious as other commercially available potato varieties.

The *Food and Drugs Act* sets out Canada's labelling regulations. The federal government applies these regulations consistently and thoroughly. Existing provisions of this Act require that the labelling of food products be truthful and not misleading. Given the decision by Health Canada concerning the safety and the nature of the product, no special labelling of this product is required. Under the *Food and Drugs Act*, labelling for genetically-engineered food would be required only if that food contained allergens or varied significantly in composition from an already approved product.

The Government of Canada developed guideline proposals specifically for the labelling of genetically-engineered foods, after discussions with a wide cross-section of society. These guideline proposals are consistent with the existing provisions of the *Food and Drugs Act*. In keeping with the principle of involving the public in the development of the regulatory framework for products produced using biotechnology, these proposals have been released for public review and the results of this review will permit the Government to further refine these guidelines.

The Editor  
The Globe and Mail  
444 Front Street  
Toronto, Ontario  
M5V 2S9

Dear Editor:

Your article on February 6, 1996, *Test potatoes marketed before approval*, needlessly alarms consumers as to how well the government can regulate the food they eat. Your

suggestion that there is a "loophole" in federal regulations that would allow NewLeaf potatoes, or any other novel food derived through genetic engineering to be sold to consumers without government approval is unfounded.

I would like to assure your readers that Canada has one of the safest food systems in the world. An integral part of this system is that new biotechnology products must meet stringent requirements for human, animal and environmental health and safety. Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada reviewed the environmental safety of the product prior to allowing field trials and eventual commercial production of the potato. Health Canada reviewed the NewLeaf potato and found it to be as safe as any other potato variety, before they allowed it to be sold here. From field trials to the grocers' shelves, the food regulatory system is well defined and thorough.

The Food and Drugs Act sets out Canada's labelling regulations. The federal government applies these regulations consistently and thoroughly, so that consumers have the accurate information they need when making food selection choices.

The government is currently consulting with stakeholders on the labelling of foods derived from biotechnology. We are always open to discuss recommendations for changes to regulations with any group or community.

Yours sincerely,  
Frank Claydon

## TRANSPORT

NEW BRUNSWICK—RE-ROUTING OF TRANS-CANADA  
HIGHWAY—ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ON WETLANDS—  
DISPARITY IN REACTION BETWEEN CURRENT AND RETIRED  
DEFENCE PERSONNEL—GOVERNMENT POSITION

(Response to question raised by Hon. Brenda M. Robertson on May 27, 1996)

The federal government is not funding the proposed relocation of the Trans-Canada Highway (TCH) between Fredericton and Salisbury. If the federal government wants to provide funds, a federal environmental assessment of the project would be required.

An Environmental Impact Assessment report has been completed by a consultant on behalf of the New Brunswick Department of Transportation (NBDOT). Transport Canada cost-shared and reviewed the environmental assessment study from a transportation point of view. All transportation related impacts were found to be insignificant or mitigable with known technology.

The federal departments of Defence, Environment and Fisheries and Oceans have also provided comments to the New Brunswick Department of Environment. Representatives of all four federal departments attended the recent provincial open houses to hear the public's views.

## ORDER PAPER AND NOTICE PAPER

### AMENDMENT TO NOTICE OF INQUIRY

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable senators, before I call Orders of the Day, I have a request from the Honourable Senator Cools to record an amendment to a notice of inquiry.

**Hon. Anne C. Cools:** Honourable senators, I wish to make an amendment to a notice of inquiry appearing in today's edition of the *Order Paper and Notice Paper* to conform with yesterday's *Debates of the Senate*. The notice should properly read:

...an attempted neonaticide, being the brutal attempted homicide of a newborn 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;

The rest of the inquiry is perfectly intact, but there is a mistake as it is printed in today's *Order Paper and Notice Paper*. I merely wanted to clarify for the record that it was "an attempted neonaticide."

**The Hon. the Speaker:** This is with respect to Inquiry No. 10 for Thursday, June 6, 1996, is that correct, Honourable Senator Cools?

**Senator Cools:** That is correct.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### CANADIAN HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

#### BILL TO AMEND—THIRD READING

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Losier-Cool, seconded by the Honourable Senator Hervieux-Payette, for the third reading of Bill C-33, to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act.

**Hon. Stanley Haidasz:** Honourable senators, I wish to say that I believe a number of extremely important matters have suffered from inadequate coverage due to constraints experienced during our committee's examination of Bill C-33.

In considering some of the social, legal and even constitutional impacts of Bill C-33, I trust that many honourable senators

would find it advisable to devote more study in a committee process of public witness, especially in view of our legislative responsibility for sober second thought.

Pursuant to increased public interest in this bill, stirred by media coverage, and the very unbalanced hearings at the committee stage in the House of Commons, it is regrettable that our committee did not take the opportunity to correct the imbalance by hearing from some 16 witnesses who had requested the opportunity to describe the inadvisability of the unqualified term "sexual orientation" and its legal implications.

The Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs has been referred several bills in a short time. A great deal of intense work falls on their shoulders, some of which I believe should perhaps be referred to a special subcommittee. It is for that reason that I propose that the committee be empowered to hear these witnesses on Bill C-33, and even be empowered to hear testimony during the summer recess.

Honourable senators, the pressure of time and our agenda this month does not exonerate us from our duty to which we are sworn, namely, "all difficulties and excuses whatsoever laying aside." Moreover, Bill C-33 in its present state has very far-reaching portents. It is a bill of great legal and even constitutional significance, and of potentially wide social impact.

Honourable senators, in the past, our committees have been highly regarded for their very comprehensive work. They have an indispensable role to assist in our informed and sober second thought in this chamber. Relating to Bill C-28, the chairman of our Legal and Constitutional Affairs Committee recently stated to the press:

There is not going to be any rubber-stamping in committee.

That is a sound and laudable stand, with which I think we all agree.

Unfortunately, with Bill C-33, it may have been thought that there was no substantive controversy, and therefore, a number of groups opposing the bill's wording as such — some 16 in number, I am told — went simply unheard. In just the past two weeks, a large number of letters and several penetrating briefs have continued to arrive raising points that our committee could not, or would not, find time to examine and report. Therefore, I believe we are duty-bound at least to consider proposed amendments and to make up for the missed opportunity of hearing from proponents who requested an opportunity to appear in person before our committee.

Without this kind of study, honourable senators, we are at a major disadvantage in making an informed judgment. No legislative summary or backgrounder was produced in relation to this bill before our committee proceeded with its consideration. There was not even a briefing book available. Many who wrote to me had been heard neither by the committee studying Bill S-2, the precursor, nor the House of Commons committee studying Bill C-33. It appears to have been assumed that opponents of the bill, as worded, have a single, undifferentiated and even misguided viewpoint.

Honourable senators, of 20 testimonies heard in the other place, only four were selected in opposition to the bill remaining unamended. Groups such as Campaign Life Coalition, Human Life International, the Catholic Civil Rights League, Société Juste de St-Joseph, Al-Shura Muslim Consultative Assembly, and the London Christian Family Forum forwarded articulate letters requesting an opportunity to become involved, with distinctive elucidations of their various objections and proposed amendments.

• (1430)

In addition, Bishop Wingle of Yarmouth, Nova Scotia, former Dean of the Toronto Seminary, requested an opportunity to clarify important points that that debate and the media have incorrectly slanted on the view of Catholic bishops in Canada, giving the false impression that they offered support, though mildly qualified, for this bill. The Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops was accorded a very testy, last-minute opportunity to be heard by the House of Commons committee, during which their time was largely taken with relentless diatribes by two committee members who went unchecked by the chairman; this for testimony by a group that stands for some 12.5 million Canadians of Catholic denomination in this great country.

At least seven bishops from the various regions of Canada, including Archbishop Ambrozic of Toronto and Archbishop Exner of Vancouver, wrote to me — I believe some wrote to other senators — and to the press, to state that unless a minimum of amendments are made to give more than lip-service protection to the standing rights of the nuclear and traditional family based upon the two sexes, Bill C-33 does not stand the first test of licitness. Contrary to the ill-advised claim by the Minister of Justice, Catholics in Canada, no less than other denominations, cannot sanction a bill that undermines the public understanding of sexuality as a realm of morality. Public morality is a sacred trust which all parliamentarians should take more seriously into consideration. For though we do not legislate morality, we should legislate for it and provide for it, not impede religious rights and freedoms of expression.

Considering that the language “sexual orientation,” as it appears in the bill, is the real cause of this raging controversy, alternate expressions of the objective of curbing unfair attitudes should be studied, as they were not known to or reported by our committee. Many correspondents have testified that treating sex as mere orientation paves the road to reverse discrimination, a condition no better than that supposedly to be addressed by the bill.

#### MOTION IN AMENDMENT

**Hon. Stanley Haidasz:** I therefore move, seconded by the Honourable Senator Cools:

That notwithstanding that the Senate is on the point of debating Bill C-33 at third reading, Bill C-33 be not now read a third time; and

That the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs be accorded powers to meet when the Senate is not in session, and that Bill C-33 be referred thereto with the order of reference to examine Bill C-33 in respect of the impact thereof to the interpretation and application of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms and other federal statute and administrative law, with particular reference to the potential effect upon or the powers to affect:

criteria determining charitable status for religious groups and churches;

criteria for the transfer of payments in education and in health care in the provinces;

criteria for the screening of biological assays, particularly donated blood;

the freedom of association particularly in respect of rental accommodation in a family dwelling;

the freedom of religious belief and expression;

the preservation and enhancement of multicultural heritage; and

preeminence in respect of benefits accorded to natural families based on the marriage of two persons of the opposite sex,

as well as in respect of the advisability of the term “sexual orientation” to establish the purpose of Bill C-33 and respect for and compliance with the said purpose, as compared with alternate terminology relating to visible characteristics appertaining to sexual orientation, such as “masculinity or femininity” or other terms as may be proposed in testimony or public communication with the said committee;

to hear expert testimonies from an array of populist and religious groups and experts on all of the aforesaid matters,

and to report to the Senate its findings, recommendations and any amendments to Bill C-33 not later than October 7, 1996.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable senators, it is moved by the Honourable Senator Haidasz, seconded by the Honourable Senator Cools:

That notwithstanding that the Senate is on the point of debating Bill C-33 at third reading, Bill C-33 be not now read a third time; and

That the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs be accorded powers to meet when the Senate is not in session —

**Senator Haidasz:** Dispense!

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

**Some Hon. Senators:** No.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Yes.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Will those honourable senators in favour of the motion in amendment please say “yea?”

**Some Hon. Senators:** Yea.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Will those honourable senators opposed to the motion in amendment please say “nay”?

**Some Hon. Senators:** Nay.

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

Motion in amendment negatived, on division.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable senators, we are back, then, to the main motion.

It was moved by the Honourable Senator Losier-Cool, seconded by the Honourable Senator Hervieux-Payette, that this bill be read the third time.

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

**Some Hon. Senators:** No.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Yes.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Will those honourable senators in favour of the motion please say “yea?”

**Some Hon. Senators:** Yea.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Will those honourable senators opposed to the motion please say “nay”?

**Some Hon. Senators:** Nay.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** In my opinion, the yeas have it.

*And two honourable senators having risen.*

**The Hon. the Speaker:** The whips have agreed that there will be a 15-minute bell. Is that agreed, honourable senators?

**Hon. Senators:** Agreed.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** The vote will be at 10 minutes to three o'clock.

Please call in the senators.

• (1450)

Motion agreed to and bill read third time and passed on the following division:

#### YEAS

##### THE HONOURABLE SENATORS

|                  |                              |
|------------------|------------------------------|
| Anderson         | Lavoie-Roux                  |
| Andreychuk       | LeBreton                     |
| Atkins           | Lewis                        |
| Austin           | Losier-Cool                  |
| Bacon            | Lynch-Staunton               |
| Beaudoin         | MacDonald ( <i>Halifax</i> ) |
| Bolduc           | MacEachen                    |
| Bosa             | Marchand                     |
| Bryden           | Milne                        |
| Carstairs        | Oliver                       |
| Cogger           | Ottenheimer                  |
| Corbin           | Pearson                      |
| Davey            | Petten                       |
| De Bané          | Poulin                       |
| DeWare           | Prud'homme                   |
| Doody            | Riel                         |
| Doyle            | Rivest                       |
| Fairbairn        | Rizzuto                      |
| Forrestall       | Rompkey                      |
| Grafstein        | Rossiter                     |
| Grimard          | Roux                         |
| Hébert           | Simard                       |
| Hervieux-Payette | Stanbury                     |
| Jessiman         | Stewart                      |
| Keon             | Stollery                     |
| Kinsella         | Watt                         |
| Landry           | Wood—54                      |

#### NAYS

##### THE HONOURABLE SENATORS

|           |           |
|-----------|-----------|
| Gustafson | Phillips  |
| Haidasz   | Stratton  |
| Perrault  | Tkachuk—6 |

#### ABSTENTIONS

##### THE HONOURABLE SENATORS

Nil

**SOCIAL AFFAIRS, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY**EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BILL—  
MOTION TO AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE TO ADJOURN FROM PLACE  
TO PLACE DURING STUDY NEGATIVED

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

On the Order:

Resuming the debate on the motion of 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 and from place to place in Canada when it begins consideration of Bill C-12, An Act respecting employment insurance in Canada.—(*Honourable Senator Rompkey*).

**Hon. Bill Rompkey:** Honourable senators, I wish to make some comments on this motion, and to say that it is obvious to all of us that Senator Simard has pursued this course of action with some vigour. We must respect that, because he is in this chamber as a senator from Atlantic Canada to do what he thinks best for the people whom he represents.

It is clear from his motion — although it says “from place to place” — that the intent is to have the committee travel in Atlantic Canada. It says “from place to place” but from what he has said in the chamber, it is clear that he means in the Atlantic region. I quote from *Senate Debates*, June 4, page 526.

The people of the Atlantic provinces, among others, are most anxious to find out the government’s position in this house. Maritimers...

I think the people to whom he is referring are probably those from the Atlantic region, but he says “Maritimers.”

...even if they look favourably upon, and agree with, the importance of this bill respecting certain agreements concerning Pearson International Airport 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.

He then goes on to say that the people of the Atlantic region attach as much importance to this bill as they do to the Pearson International Airport Agreements Bill. He says further that the chamber should give the authority to travel to meet face-to-face with the citizens of Atlantic Canada, and New Brunswick in

particular. He then says that it is not too late to instruct the committee, as his motion suggests, to travel to Atlantic Canada.

• (1500)

I understand that certain senators opposite will be travelling to Atlantic Canada. That is certainly their right. If that is the course of action that they determine, then so be it. As a matter of fact, an invitation — and, perhaps, it was not given facetiously — was offered to me last night to join that group, as well as to participate in some suppers of a crustacean nature that might be arranged while we are in Prince Edward Island, for example. I was very tempted, I must say, because the supper we had last night could in no way match the suppers that can be produced on Prince Edward Island. We had cordon bleu sandwiches, it is true, and corn chowder. I must tell honourable senators that Senator Lavoie-Roux said that her corn chowder was eminently better. At our next meeting we will put her to the test and ask her to provide her corn chowder.

Senator Simard was with us at the committee meeting last night. I know he did not show up just because of the corn chowder and the cordon bleu sandwiches. However, I wish he had been there when the minister appeared before the committee. The minister, who is also from New Brunswick, feels strongly about this bill, is knowledgeable about it and is very able to debate it. I know that Senator Simard has strong feelings on the bill. Clearly, the place for a senator to express those strong feelings and put questions is at a Senate committee hearing, particularly when the minister is present. Who better to ask those questions of than the minister? I know Senator Simard was detained elsewhere. He had important things to do. I am not questioning his motive for not being there.

I also wish that he had been at the committee yesterday when we heard, in the course of our deliberations, from the Honourable Manik Thompson, who is a minister for the government of the Northwest Territories. She presented a balanced brief in which she pointed out that certain measures were understandable and within the realm of fiscal responsibility. She also pointed out certain weaknesses and certain concerns that the people of the Northwest Territories have with the legislation. Those concerns are not unlike those which exist in the Atlantic provinces. As a matter of fact, yesterday, Senator Phillips raised the matter of people who live in remote communities or in single-industry towns where there are few job alternatives. He raised this issue, and rightly so, as a matter of concern. I, too, have raised that issue in committee as a matter of concern, as have other senators from the Atlantic region.

However, that concern exists not simply in the Atlantic provinces; it exists in the Northwest Territories, parts of the Arctic and Northern Canada, a fact to which my colleague can attest. There are people there who have short working seasons. They are iced in for most of the year. They live in single-industry towns where there are few alternatives. That is a legitimate concern that we should bring to the minister, the department and the committee. We have done that.



If a committee is to travel, it should hear the views of all Canadians. This is not an Atlantic Canada bill, as important as it may be to our people in the Atlantic provinces. This is a Canadian bill. If a committee is to travel — and this is the debate we had in committee — then it should reasonably go across this country from sea to sea to sea. If it is the intention of the committee to travel, it should be all or nothing. It should not travel simply to the Atlantic region, not simply to New Brunswick.

If the committee travels, costs will be incurred. I submit that the cost would be at least \$200,000, if not more, to put senators and staff and all the gear on an aircraft and go from place to place. The hearings may end up with 50 or 100 people present, and they may not. How many Canadians would you reach that way? Our alternative was to use the technology which is available to us — that is, television — and broadcast our meetings.

I submit, honourable senators, that we are reaching many more Canadians in the Atlantic, in the North, in the West and all across this country by CPAC and by cable in the regions, than we would if the committee, with all its paraphernalia, were to travel.

The object is to give Canadians an opportunity to hear what is going on and to respond. We might not like interactive video. We may not be used to that form of exchange. However, it is a reality in this country. Television is with us and the technology is here. I think we would be remiss not to acknowledge this alternative to travel.

Honourable senators, I should also point out that this is a very busy time for the Senate. I do not have to tell honourable senators how many committees are sitting this week and how many are sitting next week. I do not want to say that there is far too much to do to go all across the country, but that is the reality. The reality is that we have important legislation to put through in the next several weeks. It would be irresponsible of us to neglect those duties to carry out others, particularly if there is an alternative.

Another alternative is to hear from a wide cross-section of Canadians. It is worthwhile putting on the record the kind of balance which has been struck in the witnesses appearing before the committee. Apart from the minister, we have heard from representatives of the building and construction trades, the Canadian Auto Workers, the Canadian Policy Research Networks, the Canadian Labour Congress, Alexa McDonough, the Leader of the New Democratic Party, the government of the Northwest Territories, the Canadian Construction Association and the National Anti-Poverty Association.

We will be hearing from the Canadian Federation of Students, the Canadian Restaurant and Food Services Association, the Canadian Coalition of Community-Based Training, the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, the Atlantic Institute for Market Studies, the Nova Scotia Advisory Council on the Status of Women, the P.E.I. Coalition of Seasonal Workers, the Miminegash Women in Support of Fishing, the Public Service Alliance of Canada, the Greater Moncton Chamber of Commerce and the Canadian Conference of the Arts. Honourable senators

will know that individual artists will be impacted by this legislation and that they want to be heard.

We will also be hearing from the Conseil économique du Nouveau-Brunswick, the Fish, Food and Allied Workers represented by Earle McCurdy from Newfoundland, who represents fishermen and fish plant workers in both Newfoundland and Nova Scotia, Professor Alice Nakamura from the University of Alberta and the Syndicat acadien des travailleuses affiliées des pêches.

We will be hearing from Angela Vautour and Richard Pellerin, who are spokespersons for the following organizations: the Moncton Coalition for the Economic & Social Justice Committee, the Chaleur Coalition for the Preservation of Our Social Programs, the Fredericton Area Coalition for Social Justice, the Cap Pelé-Shediac Committee Against UI Cutbacks, the Committee for the Future Homeless in Restigouche, the Group of Concerned Citizens for Fair UI & Jobs, the Edmundston & District Labour Council, the Saint John & District Labour Council, the Committee for Employment and Against UI Cutbacks and the Nova Scotia Federation of Labour.

I submit, honourable senators, that that is a broad cross-section of groups which represents Canadians and Canadian interests. It is a fair and balanced list. It will give us a fair and balanced investigation and inquiry into this important piece of legislation.

I would submit that that is a reasonable and justifiable alternative. As a matter of fact, it is worthwhile pointing out that if the committee were to travel, we would have to scrap almost that entire list — that is, unless we sat all summer and fall. If we were to travel across the country, we would not be able to hear from those groups of people which represent national organizations.

- (1510)

Senator Simard gives the impression that there is massive opposition to this legislation across the country. I point out to him that 72 per cent of the Canadians polled supported this legislation, including 54 per cent in the Atlantic provinces.

The Leader of the New Democratic Party said yesterday that governments are whitewashing this legislation and ramming it through Parliament, and that Canadians really do not understand it. In seven elections, I have never underestimated the intelligence of the voters. It discredits the New Democratic Party to suggest that such is the case, and it may be an explanation for why they are where they are today. The fact is that Canadians are not dumb. They know what is going on, and it is our intention to make them even more aware of what is going on.

At the moment, 72 per cent say this is good legislation. Why do they say that? They say that because this legislation moves us to an hourly-based qualification which brings many more Canadians into the employment insurance system, particularly women and young people. More people, including women and young people, will have their earnings insured than ever before. As a matter of fact, 500,000 more will have their earnings insured.

As well, 350,000 low-income families — that is, families earning less than \$26,000 cumulatively — will receive a supplement over and above the Child Tax Credit. That is significant in the Atlantic region, in the West, and in the North.

This legislation will help to create 100,000 to 150,000 jobs by redirecting funds from those who have more to those who have less. For example, it will redirect funds into wage subsidies for people who would not normally be able to afford to accept the reasonable wage that must be offered.

It will also redirect funds into training. As far as I know, this is the first time that money has been put into the hands of individuals to buy their own training. For many years now, a number of groups in this country, such as the MacDonald Royal Commission and the Forget Commission and the House Commission in Newfoundland, have proposed that the funds for training actually be put into the hands of the student so that he or she is empowered to buy the kind of training they want, where they want it, and when they want it. This legislation, then, is a step in the right direction.

It will redirect funds towards self-employment so that people can find alternatives for themselves. I know that for people in the North and in the Atlantic Canada, alternatives may not be plentiful, but they are there. I know of fishermen who are actors today, fishermen who are in the singing business, and fishermen who are in the tourist business. Fishermen and other people are finding alternatives for themselves. That is possible if we help them create their own jobs. That is what this legislation will do.

Those are my reasons for voting against this motion. I have no problem with a committee travelling, in principle. I have been on committees that have travelled and on committees that have not travelled. I submit that it does not necessarily add to the quality of the report for the committee to travel from place to place, the members dragging their bodies around until they are tired, and perhaps not performing up to their capacity.

We will give this legislation a fair, just, thorough, and reasonable hearing. We hope that many Canadians will listen, respond and participate. I hope in particular that Senator Simard continues to participate in the committee, as he did last night. We can promise him even better suppers in future, and we can promise him debate. I hope that he attends, because I will enjoy debating with him. I encourage him to attend because we will give this legislation a thorough hearing here in Ottawa.

**Hon. Jean-Maurice Simard:** Honourable senators —

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable senators, I wish to inform the Senate that if the Honourable Senator Simard speaks now, his speech will have the effect of closing the debate on this motion.

[Translation]

**Senator Simard:** Honourable senators, you will see that I waited a few seconds before getting up. I was expecting to hear

more senators from the other side of the house. We have heard little from them on this motion in the past two weeks.

We will have to settle for these explanations. Canadians will have to settle for the explanations Senator Rompkey has just given us, in order to find out the true reasons for their position on this motion. How much time do I have, Mr. Speaker?

**The Hon. the Speaker:** You have 15 minutes, Senator Simard. You started at 3:15 p.m., about a minute ago.

**Senator Simard:** Senator Rompkey has referred to the fact that such a trip by the committee to the Atlantic region, as well as to other regions might cost \$80,000.

To justify the position of his party, he pointed out that there was massive public support. He referred to certain polls that had apparently been held in support of this.

I would like to remind honourable senators that costs cannot be brought into it. A refusal by his party could not be justified by a supposedly massive public support.

If there is massive public support for this bill, how is it that a mere month or two ago the Minister of Human Resources Development, Mr. Young, was prepared to spend up to \$2 million to sell the public on what a good bill this is?

It appears that this massive support does not exist, and if there is any support, massive it is not. The support is probably lukewarm and weak, seeing that the clauses and amendments to Bill C-12 are not well known, and particularly since they do nothing to allay the public's concerns.

I would point out that, when I spoke particularly about the Atlantic or Maritime provinces, I was counting on the support of the senators on both sides of the house to assist me in my arguments to convince this committee to visit other regions. I have sometimes referred to Quebec and other provinces. It is not a question of costs. Even at a cost of \$200,000, I consider that this would have been money well spent, a good investment. It would have enabled people to be heard, since they are the ones who will have to live with the harmful effects of this bill.

[English]

It cannot be a question of money, and there is no massive support.

• (1520)

There is no need to remind honourable senators that it is the intention of this government to ram this bill down the throats of Atlantic Canada, Pacific Canada and Central Canada at any cost because, as we just found out, time is a factor. That was just confirmed by Senator Rompkey. We are told that they have no time. We are told that they have no money. Of course, we know that.

Honourable senators, Senate committees have been travelling to Paris, Toronto, Vancouver and to exotic islands, but this committee does not have the money to go to the peninsula, to P.E.I., or to Rivière-du-Loup. There is money to fly some senators and some elected members of Parliament to exotic destinations. When it comes to tasting food in Paris, Japan or Toronto, money appears to be no object. I can tell honourable senators that I am sick and tired of that.

Honourable senators, this bill has been presented by the most arrogant Liberal government since the days of C.D. Howe. We know those were the days when we had an arrogant government.

**Senator MacEachen:** No, a good government.

**Senator Simard:** Canadians were shocked when C.D. Howe uttered the words "What's a million?" Now we hear, "What's \$6 billion in extra taxes?" These are additional taxes that employees and employers have had to pay for the last three years. These taxes have caused, not a deficit, but a surplus in that fund since 1994-95. By the end of 1996, even without this bill, that fund will have accumulated a total of \$11.6 billion. We do not need it.

Honourable senators, this bill will compound the problem. As a matter of fact, it will confirm that the employers will have to pay \$4.20 per \$100 to their employees and that, for new employees, employers will have to pay from the first hour.

Mr. Young and Mr. Martin were very pleased with themselves when they announced a five-cent reduction starting in a few months. I submit to you that the present rates, with the cuts to the deficit and the clawback on the backs of seasonal workers, among others, will allow the perpetuation of a system. This bill could be amended to reduce the rates of low-income employees or perhaps all employees covered by the fund. The rates for employers could be chopped immediately by 20 per cent. That is the only reason this bill needs amendment now — not next year and not two years from now. We do not need the discretionary power of the minister to make reductions of five cents or ten cents an hour. Honourable senators, if the Senate takes the time to grant an immediate 20 per cent decrease in the rates, we will have accomplished something.

The Bank of Canada, among others, has stated that a payroll tax is a killer of jobs. If this UI rate system is not a killer of jobs given present rates, I wonder if a payroll tax is more devastating.

Yes, honourable senators, this bill comes from the most arrogant Liberal government since the days of C.D. Howe. Yet, I and my colleagues on this side have offered four opportunities so that a Liberal senator, or two or three, from whatever region, could join with us and allow the committee to travel.

First, the steering committee of the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology voted no to our suggestion that the committee travel. That was two weeks ago, and, poof, right away the clerk, who did not miss a step,

phoned everyone, telling the world that the senators would not be travelling. Then, three or four days later, the members of Senator DeWare's committee were given an opportunity to introduce another motion to the full committee. It is interesting that five or six Liberal senators voted against that motion, for the second time denying citizens the opportunity to be heard.

This motion has been on the Order Paper of the Senate for the past 10 days or 12 days, with no sign of Liberal senators changing their position. As a result, I moved a motion yesterday before the committee as it was being televised. I do not care if it was seen by anyone. Perhaps it was shown in the Maritimes at 3 a.m. Six senators on the Liberal side, two from New Brunswick, said no to our suggestion that Canadians be heard.

• (1530)

We will vote on my motion today. I have not lost hope yet. Maybe I am still as naive as I was at the age of 20 or 25, long before I entered politics. I hope I am wrong and that I am realistic enough in my hope that some senators will change their minds today. I wish I could count on the support of some independent senators who at times have joined the majority or the minority to support matters before the Senate and voted according to their conscience. I have not lost hope that they will do so on this occasion.

In the Senate, we must do the job of which we are capable. We have demonstrated that we are capable of meaningful and complete study. There is nothing we can do about the House of Commons. I was at the Social Affairs Committee meeting last night. The National Anti-Poverty Association informed us that the House of Commons gave them 48 hours to prepare a submission. They are short-staffed so they did not show up. However, they appreciated our efforts and they came yesterday to appear before our committee.

[Translation]

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable senator, I regret to interrupt, but I must inform you that your 15 minutes are up.

**Senator Simard:** May I continue? I would need another 10 minutes or so.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Is leave granted?

**Hon. Senators:** Agreed.

**Senator Simard:** Honourable senators, I hope that the senators from both sides of this house will take advantage of this fourth opportunity to express their opinions on this employment insurance bill. This is a bad bill. It has been described by some as, and I quote:

[English]

It was the biggest hold-up ever legislated on the Hill in many years.

I invite Senator Rompkey to convince me that there is massive support for this bill. It could be the right-wingers, because they know that it is a direct tax, as I said earlier, which could be reduced immediately. As a matter of fact, last night representatives from the Canadian Construction Association requested that this fund be limited and not be permitted to grow beyond \$3 billion.

I submit to you that even without Bill C-12, at this very moment that fund is at \$2.5 billion and growing. In fact, before the end of December of this year — assuming that there was a surplus of \$700 million at the first of the year — the fund will have accumulated \$5 billion or \$6 billion.

At this point in the year — that is, as I stand in this chamber now — we have already reached the goal of \$3 billion suggested by the Canadian Construction Association last night.

[*Translation*]

I alluded to a possible 20 per cent reduction in employer and employee contributions. This would be a good way to lessen the tax burden and give the impetus required to create jobs.

It is said this government is the most arrogant one of the last 30 or 40 years. It is a government that was elected under false pretences. During the last election campaign, Mr. Martin and others — Senator Bryden may have been one of them — were telling people that the reform implemented by the Mulroney government, with Mr. Valcourt and Mr. Mazankowski, had created a huge problem in the Atlantic region and elsewhere in Canada. The Conservative government had dared put some order in the system to make sure that people voluntarily leaving their jobs would not be eligible for unemployment insurance benefits.

This was not mentioned in the Red Book. This group was giving indications that, perhaps, it wanted to go back to the good old Liberal days. In fact the Liberal government made things even worse, not only for people in the Atlantic region, but for people all over Canada.

Under the pretext of helping students during the summer, the government will now make them pay contributions on their first hour of work. But the government does not say that 75 per cent of these 500,000 new UI contributors will not be eligible for benefits, because they will not have worked long enough. As for the employers' contribution, it will remain in the fund — yet another tax. Senator Rompkey alluded to this earlier.

I hope the motion will be supported by the Senate. Should this not be the case, I will go to New Brunswick, to Prince Edward Island and elsewhere to condemn the employment insurance legislation, and to try to get suggestions from the public to improve the bill and promote true employment insurance reform.

Make no mistake about our intentions. We want an honest and comprehensive reform that will take into account needs and

employment availability in all regions of the country and, since I represent an Atlantic region, particularly in the Maritime provinces.

I hope we really have a free vote in the Senate this afternoon. I hope several senators who are seasoned parliamentarians will not let their party gag them.

Needless to say, if I have been insisting on this bill for five or six months, it is because I believe in a comprehensive and beneficial reform that will promote employment and eliminate abuse.

[*English*]

Bill C-12 fails to meet the objective that the government set for itself a few years ago. I beg honourable senators to agree with me that it is better to let the bill stand for six months rather than to deal with it as amended now.

[*Translation*]

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable senators, it has been moved by the Honourable Senator Simard, and 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 and from place to place in Canada when it begins consideration of Bill C-12, An Act respecting employment insurance in Canada.

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

[*English*]

**Some Hon. Senators:** Yes.

**Some Hon. Senators:** No.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Will those honourable senators in favour of the motion please say “yea”?

**Some Hon. Senators:** Yea.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Will those honourable senators opposed to the motion please say “nay”?

**Some Hon. Senators:** Nay.

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

*And two honourable senators having risen.*

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable senators, I am advised by the whips that they have agreed to a 30-minute bell. The vote will therefore take place at 4:10 p.m.

Please call in the senators.

• <sup>(1610)</sup>

Motion negated on the following division:

#### YEAS

##### THE HONOURABLE SENATORS

|            |                                  |
|------------|----------------------------------|
| Andreychuk | Kinsella                         |
| Atkins     | Lavoie-Roux                      |
| Beaudoin   | LeBreton                         |
| Bolduc     | Lynch-Staunton                   |
| Cogger     | Macdonald ( <i>Cape Breton</i> ) |
| Comeau     | MacDonald ( <i>Halifax</i> )     |
| DeWare     | Oliver                           |
| Di Nino    | Ottenheimer                      |
| Doody      | Phillips                         |
| Doyle      | Prud'homme                       |
| Forrestall | Rivest                           |
| Grimard    | Rossiter                         |
| Gustafson  | Simard                           |
| Jessiman   | Stratton                         |
| Kelly      | Tkachuk—30                       |

#### NAYS

##### THE HONOURABLE SENATORS

|                  |             |
|------------------|-------------|
| Anderson         | Lewis       |
| Austin           | Losier-Cool |
| Bacon            | MacEachen   |
| Bonnell          | Marchand    |
| Bosa             | Pearson     |
| Bryden           | Perrault    |
| Carstairs        | Petten      |
| Cools            | Poulin      |
| Corbin           | Riel        |
| Davey            | Rizzuto     |
| De Bané          | Robichaud   |
| Fairbairn        | Rompkey     |
| Forest           | Roux        |
| Gigantès         | Stanbury    |
| Grafstein        | Stewart     |
| Haidasz          | Stollery    |
| Hébert           | Watt        |
| Hervieux-Payette | Wood        |
| Landry           | Milne—38    |

#### ABSTENTIONS

##### THE HONOURABLE SENATORS

Nil

#### BUSINESS OF THE SENATE

**Hon. Richard J. Stanbury (Acting Deputy Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, I have had some discussions with my friends opposite, and we have agreed that all further items on the Order Paper should stand.

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

**Hon. Marcel Prud'homme:** Honourable senators, Senator Stanbury said that he has the agreement of this side, and I wish to draw to his attention that not everyone on this side has agreed.

**Senator Stanbury:** My apologies.

**Senator Prud'homme:** However, because of my long-time friendship with Senator Stanbury, I am willing to overlook his oversight this time and offer my agreement.

**Senator Stanbury:** Then all further items will stand.

The Senate adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m.

## CONTENTS

Wednesday, June 5, 1996

|   | PAGE |   | PAGE |
|---|------|---|------|
| <b>SENATORS' STATEMENTS</b>   |      | <b>National Unity</b>   |      |
| <b>The Honourable John M. Macdonald, Q.C.</b>                           |      | Creation of Special Senate Committee—Government Policy.       |      |
| Felicitations on Ninetieth Birthday. Senator Lynch-Staunton . . .       | 540  | Senator Beaudoin . . . . .                                    | 544  |
| Senator Fairbairn . . . . .   | 541  | Senator Fairbairn . . . . .                                   | 544  |
| Senator Macdonald . . . . .   | 541  | <b>Foreign Affairs</b>  |      |
| <hr/>   |      | Reduction in International Aid—Government Policy.             |      |
| <b>ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS</b>  |      | Senator Di Nino . . . . .                                     | 545  |
| <b>Civil Air Navigation Services Commercialization Bill (Bill C-20)</b> |      | Senator Fairbairn . . . . .                                   | 545  |
| First Reading. . . . .  | 542  | <b>Human Rights</b>   |      |
| <b>Agriculture and Forestry</b>   |      | Signing of Convention of Organization of American States—     |      |
| Committee Authorized to Permit Electronic Coverage.                     |      | Government Position. Senator Di Nino . . . . .                |      |
| Senator Gustafson . . . . .   | 542  | Senator Fairbairn . . . . .                                   | 545  |
| <b>Foreign Affairs</b>  |      | <b>Justice</b>  |      |
| Committee Authorized to Meet During Sitting of the Senate.              |      | Investigation into Sale of Airbus Aircraft to Air Canada—     |      |
| Senator Stewart . . . . .   | 542  | Authorization for Correspondence to Swiss Authorities—        |      |
| <b>Fisheries</b>  |      | Procedure Required to be Followed—Government Position.        |      |
| Notice of Motion to Authorize Committee to Engage Services.             |      | Senator Tkachuk . . . . .                                     | 545  |
| Senator Comeau . . . . .  | 542  | Senator Fairbairn . . . . .                                   | 545  |
| <b>Precincts of Parliament</b>  |      | <b>Foreign Affairs</b>  |      |
| Designation of Room 160-S as Aboriginal Peoples Room—                   |      | International Centre for Human Rights                         |      |
| Notice of Motion. Senator Phillips . . . . .                            |      | and Democratic Development—Travel Pattern of                  |      |
| 542   |      | President—Government Position. Senator Bolduc . . . . .       |      |
| <b>Justice</b>  |      | Senator Fairbairn . . . . .                                   | 546  |
| Investigation into Sale of Airbus Aircraft to Air Canada—               |      | Senator Bolduc . . . . .                                      | 546  |
| Notice of Inquiry. Senator Cools . . . . .                              |      | Senator Fairbairn . . . . .                                   | 546  |
| 542   |      | <b>Employment Insurance Bill (Bill C-12)</b>                  |      |
| <b>Social Affairs, Science and Technology</b>                           |      | Motion for Committee to Adjourn from Place to Place—          |      |
| Committee Authorized to Meet During Sitting of the Senate.              |      | Possibility of Free Vote—Government Position.                 |      |
| Senator DeWare . . . . .  | 543  | Senator Simard . . . . .                                      | 546  |
| <b>Criminal Code of Canada</b>  |      | Senator Fairbairn . . . . .                                   | 547  |
| Section 43—Notice of Inquiry. Senator Carstairs . . . . .               |      | <b>Delayed Answers to Oral Questions</b>                      |      |
| 543   |      | Senator Stanbury . . . . .                                    |      |
| <hr/>   |      | 547   |      |
| <b>QUESTION PERIOD</b>  |      | <b>Immigration</b>  |      |
| <b>National Defence</b>   |      | Deportation of Member of Alleged Terrorist Organization—      |      |
| Failure to Establish Militia Training Centre at                         |      | Declaration of Federal Court of Canada.                       |      |
| Cornwallis Park, Nova Scotia—Government Position.                       |      | Question by Senator Di Nino.                                  |      |
| Senator Comeau . . . . .  | 543  | Senator Stanbury (Delayed Answer) . . . . .                   | 547  |
| Senator Fairbairn . . . . .   | 543  | <b>Health</b>   |      |
| <b>Goods and Services Tax</b>   |      | Banning of Sales of Bovine Growth Hormone by OECD—            |      |
| Harmonization with Provincial Sales Taxes—Review of Issue               |      | Labelling of Products Containing Hormone—Government Position. |      |
| on Agenda for First Ministers Conference—Government Position.           |      | Question by Senator Spivak                                    |      |
| Senator Forrestall . . . . .  | 544  | Senator Stanbury (Delayed Answer) . . . . .                   | 548  |
| Senator Fairbairn . . . . .   | 544  | <b>Transport</b>  |      |
| <hr/>   |      | New Brunswick—Re-routing of Trans-Canada Highway—             |      |
|   |      | Environmental Impact on Wetlands—Disparity in Reaction        |      |
|   |      | Between Current and Retired Defence Personnel—                |      |
|   |      | Government Position.  |      |
|   |      | Question by Senator Robertson                                 |      |
|   |      | Senator Stanbury (Delayed Answer) . . . . .                   | 549  |

|  | PAGE |   | PAGE |
|--|------|---|------|
| <b>Order Paper and Notice Paper</b>                |      |   |      |
| Amendment to Notice of Inquiry. ....               | 550  | Senator Haidasz .....   | 551  |
| Senator Cools .....                                | 550  |   |      |
| <hr/>  |      |   |      |
| <b>ORDERS OF THE DAY</b>                           |      |   |      |
| <b>Canadian Human Rights Act (Bill C-33)</b>       |      | <b>Social Affairs, Science and Technology</b>   |      |
| Bill To Amend—Third Reading. Senator Haidasz ..... | 550  | Employment Insurance Bill—Motion to Authorize Committee<br>to Adjourn From Place to Place During Study Negatived. |      |
| Motion in Amendment. ....                          | 551  | Senator Rompkey .....   | 553  |
|  |      | Senator Simard .....  | 555  |
|  |      | <b>Business of the Senate</b>   |      |
|  |      | Senator Stanbury .....  | 558  |
|  |      | Senator Prud'homme .....  | 558  |



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