



CANADA

# Debates of the Senate

---

2nd SESSION

•

35th PARLIAMENT

•

VOLUME 135

•

NUMBER 49

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Tuesday, November 5, 1996**

---

**THE HONOURABLE GILDAS L. MOLGAT  
SPEAKER**

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

## CONTENTS

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

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

---

Published by the Senate

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

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

## THE SENATE

Tuesday, November 5, 1996

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

Prayers.

### VISITORS IN THE GALLERY

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable senators, before I call for Senators' Statements, I should like to draw to your attention two distinguished groups in our gallery today.

First, we have with us a parliamentary delegation from Barbados. I am pleased to introduce the Honourable Cynthia Y. Ford, Senator, Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Education, Youth Affairs and Culture of the Senate of Barbados, accompanied by Mr. Duncan Carter and Mr. Denis St. Elmo Kellman, who are Members of the House of Assembly of Barbados.

Welcome to our Senate chamber.

We are also honoured to have with us today a delegation from the Parliament of Finland. This delegation comprises the constitutional affairs committee of that Parliament. They are here for meetings with the constitutional affairs committees of both the Senate and the House of Commons. They are led by Mr. Vile Itala, the president.

Welcome to our Senate chamber. We are delighted to have you visit us in Canada.

### PAGES EXCHANGE PROGRAM WITH HOUSE OF COMMONS.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable senators, in continuation of our exchange program of pages with the House of Commons, I should like to introduce to you the two pages who are here with us for the week of November 4 to November 8.

[*Translation*]

Lise Jolicoeur, who hails from the village of Lorette in the beautiful province of Manitoba, is studying at the Faculty of Arts of the University of Ottawa.

[*English*]

We have from Iqaluit in the Northwest Territories, Fawn Fritzen. Fawn is enrolled at Carleton University in the Faculty of Arts, majoring in economics.

On behalf of all the senators, I bid you both welcome to the Senate.

---

## SENATORS' STATEMENTS

### VETERANS' WEEK

**Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Deputy Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, the Prime Minister has declared the week of November 3 to 11 to be Veterans' Week. This week, we honour those who fell at the Somme and at Passchendaele, and those brave Canadians who took Vimy Ridge. We honour those of the Second Canadian Division who landed on the beaches of Dieppe. We honour those who kept the Atlantic lifeline open and those who served in the air; all of those brave men and women who pried open the windows of freedom over Europe.

[*Translation*]

We honour the Canadian infantry divisions that suffered heavy losses on the beaches of Normandy. We honour those who served in Korea.

[*English*]

We honour our peacekeepers who, over the decades, have become symbols of hope in countries where hope had often been forgotten. During this week, Canadian veterans will tell their stories in schools across the country, educating our young people about Canada's role in those battles.

Last year, the "Canada Remembers" program helped us to focus on a national commemoration of the events that led to the end of the Second World War. For many Canadians, the "Canada Remembers" events provided the first opportunity for them to learn about Canada's exemplary contribution to the successful conclusion of conflicts far beyond our own borders.

We have a responsibility — indeed, a unique opportunity — to build upon the experience of the "Canada Remembers" events, and to emphasize to our young people in particular the horrors of war and the desire to promote lasting peace.

The technological evolution has made it possible to link Canadians with each other across the country through the Internet. The Department of Veterans Affairs has now established a home page on the Internet that includes information on many activities. One section on Canadian military medals and decorations provides information about their significance and the stories of some of the recipients. The Department of Veterans Affairs has even planned a scavenger hunt on the Internet for Veterans' Week, and students will have the opportunity of testing their prowess in surfing the Internet by searching for information relating to the two world wars, the Korean War and, of course, Canada's peacekeeping activities.

During the week, the Department of Veterans Affairs is also launching a contest to design a new home page for the Department of Veterans Affairs website. The prize-winning designs will be selected and placed on the website in the spring of 1997.

The Department of Veterans Affairs has worked with the school net to implement several programs to help teachers and students learn more about our country's history.

For most young Canadians, the reality and the horror of war has never really hit home. Wars tend to be seen as events happening far away and viewed only through the television screen.

[Translation]

However, for many Canadians who fought during the Second World War, the memories have far from faded.

[English]

Some are sitting in this chamber today. We all know that in the struggle for peace, freedom and democracy, there is no room for complacency. Veterans' Week will remind us of that.

We have this wonderful opportunity to make Canadians, and particularly younger Canadians, more conscious of the contribution made by the men and women who brought our colony to nationhood by understanding that there are no shortcuts to freedom.

As Canadians contemplate the unprecedented domestic and global problems our nation faces today, we remember, honour and express our deep gratitude to all those who, with courage as their lifeblood and freedom as their guide, stood in defence of Canada, our home and native land.

[Translation]

### THE HONOURABLE JEAN-LOUIS ROUX

**Hon. Jacques Hébert:** Honourable senators, if I were asked who, among my fellow citizens, I consider the most exemplary defenders of rights and freedoms, I would answer without hesitation: Jean-Louis Roux.

We are the same age and have known each other for 60 years. Like all members of our generation, we were exposed to systematic brainwashing by the nationalists of our time.

Just before the last war, as students at the Collège Sainte-Marie, we were under pressure from some of our Jesuit teachers, to whom the war that was yet to come was just another example of British imperialism, hence justifying demonstrations against conscription. This was the kind of demonstration attended by Jean-Louis Roux and not a racist demonstration as claimed by the members of the Bloc and certain journalists. A few hotheads may have broken the windows of shops owned by Jewish and other merchants, but Jean-Louis Roux was not among them.

We read *Le Devoir*, which told us that Pétain was the man of the hour and De Gaulle a miserable rebel and a traitor. To *Le Devoir*, even the Nazi concentration camps were a product of Allied propaganda.

We were innocent teenagers who had no way of hearing another version of the facts. This little anecdote will give you an idea of the atmosphere. Shortly before war was declared, our Jesuit teachers thought it was perfectly normal to let members of the Nazi party of Adrien Arcand — real ones this time — come to class in their uniforms, a black or brown shirt, I forget which, but I do remember the swastika on the sleeve.

Of course, Jean-Louis Roux had no connection with those people. But I can well imagine that as a stunt, to shock the public, he was capable of taking his pen and drawing a swastika on the sleeve of his white lab coat, but this was inside a small laboratory at the University of Montreal, not in public, as a great democrat Gilles Rhéaume and many others, unfortunately, have said.

With hindsight, in other words, after the readers of *Le Devoir* had been forced to acknowledge the horrors of Nazism, we can say this was a stupid gesture, as Jean-Louis Roux himself admitted.

What is extraordinary is that, together with a certain number of his contemporaries, he recognized very early that Nazism and Fascism in all their forms were an aberration and he became a ferocious adversary of racism, any kind of racism.

In the past 50 years, Jean-Louis Roux has always been the first to defend democracy, freedoms and universal peace. Every situation that threatened these fundamental values found him in the front row, on the barricades.

A member of the League of Human Rights, he was one of the leaders of the famous strike at Radio-Canada, side by side with René Lévesque, my dear Mr. Rhéaume! He protested against the War Measures Act, in spite of his friendship with Pierre Elliott Trudeau. He braved public opinion to defend freedom of expression by playing *Les fées ont soif*. He was one of the pillars of Artists for Peace, of which he was honorary president until quite recently. He defended Canada — well before the referendum — against attacks from the separatists, which took more than just courage for an artist who had to earn a living in an environment where the majority was separatist.

Truly, Jean-Louis Roux is a man whose chivalry and absolute fearlessness have vastly irritated the separatists and other crypto-separatists. They could not accept that his new duties gave him certain legal powers, which is extremely annoying to those who would like to impose the separation of Quebec, even by illegal means.

On the occasion of the funeral of Robert Bourassa, people who were there welcomed with applause — in a church, oh horrors — the arrival of political figures. Who got the most applause? Jean-Louis Roux, and rightly so.

The resignation of this profoundly honourable man is the triumph of stupidity, ignorance, malevolence and intolerance.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Tuesday, November 5, 1996

### STATE OF FINANCIAL SYSTEM

REPORT OF BANKING, TRADE AND COMMERCE COMMITTEE  
REQUESTING AUTHORIZATION TO TRAVEL FOR PURPOSE  
OF PURSUING STUDY PRESENTED

**Hon. Michael Kirby**, Chairman of the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce, presented the following report:

Tuesday, November 5, 1996

The Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce has the honour to present its

#### TENTH REPORT

Your Committee, which was authorized by the Senate on Thursday, March 21, 1996, to examine and report upon the present state of the financial system in Canada, and for which a budget was approved by the Standing Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration on Thursday, May 30<sup>th</sup>, 1996 respectfully requests that it be empowered to adjourn from place to place outside Canada for the purpose of pursuing its study of the question of professional liability and in particular to meet with British government officials; Professor Andrew Burrows, the author of a feasibility investigation of joint and several liability; and underwriters and brokers from the international insurance markets.

This request does not entail any new funding as all the expenses can be met through the existing and already approved budget.

Respectfully submitted,

MICHAEL KIRBY  
*Chairman*

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

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

### YUKON QUARTZ MINING ACT YUKON PLACER MINING ACT

BILL TO AMEND—REPORT OF COMMITTEE

**Hon. A. Raynell Andreychuk**, Deputy Chair of the Standing Senate Committee on Aboriginal Peoples, presented the following report:

The Standing Senate Committee on Aboriginal People has the honour to present its

#### SECOND REPORT

Your Committee, to which was referred the Bill C-6, An act to amend the Yukon Quartz Mining Act and the Yukon Placer Mining Act, has, in obedience to the Order of Reference of Wednesday, October 23, 1996, examined the said Bill and now reports the same without amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

A. RAYNELL ANDREYCHUK  
*Deputy Chair*

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

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

• (1420)

#### ADJOURNMENT

**Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Deputy Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, with leave of the Senate and notwithstanding rule 58(1)(h), I move:

That when the Senate adjourns today, it do stand adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 6, 1996, at one thirty o'clock in the afternoon.

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

**Hon. Senators:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

#### FOREIGN AFFAIRS

COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO MEET  
DURING SITTING OF THE SENATE

**Hon. John B. Stewart**, Chairman of the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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 4 p.m. today, Tuesday, November 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.

## QUESTION PERIOD

### THE SENATE

ABSENCE OF GOVERNMENT LEADER

**Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Deputy Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, unfortunately, Senator Fairbairn is not with us today. She is ill at home. It is to be hoped that she will be with us tomorrow, or later in the week.

I would be happy to take any questions as notice.

**Senator Lynch-Staunton:** Does that mean we will get answers?

### JUSTICE

SALE OF AIRBUS AIRCRAFT TO AIR CANADA—  
ALLEGED CONSPIRACY TO DEFRAUD FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—  
KNOWLEDGE OF GOVERNMENT MINISTERS—  
REQUEST FOR PARTICULARS—REQUEST FOR ANSWER

**Hon. R. James Balfour:** Honourable senators, on December 12, 1995, I put the following question to the government:

Would my honourable friend tell us precisely on what dates the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General became aware of the government-to-government communication, addressed under the letterhead of the Minister of Justice, to the authorities of the Swiss government concerning the Airbus matter?

I have since received a reply to the effect that the Minister of Justice became aware of the request on November 4, 1995. However, I have still not received a response to my question as it pertains to the Solicitor General.

Would my honourable friend the Deputy Leader of the Government look into this matter and let me know when I might have an answer to the balance of my question?

**Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Deputy Leader of the Government):** Yes, I would be happy to do so, and I will do so today.

### DELAYED ANSWERS TO ORAL QUESTIONS

**Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Deputy Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, I have a response to questions raised in the Senate on December 13, 1995, by the Honourable Senator Andreychuk and the Honourable Senator Rivest regarding the distinct society motion.

## QUEBEC

DISTINCT SOCIETY MOTION—LEGAL OPINION SOUGHT ON  
INTERPRETATION OF WORDING— GOVERNMENT POSITION

*(Responses to questions raised by Hon. A. Raynell Andreychuk and Hon. Jean-Claude Rivest on December 13, 1995)*

The constitutional and international lawyers in the Department of Justice and the lawyers in the Department of Foreign Affairs have advised over the years on the legal meaning of the term “people” (“peoples”) as it appears in various international and domestic contexts. The sense in which the expression “people of Quebec” is used in the context of the resolution is that of *vox populi* — the people directly or through elected representatives having expressed a desire for Quebec’s recognition as a distinct society within Canada. The term “people of Quebec” in this context is not used in the sense of an identifiable collectivity that may assert rights such as the right to self-determination.

The Department of Justice lawyers involved in the drafting of the resolution advised as above on the meaning of the phrase, being of the opinion that the phrase neither opened the possibility of being used as a basis for claims to international recognition nor as a means of diminishing the rights of aboriginal peoples.

There are very few examples of the use of the expression “aboriginal people” or equivalent outside Canada. A copy of these examples follows.

There are some examples of the use of the expression “aboriginal people” in the Statutes of Canada, as well as some examples of the expression “native people.”

The expression generally found in the Statutes of Canada is “aboriginal peoples of Canada” as in Section 35 of the *Constitution Act, 1982*.

There are no examples of the expression “Acadian people.”

INTERNATIONAL EXAMPLES OF THE TERM  
“ABORIGINAL PEOPLE” (OR EQUIVALENTS)

Costa Rica, apparently uses the term “Indigenous populations” to describe the descendants of the tribes or sub-tribes that inhabited the country at the time of the Spanish conquest and who today live in certain isolated areas and live in traditional ways.

Sami, in Norway, in the Constitution, 1988, are referred to as a “Sami population”.

In Sweden they refer to the status of the Sami as a “minority and indigenous population”.

The Venezuelan constitution uses the term “people” (*pueblo* in Spanish) to refer to all the inhabitants of the Venezuelan state.

Brazil amended its constitution in 1988, including a chapter titled “Concerning the Indians”.

Chile has legal but not constitutional recognition of the existence of the “Indigenous” and recognizes “Indigenous communities” and “organizations”.

Guatemala, in its constitution has a number of articles which deal with Indigenous rights, and refers to “Indigenous communities”, and “Indigenous groups”.

Nicaragua refers to “Communities of the Atlantic coast” which is the Indigenous territory.

Mexico, in 1993 revised its Constitution to refer to its “Indigenous peoples”. (unofficial translation)

Australia, apparently refers to “Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people” in its *Native Title Act, 1993*, in the portion establishing a tribunal.

The U.S. Constitution refers in Section 8 to “The Congress shall have Power [...] To Regulate Commerce [...] with the Indian Tribes”.

Canadian labour markets. Among the most notable are the many increases that have taken place in minimum wage rates set by provinces and territories. In fact, over the last 10 years, every single one of the provinces and territories has upgraded its minimum wage legislation — in some cases more than once.

There is a wide range of minimum wage rates in existence across Canada. In British Columbia, for example, the minimum wage is \$7 per hour. In Alberta and Newfoundland, it is \$5 per hour. Other provinces are somewhere in between these two levels. At a rate of \$4 per hour, the federal legislation is no longer in tune with any of the provinces, or with marketplace realities. In fact, the provinces really have the lead on the issue of minimum wage rates since they have jurisdiction over some 98 per cent of such workers in Canada.

As in other aspects of economic and social policy, there are both federal and provincial areas of jurisdictional responsibility in the national labour market. The federal government is specifically responsible for workers in those industries that fall under the Canada Labour Code; the provinces and territories for the others. In reality, the industries that do fall under the federal labour code, such as transportation, telecommunications, banks and some Crown corporations, have relatively few workers at minimum wage rates. Recent estimates show that less than one-tenth of one per cent of Canadian workers fall into this category.

Nevertheless, employees under the federal as compared with provincial jurisdictions should not be disadvantaged under the law. Therefore in the interests of fairness alone, we are compelled to bring the federal minimum wage rate into line with the others so that it is at a more realistic level.

That is one of the things that this bill will do. By linking the federal minimum rate to those of the provinces and territories, it ensures that the federal minimum wage rate will not be out of tune with comparable minimum wage levels under provincial or territorial jurisdiction.

This linkage of the federal minimum wage to the provincial and territorial rates is an important feature of this legislation. First of all, it is a departure from the traditional approach of having the federal government set one rate to apply anywhere in Canada. This legislation recognizes that there are differences in labour markets and in social and economic conditions in different parts of the country. As well, it acknowledges that provincial and territorial governments are in the best position to establish minimum wage rates consistent with local and regional needs.

• (1430)

As noted earlier, over the last ten years, all of the provincial and territorial governments have set their own levels for minimum wage rates within their own jurisdictions. The current federal rate, which was set to reflect rates in effect in the provinces and territories as of July 17, 1996, is still not in harmony with any of them.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### CANADA LABOUR CODE

#### BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING—DEBATE ADJOURNED

**Hon. Peter Bosa** moved the second reading of Bill C-35, to amend the Canada Labour Code (minimum wage).

He said: Honourable senators, I am pleased to present to the Senate the amendments to the Canada Labour Code relating to the minimum wage for workers under federal jurisdiction.

Bill C-35 harmonizes federal-provincial minimum wage legislation with that of the provinces and territories by automatically aligning the federal minimum wage with the general adult minimum wage in each of the provinces and territories. This completes the Liberal government’s promise to raise the federal minimum wage rate from the level of \$4 per hour as of July 17, 1996, a rate which was set 10 years ago, and which has become practically irrelevant in today’s market.

Bill C-35 provides the opportunity to make the necessary amendments to the Canada Labour Code in order to implement what we began through legislation in July. Passage of this bill will allow the government both to improve the fairness and to enhance the efficiency of our federal minimum wage legislation.

Since the Government of Canada dealt with minimum wage legislation in the mid-1980s, there have been many changes in

Once passed, this bill will automatically incorporate any changes to provincial and territorial rates into the general adult federal minimum wage rate for workers under federal jurisdiction, so that those under the Canada Labour Code will not be at a disadvantage to those working under other legislative jurisdictions. At the same time, the new legislation establishes the principle that those who are working under federal jurisdiction, no matter where in the country, have the right to be treated fairly vis-à-vis the labour market conditions in their region. Thus, a worker in an industry under federal jurisdiction should not be disadvantaged under law when compared with a worker in an industry under provincial or territorial minimum wage legislation. Honourable senators, this is a matter of practical common sense and fairness. By aligning federal minimum wage rates with local practices, the bill will bring greater harmony to workplace standards in Canada.

Honourable senators, the bill also introduces other positive changes. For example, in addition to acknowledging the important role that the provinces have in labour market matters, and especially in tailoring labour market legislation to regional market needs, the changes brought forward in Bill C-35 will introduce a new efficiency into the federal legislative process. By automatically linking the federal minimum wage with the comparable provincial or territorial minimum wage, the federal government will not be obliged to react to every provincial or territorial change with new amendments to the Canada Labour Code.

Under the present legislation, in order to meet the objective of remaining current with regional labour market changes as reflected by changes to provincial and territorial minimum wage rates, the Government of Canada must introduce a new amendment to the Canada Labour Code every time there is a change in a province or territory. Continuing with the current system, honourable senators, would require amendment upon amendment, and paper upon paper. It has been broadly recognized that the system needs to be changed, and now we have the means to do it. Thus, this new legislation gives us an opportunity to make the federal minimum wage law more efficient, responsive and fair.

Honourable senators, this legislation acknowledges the lead role that the provinces have in setting rates consistent with their perception and knowledge of regional labour market needs. By harmonizing the federal minimum wage rates with those set by individual provinces, the new approach avoids the use of the heavy hand of federal authority where it is not needed.

I want also to emphasize that this does not mean that the federal government is withdrawing from this area of labour law, or that it is abandoning either its responsibility or its right to set federal minimum wage rates. In fact, with Bill C-35, the federal government specifically retains its right and authority under the

Canada Labour Code to set a separate federal minimum wage rate when it becomes advisable.

Another aspect of this legislation that I should like to draw to the attention of my honourable colleagues relates to the signal that we send in support of our overall concern with fighting poverty in Canada. A basic objective of any minimum wage legislation is to protect the working poor. Bill C-35 remains consistent with that national objective, and it supports our objective to fight poverty by providing a floor for wage rates in Canada. It also ensures that the federal minimum wage applies equally to youth and young workers, as well as to adults.

Clause 178.(2) of the bill states that where provinces have set rates according to occupation, age or work experience, the general rate will apply. In other words, under the new federal minimum wage legislation, there will be equality of treatment for all workers. Thus, in cases where there are different federal and provincial rates based on age, for example, the higher of the minimum rates will apply under federal jurisdiction. In addition to introducing administrative efficiencies, the new bill ensures that all employees under federal jurisdiction, young and old alike, will be treated as equals as far as minimum wage rates are concerned.

As honourable senators know, the new Employment Insurance program, which the government introduced earlier this year, strikes a balance between the need to provide incentives for people to seek work and, at the same time, not imposing a negative burden on employers. This legislation follows a similar philosophy.

To ensure that proposed changes to federal legislation would meet these three objectives, the government has engaged in a broad process of consultation. Because of the feedback from this consultative process, we know we are on the right track. The government has heard from a broad cross-section of stakeholders, and the general reaction to the new legislation is positive. Two of the major employer groups potentially affected by this legislation in both the transportation and banking sectors have indicated that they do not oppose the government initiative.

Labour organizations have acknowledged the move as a small increase long overdue. It is probably fair to say that labour organizations would like to see a higher minimum wage, but the government has balanced its position with the realities of the market in arriving at the current formula.

To sum up, honourable senators, there is broad support for this legislation. It recognizes the federal and provincial and territorial systems for minimum wage rates, it reflects the realities of the marketplace, and it provides future adjustments without recourse to Parliament. I urge honourable senators to support Bill C-35.

On motion of Senator Berntson, debate adjourned.



## NEWFOUNDLAND

### CHANGES TO SCHOOL SYSTEM—AMENDMENT TO TERM 17 OF CONSTITUTION—REPORT OF COMMITTEE— MOTION IN AMENDMENT—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming the debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Rompkey, P.C., seconded by the Honourable Senator De Bané, P.C., for the adoption of the Thirteenth Report of the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs (*amendment to the Constitution of Canada, Term 17 of the Terms of Union of Newfoundland with Canada*), deposited with the Clerk of the Senate on July 17, 1996;

And on the motion in amendment of the Honourable Senator Doody, seconded by the Honourable Senator Kinsella, that the Report be not now adopted but that it be amended by deleting the words “without amendment, but with a dissenting opinion” and substituting therefor the following:

with the following amendment:

Delete the words in paragraph (b) of Term 17 that precede subparagraph (i) and substitute therefor the words: “where numbers warrant,”;

And on the subamendment of the Honourable Senator Cogger, seconded by the Honourable Senator Bolduc, that the motion in amendment be amended by substituting for the words “with the following amendment:” the words “with the following amendments: (a)” and by removing the period at the end thereof and adding the following words:

; and

(b) Delete the words “to direct” in paragraph (c) of Term 17 and substitute therefor the words “to determine and to direct”.

**Hon. C. William Doody:** Honourable senators, I should like to speak briefly today in support of the amendment of Senator Cogger on this matter of Term 17, or the new, proposed, Term 17. My honourable friend opposite says that it is a subamendment. However, I do not think that it is any less important than the amendment which I made, although I defer to his judicial prudence. I think I will stick to my term, “amendment.”

This amendment may appear to be rather insignificant in terms of the importance of this whole matter and the wording of the new Term 17. Indeed, this was the impression that the minister in Newfoundland gave us in his testimony to the Senate committee.

He said that the inclusion or the adding of the phrase “to determine” was so insignificant as to make it unnecessary to amend the proposed new Term 17 with this phrase.

However, there are others, honourable senators, who feel quite differently; they feel that this is a matter of major importance. Mr. Binnie, a very prominent and, I suspect, a very expensive lawyer retained by the province of Newfoundland, suggested that the power to direct includes the power to determine. He said:

The only real reason for putting the word “determine” in the proposed new Term 17 would be to cater to lawyers’ love of never settling for one word if two words could do the job.

This is really not worthy of Mr. Binnie. I suspect that he knows that the issue is far more important than this.

• (1440)

Let me tell you, honourable senators, what Mr. Colin Irving had to say in his brief to the Senate committee. He says that the *Oxford Dictionary* and *Black’s Law Dictionary* are to the contrary in their definitions of the term “to determine.” On page 8, section 20 of Mr. Irving’s brief, he quotes a high court ruling on this very matter. The key issue before the court was whether the pre-Confederation rights “to regulate the course of study” included the right “to determine” the course of study. The court found that it did not have the right to regulate the course of study. It was found to be limited to the right to implement and monitor but not to determine the curriculum. This is vital to the struggle that is now going on in terms of the constitutional amendment in Newfoundland.

In order for the authorities representing the various concerned denominations to have input into the guiding of the school system to which they feel so bound, both the right to direct and the right to determine are necessary. This is a matter of great importance to the minorities concerned, and I would urge honourable senators to adopt Senator Cogger’s amendment.

There are one or two other points that are relevant to the matter before us, and I would ask for your indulgence to address them. I refer specifically to Senator Stanbury’s comments of a few days ago in which he takes great exception to my interpretation of the new Term 17, paragraphs (a) and (b).

It is quite clear from reading the proposed Term 17 that the intention of the drafters is to put the control over the school system in Newfoundland under the legislature. The amendment will be subjected to provincial legislation and the governance of schools in Newfoundland will be subjected to provincial legislation.

The concerns that I express, honourable senators, are not only mine, but are the concerns of a great many people far more learned than I am.

Let me quote from Dr. Robert J. Carney, Professor Emeritus of the University of Alberta, who said:

As the statement “subject to provincial legislation” would remove the establishment and maintenance...of unidenominational schools from the protection of Canada’s Constitution, it should be deleted from the present resolution. Otherwise, the protection of denominational school rates would be subject only to a provincial law of general application.

Colin Irving, who is a gentleman known to all of you as a very prominent legal scholar and authority, on page 4 and 5 in the brief presented to the committee, says about paragraph (b), to which I have referred:

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

I now refer to section 9 on page 5 of Mr. Irving’s brief, which says:

The “right” to establish and maintain —

“right” being the key word here —

— unidenominational schools is thus made entirely subject to provincial legislation. If the Newfoundland legislature were to enact legislation which would, in purpose and effect, make the right to establish or maintain unidenominational schools difficult or impossible, the Roman Catholic and Pentecostal minorities —

And I would add, although he has not said so, the Seventh Day Adventist minority —

— would have no legal remedy provided, only that the law in question was uniformly applicable to all schools. It is not difficult to imagine how such a result could be achieved.

I have also consulted with several prominent and well-respected legal people in St. John’s on this matter. They all assure me there can be no doubt about the intent of the new Term 17.

The clincher, honourable senators, certainly has to be in the testimony presented by the Minister of Education in Newfoundland, the Honourable Roger Grimes, in which he sets out the intentions of the Government of Newfoundland on this matter. He is an admirable gentleman who is honest, straightforward, and up front. Let me read from the presentation that he made to the committee.

Concerning this matter, Minister Grimes points out that the question “subject to provincial legislation” was raised in discussions in the debates in Newfoundland on this proposed new Term 17. I refer to the amendment to change the whole

concept of the clause “subject to provincial legislation that is uniformly applicable to all schools, specifying conditions for the establishment or continued operation of schools” and replacing it with “where numbers warrant.”

Mr. Grimes says:

This issue is the crux of the matter. It dominated debate in the legislature in Newfoundland and Labrador and amendments were moved and defeated, there is no doubt about that. If an amendment were to remove the clause “subject to provincial legislation”...then we need not have gone through this exercise in the province. We need not have troubled the legislature with it. We need not have gone through a referendum. We need not have gone through the House of Commons and we need not be having these hearings. This is the crux of the matter. It would be dishonest for anyone to suggest anything other than this.

Mr. Grimes makes it perfectly clear that denominational education or, indeed, the entire school system in Newfoundland, will be subject to provincial legislation.

This is terrible, from my point of view, as a Newfoundlander committed to the denominational system that we have. It should be of interest to all Canadians, having a provincial statute, a prominent ruling and precedent over a constitutional protection or constitutional clause. I have never heard of this before. Perhaps other people can enlighten me. This document has the audacity to say that the Constitution of Canada will be subject to provincial legislation. That is most interesting.

Senator Stanbury says that this applies only to multi-denominational schools or public schools — which is an easier way for me to describe it — and that is what the government appears to be aiming for. However, this legislation will be of general application to all schools.

Lest there be any doubt in senators’ minds about this, let me assure you there is at the present time a discussion paper being debated at public hearings in the province of Newfoundland. I will read to honourable senators from one section of it, which should put to rest forever the canard that Senator Stanbury has raised before us. It says on the top of page 8, the first paragraph, entitled “Interdenominational schools”:

Under the new interdenominational structure beginning with the 1997-98 school year, schools will be designated interdenominational unless parents of a sufficient number of students express the desire to have their children attend a unidenominational school.

Further on the page it tells us how a school board will designate schools. It says that if the parents of a sufficient number of students indicate that they wish their children to attend a unidenominational school, the school board will be required to establish such a school, provided the following conditions are met.

Here is the hook. It states:

1. The unidenominational school meets the criteria for a viable school and the creation of a unidenominational school does not cause another school to become non-viable.

Think about that, honourable senators. In the beginning of the 1997-98 school year, all schools are designated as multi-denominational. Imagine a community in Newfoundland with 90 per cent of the population of one denomination and 10 per cent of an assortment or perhaps of some other denomination. The representatives of the 90 per cent approach government through a mechanism yet to be determined and apply to have a school designated as unidenominational — which means that 90 per cent of the people of that community are of that one religion. The government looks at the application and says, “We have lots of people who want to attend a denominational school, but if we allow you to go ahead with this, there will only be 10 per cent of the population willing to attend the public school which we have already designated, and that would make the school non-viable. The school which we have already designated as multid denominational would now be non-viable because only 10 per cent of the population want to go there. Therefore, 90 per cent of the people cannot go to that other school; they must all go to our designated multid denominational school. Therefore, you do not fit the criteria.”

• (1450)

This procedure can be applied to just about every community in Newfoundland, with few exceptions. Of course, it all depends on the definition of “viable.” Since the government holds the levers of power in this circumstance, subject to provincial legislation, it can make the regulation, it can define the viability, it can decide how far from the school people have to live and how many of a denomination can be within range of the school. It is a very interesting scenario, and it is very frightening. We do not know that that scenario will occur, but there are a great many people in Newfoundland who fear that it will. I think it is unfair and unjust for the Parliament of Canada to subject them to that possibility. They do not deserve it.

The previous discussion paper put forward by Premier Wells’ government said that 10 per cent of the population would be enough to declare a 90 per cent denominational school non-viable. That was withdrawn. We have no idea what the present administration wants to put forward as a definition of “viable” nor what the school bus routes will be, or where the nearest school will be, or what denomination it will be, and so on. It is all up in the air.

In the discussion paper I spoke about a minute ago, on the page following the one from which I just quoted, they go on to describe a single school in a community or a school which serves students in several communities. They say that if the parents of a sufficient number of students wish the school to be designated

unidenominational, the school board will designate it as such. In such cases, the parents of a required minimum percentage of students would indicate a preference that their children attend a unidenominational school before the school board would be required to designate the school unidenominational. The minimum percentage could be 50 per cent plus 1, 75 per cent, 90 per cent, or whatever they decide it will be.

It is a hodgepodge. It is a mess. In other words, it is a blank cheque for the government because this thing is subject to provincial legislation.

The unkindest cut of all is that when all schools are declared multid denominational, or public, in my estimation it will be up to the parents or the groups of a particular denomination to present the government with proof that they believe it is best for their children to have a denominational school.

Honourable senators, this is a new twist to negative option billing as introduced by Rogers TV. First the government declares that all schools are multid denominational, then parents must prove that they want to have a denominational school. It is quite an interesting new concept in public policy.

Honourable senators, that is the situation in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador today; total government control with input from the minorities, if any, with leave of the government. Small denominations with minuscule numbers of people, like the Seventh-day Adventists, have absolutely no hope. They would have recourse to the courts under the amendment, which suggests that “where numbers warrant” should be included.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable senator Doody, I hesitate to interrupt you, but your 15-minute time period has expired.

**Senator Doody:** Perhaps I could have another two or three minutes, if honourable senators agree.

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

**Hon. Senators:** Agreed.

**Senator Doody:** Thank you, senators. I appreciate that.

Small denominations like the Seventh-day Adventists would have absolutely no hope under this new amendment to Term 17. I think that under the “where numbers warrant” clause they would have recourse to the courts, which is where all constitutional problems should be addressed. They should not be sent to the legislature of a province or a country which has enacted the law which you are appealing. The courts have been the traditional avenue of appeal. Although there are senators here who expressed concern about the fact that Seventh-day Adventists indicated in their testimony at the hearings in Newfoundland that they would not find the “where numbers warrant” amendment helpful, I believe that all honourable

senators have subsequently received a copy of a letter from them stating that they regret having said that in the hearings. The letter was addressed to Senator Carstairs and she very kindly gave me her authority to distribute it to all senators. The Seventh-day Adventists tell us they would be far more comfortable with the "where numbers warrant" addition than they would be having no recourse at all except to the legislature in Newfoundland.

I should like to touch on one or two other very short points before I take my seat. One of them is the question raised by Senator Grafstein following the very rational and sensible speech of Senator Kinsella on this motion. Senator Grafstein asked whether there are constitutionally entrenched rights for people who wish to have their children educated in a secular or non-denominational school. The answer is quite simple and quite accurate, and it is "no."

Honourable senators, let me give a brief history of this entrenchment of Term 17. At the time of the Confederation of Newfoundland and Canada in 1949, various denominations in Newfoundland operated their own schools. There were no other schools, nor was there any demand for other schools. These seven systems were protected by Term 17 of the terms of Confederation. The only other class of people who applied for this right were the Pentecostal Assemblies, in 1981, I believe. This right was promptly extended to them by the Parliament of Canada and the House of Assembly and it was entrenched in Term 17.

There was and is no need to protect secular schools. There are no such schools and no demand for them. I suspect that such a guarantee for Godless schools would never be accepted in Newfoundland, nor, I suspect, would it be accepted in the rest of Canada, as it is accepted in the United States of America.

Honourable senators, another short but important point raised by Senator Rompkey some time ago was to the effect that the various denominations were offered the opportunity to vote by class of people to identify their religious preference in the referendum. I found that quite startling. I was rushing to try to get confirmation because, if that were so, it would make a considerable difference in the situation. I consulted with the leadership of several groups in Newfoundland and received the only correspondence available which even remotely relates to this subject. I have the letter here with me. It is rather short and I think I should read the into the record.

It is a letter dated July 11 from the office of the Premier of Newfoundland, Mr. Clyde Wells, addressed to the Most Reverend James H. MacDonald, Archbishop of St. John's. It states:

Your Grace,

It is my recollection that on occasion during some of our meetings over the last year or so, representatives of the Roman Catholic Church have indicated a preference to see any referendum conducted in a manner that would provide for the votes being counted separately by classes of people.

Recent comments reported in the news media have raised some doubts about this. The government has not yet made a firm decision as to how the vote will be conducted and I would appreciate hearing your thoughts on the matter prior to making that decision.

There was no decision.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,  
Clyde Wells.

The Archbishop of Newfoundland, the Most Reverend James H. MacDonald, replied in a letter dated July 13, which states:

Dear Premier Wells:

This is in response to your letter dated 11 July, 1995.

I have no recollection whatsoever of representatives of the Roman Catholic Church and/or the Government making reference in any of our meetings to a referendum. I recall you saying near the end of our last meeting that the Government "would have to go to the people", and that the manner of consultation would be decided by Cabinet.

I feel that a referendum is inappropriate in that it asks Roman Catholics to vote on the rights of other denominations and asks other denominations to vote on the rights of Roman Catholics.

Yours sincerely,  
Most Reverend James H. MacDonald, C.S.C, D.D.  
Archbishop of St. John's.

There is a similar letter addressed to Pastor King of the Pentecostal Assemblies of Newfoundland, signed by Premier Wells, and there is a slightly different letter addressed to the Churches of Integration, the other churches with denominational rights in Newfoundland. Premier Wells asks for their collective position, or their individual positions, if you prefer. I do not have the reply of the integrated churches. However, it is clear that at no time were the Roman Catholics and Pentecostals invited to have a ballot by class of people. Nor at any time did they commit themselves to agreeing to a referendum. It appears to me that this letter from Premier Wells to these heads of denominations was aimed at getting some sort of commitment, or at least an agreement to a referendum to decide on their rights.

Honourable senators, I have very little else to say on this matter. I thank you for your indulgence, patience and attention. I urge you to accept these amendments to Term 17. It is a major matter. It may not appear all that important to many people in Canada, but a tremendous precedent will be established if, against the wishes of the minorities affected, a constitutional change is enacted to take away the constitutional protection of these minorities.

I ask honourable senators to send this measure back to the House of Commons with these amendments. Let them have another look at it. Let them debate it. Let them send it back to the House of Assembly in Newfoundland. Let them have a sober second look at it and debate it. The people of Newfoundland, by now, should be fully aware of the consequences of this thing. Let us see what happens from there.

Honourable senators, it is entirely in your hands now.

**Hon. Jerahmiel S. Grafstein:** Honourable senators, will Senator Doody allow one question?

**Senator Doody:** Certainly, honourable senator.

**Senator Grafstein:** The honourable senator made reference in his speech to the fact that, at Confederation, there was no demand in Newfoundland for non-denominational schools. Based on the evidence that he has heard to support the current amendment, is there currently a demand for non-denominational schools in Newfoundland?

**Senator Doody:** In all honesty, honourable senators, I would have to say that there is some interest in having non-denominational and secular schools in Newfoundland at this point in time. I would hesitate to say that it is anywhere close to a majority of the population that has this interest. I suspect it is a great deal less than that. Most of those who are interested in that sort of school system are concentrated in St. John's.

However, it should also be pointed out that there is nothing currently in effect, legislatively, constitutionally or otherwise, that denies the right of people to establish that sort of school or, indeed, the government to establish that sort of school. The argument has been made that the government does not have enough money to have two parallel school systems. I would suspect that if they wanted to set up one model — a temporary, test, secular, non-denominational school — it could be done in St. John's at a minimal cost. Those people who are interested in that sort of school and who are now attending a denominational school could go to this new school. That would test the demand for such a system. Perhaps, over time — who knows? — it may be the preferred way to go.

However, the preferred way to go is definitely not taking away a constitutional protection that people already have and sticking an alternative down their throats and saying, "This is the way we are going," before we even know if that is where people want to go.

**Senator Grafstein:** Following up on that question, honourable senators, have there been any statistical studies to indicate the number of people in Newfoundland who would be covered by non-denominational schools? Is there any information that Senator Doody could give to senators about the viewpoint of that minority in relation to constitutional entrenchment of their rights?

**Senator Doody:** No, I do not have statistical evidence. I have the knowledge of a group which established itself in St. John's — I suspect with support from some other parts of the province — who call themselves the No Means No Committee. They are most dissatisfied with the lack of progress that the Government of Newfoundland has made in demolishing the educational system. As we now know, that means the denominational educational system. How many of them there are, and how much support they have, as I said a few minutes ago, no one knows, and no one will ever know, unless some sort of a test program is set up. I have no problem with that.

If everyone in Newfoundland decides tomorrow that they want to go to a secular, non-denominational, godless school, then that is their right: Do it, by all means. However, those people who are protected by the Constitution of Canada cannot have that protection ripped away from them, and then be told what they have to do.

As I have said from the beginning, the point here is not the educational system in Newfoundland: that is Newfoundland's problem to work out. Our problem here, in this place, is the Constitution and the protection of minorities under that Constitution. That is where we stand.

On motion of Senator Whelan, debate adjourned.

## CANADA-EUROPEAN UNION RELATIONS

REPORT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE ON STUDY—  
DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming the debate on the consideration of the second report of the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs (*Special Study on European Relations*), deposited with the Clerk of the Senate on July 18, 1996.—(*Honourable Senator Bernison*).

**Hon. Peter A. Stollery:** Honourable senators, I wish to speak to the report of the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs entitled, "European Integration: The Implications for Canada." I am a member of that committee, and participated in preparing the report.

Before continuing, honourable senators, I want to add my appreciation to that of our Chairman, Senator Stewart, for the work done by our researcher, Mr. Chapman, our clerk, Mr. Pelletier, and also Mr. Albert Galpin, who was seconded to us from the Foreign Affairs Department. Our European agenda was substantial. Without their support, we would not have made it through. Senators worked long days to the point of exhaustion. It was not a coincidence that there were many minor illnesses when we arrived home.

Honourable senators, I was impressed by the quality and the seniority of the people we met. They included members of the House of Commons Foreign Affairs Committee at Westminster, and the Minister of State for European Affairs of Ireland, at the time when Ireland was preparing to take over the presidency of the European Community. Our ambassador, Mr. Mawhinney, was most gracious and helpful, as was Ambassador Heinbecker in Bonn, where I personally found Herr Dr. von Ploetz, State Secretary at the Foreign Office, and Herr Schomerus, State Secretary at the Ministry of Economics, very helpful. A "State Secretary" is approximately the same as our "deputy minister." We met many other interesting individuals, including Premier Biedenkopf of Saxony, and enjoyed an enlightening luncheon with Professor Detlev Karsten, a most interesting man.

• (1510)

In Frankfurt, two gentlemen from the Bundesbank explained the proposed common currency and central bank in great detail. Herr Pohl, a former president of the Bundesbank, was candid about possible consequences.

In Paris, on Sunday, March 24, *Le Monde* printed an extensive and important interview with Mr. Jacques Delors, the famous and recently retired President of the European Commission. The article must have had telephones ringing across Europe. I am sure that Mr. Delors was very much in demand. However, on Monday, March 25, he took the time to come to the residence of Ambassador Bouchard to meet with us. We met with representatives of the Bank of France, as well as with some interesting and senior French parliamentarians. In Brussels, we met with Ambassador Roy who ably heads our mission to the European Union.

Again speaking for myself personally, I was especially fascinated by our candid interview with Herr Jurgen Trunpf, Secretary General of the Council of the European Union. I would say that Herr Trunpf talked to us for about 45 minutes. His talk was so fascinating that there were almost no questions afterward, because he had reflectively thought through in advance the questions that we might have had.

Honourable senators, these were very helpful people who did not beat around the bush. They helped the committee greatly. They certainly helped me form my thoughts about the direction in which contemporary Europe is going. That is something that we have addressed in our report, which I think is first-rate. I should like to take a few minutes to pursue that matter, and talk about what I think is the direction being taken by contemporary Europe, and what that means for Canada.

In his 1992 memoirs, Telford Taylor, the American prosecutor at Nuremberg, wrote:

In 1945, and for fifteen to twenty years thereafter, the reading public in the Western World knew a good deal about the structure and record of the Third Reich and the names of

its leading personalities — Hitler, Goering, Goebbles, Ribbentrop, Himmler, among others — were household words. Today that is no longer the case...

Honourable senators, I believe it is impossible to understand the politics of the current profound changes being attempted in Europe without keeping that observation of Telford Taylor's in mind. "It depends on people's memories," we were told at the Foreign Office in London. "Cela dépend de la mémoire des gens," repeated Mr. Delors in Paris. Others said the same. They were, of course, talking about European integration, apart from Britain; an article of faith, even a decade ago.

To people of my age — I was born in 1935, and started reading newspapers religiously around 1943 — the Schuman Plan, the European Coal and Steel Community represented a new beginning. It was exciting to read about the Treaty of Rome, as I first lived in France when it came into force. Everyone talked about the Common Market. No one I knew would even have thought of being against European integration, even though we probably were not quite sure what that meant. We were young, but the war was fresh in all our memories.

Fifty years have passed since that time. The atmosphere of a new world rising from the ashes has practically been forgotten by the people at large. On this particular trip, I noticed that very often our academic witnesses were bookish. They had read about the events, but they had no memory of them, so that their testimony had no texture.

With the passage of time, that idealism of the 1940s and 1950s has become distorted. There is no question in my mind that, today, the European Economic Union discriminates against allies such as Canada. The fishing dispute is one example where one of the countries can use the others for its own national interests. In other words, when Canada has a dispute, it is not a dispute with one country but with 15 countries. There is no question that Canada's relationship with Europe has suffered. Not only do they bypass us and deal with our neighbour to the south on the question of an action plan, but as Senator Kelleher, who is, after all, a former trade minister, repeated time after time in our discussions:

Every time a new country was admitted, I got the call to go to Brussels and be told that this or that item that we sold in Europe would now be reduced.

Never mind, as Senator Stewart pointed out, that the Grand Banks, off Canada, have provided food for Europe for centuries, and in that sense is where we border the European Community. Never mind the fact that you can actually see Greenland from Canada, or that Canada has had longer, closer and more continuous cultural links with Europe than any other country in the western hemisphere. I believe that some European leaders are very short-sighted about the importance of maintaining strong trade relations with Canada.

Let us look back for a moment and remind ourselves of what happened. The late 1940s and the early 1950s were tumultuous days. There was the collapse of the pound, the Stern Gang and Palestine, the Chinese civil war, the partition riots, the Trieste crisis, and the Berlin airlift. We must remember that the European Community grew out of Western European reconstruction, and that thinking about that started before the Cold War, before the founding of the federal republic. The politics of Western European economics and the reconstruction were quite separate from the politics of East-West confrontation which caused, first, the Brussels Treaty Organization in 1948, and then NATO in 1949.

In other words, European security and European recovery have given us two different organizations and groupings, even though there was overlapping. Germany was not a full member of NATO until 1955. Franco was enraged when Spain was excluded from the Atlantic Pact, founding NATO, which was signed in 1949. Many countries were included in NATO that were not included in the Treaty of Rome — in particular, the EFTA countries, of course, most of which are now in the European Community, but also Canada and the United States.

In his memoirs, Dean Acheson pointed out how unexpected crisis after unexpected crisis affected the international agenda of those days. It would have been better if economics and security had been more carefully coordinated so that, with the fall of the Berlin Wall, there could be more coherence to Western foreign policy; but, then, even the fall of the wall was unexpected.

Where are we now? What has developed, what is developing, and what are the implications for Canada?

One thing is that a commercially united Western Europe has come about, but a politically united Western Europe, capable of a common foreign and defence policy, has not come about. As we have noted in our report, the economic union has become “an economic giant but a political dwarf.” The union currently consists of 15 countries, but with important political differences, likes and dislikes. The Deutschmark reigns supreme so that French interest rate policy is dictated by Frankfurt. The Benelux currencies are a subsidiary to the Bundesbank. Britain and Italy are widely accused of having competitively devalued their currencies, because in 1992-93 they bailed out of the European Monetary System devised to ensure that exchange rates did not vary too widely and thus act as an unfair trade advantage. Britain is still debating entry to the Common Market, because Britain still looks outside Europe for half its trade.

• (1520)

Spain and Portugal want more integration into Europe because, for the first time in centuries, they have breached the Pyrenees.

Germany is possibly skeptical about some European countries, but very concerned now about Eastern Europe.

Thus the story goes: Fifteen countries unable even to fulfil the important obligations of the 1991 Maastricht treaty. Imagine the

difficulty that will come about when the Baltic States, Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary, Romania, and Bulgaria join. It is my considered opinion that those countries will join. They want the economic success, and part of the German strategy is to have stability in that band of countries between themselves and the Russians.

The whole scenario changed with the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of communism. Germany is once again a great power, with the same preoccupation that it had under Bismarck. Put simply, where does Germany end and Russia begin? It is impossible to overstate this preoccupation, for it is driving German foreign policy. Since Germany is the economic force of the European Community, that preoccupation will affect the entire organization. It is the real reason that the German government is prepared to give up the Deutschmark in the teeth of overwhelming opposition in Germany. No one dares asks the populace if they are prepared to risk their Deutschmark savings for a new and untried currency whose value will be partly determined by foreigners. It is all about the East — Russia and Ukraine, and the quite understandable German fears about uncertainty there.

The European Economic Community has become the world's most successful customs union, but it has not become a European state, and Germany would like a European state on its side in case of Eastern trouble. The German government undoubtedly believes that a common currency will act as political glue, and is prepared to take the gamble and do in one of the world's most important currencies. Considering the strength of the public opposition, it is difficult for me to believe that the common currency will happen soon.

Is it not possible that the current European Economic Community's future — the current European Economic Community in the sense that it exists today — may be limited, may become more flexible, precisely because its most powerful member has such a different, overriding interest, for which, as I say, it is even prepared to give up its currency?

I wonder how this will play when the others outside the core group of Germany, Benelux and, with a big question mark, France conclude that they are signing up for German preoccupations. How will those French farmers receive eastern agricultural productions? For that matter, how will the Belgian farmers and even the German farmers react? When you ask a prominent German if there will be a referendum on the death of the Deutschmark, you are told that people could not possibly understand something so complicated.

What about NATO? It stands, after all, for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, but it is being fashioned into something quite different. Its enemy, the Warsaw Pact, conceded. The Warsaw Pact was a direct threat to Canada and the United States. Will the citizens and taxpayers of the United States be interested in the — to them — obscure relations between Germany and Ukraine? Can they distinguish between Slovakia, Slovenia, and Slavonia? Do they care? Do they not have other, more pressing defence problems, such as the Pacific or the possibility of a Mexican civil war, for example?

Honourable senators, Europe is in the midst of profound change. There is the threat that a unified Western Europe no longer exists; that new and old concerns have arisen; concerns that are not well understood outside Germany. The complex meeting ground of the Slav and the German leaves no clear role for outsiders, and one of the problems with the current European Economic Community is that it has made Canada an outsider. But then, will the current community not be forced to change with the circumstances?

I started my remarks talking about people's memory. I think the reference is different east and west of the Rhine. West, the memory is of the danger of a too powerful Germany; east, it is of the Russian threat. Nonetheless, we are only at the beginning, and it is very difficult to draw definite conclusions at this stage of the game.

**Hon. Eric Arthur Berntson (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Honourable senators, this item was standing in adjournment in my name, and I suggest it continue standing in my name.

**Hon. Senators:** Agreed.

On motion of Senator Berntson, debate adjourned.

### INTER-PARLIAMENTARY UNION

NINETY-SIXTH CONFERENCE, BEIJING, CHINA—  
INQUIRY—DEBATE ADJOURNED

**Hon. Peter Bosa** rose pursuant to notice of October 31, 1996:

That he will call the attention of the Senate to the 96th Inter-Parliamentary Conference, held at Beijing, China, from September 14 to 21, 1996.

He said: Honourable senators, it is my privilege to present the report of the Ninety-Sixth Inter-Parliamentary Conference held in Beijing from September 15 to September 21. My distinguished colleague Senator Di Nino and I attended the conference along with four members of the House of Commons, Ms Sue Barnes, Mr. Herb Dhaliwal, Mr. Janko Peric, and Madame Pauline Picard.

Before dealing with the conference itself, I should like to speak briefly about China.

Canada-China relations are excellent and are being moved ahead on all dimensions: trade and economic exchanges, regional security, sustainable development, and good governance—rule of law.

The Team Canada visit, led by Prime Minister Chrétien, has been promising in terms of trade and economic exchanges between Canada and China. This was reinforced by the October, 1995 visit of Li Peng. Ministerial delegations, bolstered by the work done by Team Canada, have been successful in exploiting

opportunities for Canadian products and expertise. Canadian ministers have visited China to investigate market opportunities in railways, housing and construction.

In absolute terms, trade between Canada and China has risen dramatically in the post-1978 era, an era during which China undertook substantial economic reform. In 1995, Canada-China trade reached a record level of \$8.1 billion, and Canadian exports to China were at an all-time high. China is now our fourth largest export market after the United States, Japan, and the United Kingdom.

Respect for human rights is raised with senior Chinese leaders whenever the opportunity presents itself. Last year, the Prime Minister raised good governance issues with Premier Li Peng during his visit to Canada and again with President Jiang Zemin in Osaka during the annual APEC meetings.

Mr. Max Yalden, Commissioner of the Canadian Human Rights Commission, visited China in November, 1995, to discuss equality rights and access for the disabled in society. In January of 1996, the first of what is expected to be a series of bilateral discussions on human rights at the level of officials took place in Beijing.

I would like to turn to the conference itself. At the outset, I extend our thanks and appreciation to the officials from Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada who briefed our delegation prior to departure, as well as to the researchers in the Library of Parliament who provided background papers. I would also thank the Canadian Ambassador, Mr. Howard Balloch, and his colleagues for their assistance and support during the conference. At the breakfast briefing, Mr. Balloch spoke about the political and economic situation in China. He also hosted a reception for us to meet representatives of Canadian companies doing business in China. Miss Rachel Bedlington, Second Secretary and Consul, assisted us throughout the conference. We wish to express our thanks and appreciation for their work.

Before speaking about the topics on the agenda of the conference, I want to refer briefly to the work of the women parliamentarians at these inter-parliamentary conferences. During the 1985 IPU Conference in Ottawa, there was a decision that the women delegates would meet prior to the opening session to discuss matters of mutual interest, including ways of increasing the participation of women parliamentarians within the union and its various activities. Ms Barnes and Madam Picard participated in these meetings. One of the troubling statistics presented at this meeting was a report on the number of women parliamentarians worldwide. Women legislators occupy on average only one-tenth of the seats in the world's parliaments. This figure is down 1 per cent over the last 12 months from 11.3 per cent in mid-1995. It is down nearly one-third from the all-time high of 14.8 per cent recorded in 1988. Happily, I can report that this chamber is doing well. With 24 women senators, or 23 per cent, the Canadian upper house ranks 12th in the world. We are proud of this achievement. Our host country of China, which has the largest Parliament in the world with close to 3,000 MPs, has 21 per cent women legislators.



In February of 1997 in New Delhi, the IPU will hold a symposium entitled, "Towards a Partnership Between Men and Women in Politics." Among the workshops will be one on the training of political candidates and another on financing electoral campaigns. I am confident that Canadian parliamentarians will make a valuable contribution to these discussions.

The first topic on the agenda of our conference was "Promoting greater respect and protection of human rights in general and in particular for women and children."

Ms Barnes and Madam Picard spoke in the debate on this subject at the Second Committee on Parliamentary, Juridical and Human Rights Questions. Fortunately, we were able to have a number of parts of our draft resolution incorporated in the final resolution adopted by the conference. These elements include references to national human rights institutions, domestic violence, development assistance and the role of non-governmental delegations.

The second topic on the agenda was "Policies and strategies to ensure the right to food in this time of globalization of the economy and trade liberalization." This subject was chosen in part because of the FAO Food Summit being held in Rome in mid-November. By debating the subject in Beijing, the IPU is able to make a contribution to the deliberations in Rome.

During the debate at the Third Committee on Economic and Social Questions, both Mr. Peric and Senator Di Nino spoke. Thirteen countries, including Canada, were selected to serve on the drafting committee. Mr. Peric served as our representative. Again, several sections of the Canadian draft resolution were used.

At each conference, there is an opportunity to vote on a supplementary item to be included on the agenda. However, the agenda is structured in such a way that it only allows for one supplementary item to be added to the regular agenda at each conference. At some conferences, there have been as many as eight proposals for the supplementary item. Since only one item can be chosen, the competition is intense.

The subject of anti-personnel mines was first raised by the Belgian IPU group in early 1995 when the group proposed a debate on a "worldwide prohibition of the use, production, stockpiling, sale, transport, transit and export of anti-personnel mines."

While there was not a full debate on land mines at the Madrid Conference, in a resolution that was adopted by consensus following a wider debate on the challenges that arise from armed conflicts and man-made disasters, the conference "...called on States to lay down a ban on anti-personnel mines and blinding laser weapons during the review of the 1980 Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons." The resolution went on to state that, pending the total prohibition of these weapons, states should: stipulate that all anti-personnel mines must be equipped with effective self-destruction devices; ban all mines that cannot be easily localized and recommend specifications to this end;

broaden the convention to cover all internal conflicts and incorporate effective mechanisms for implementation that rely on independent international monitoring; and ban blinding laser weapons in an additional protocol.

Later in 1995, a special session of the IPU Governing Council met in the United Nations General Assembly to debate issues relating to the international cooperation on the eve of the 21st century. In the solemn declaration which was then adopted, again by consensus, the members of the IPU reaffirmed their conviction that it is simply not possible today to accept the continued use of mines and that it is urgent to arrive at a total ban of land mines, their production, sale and use.

There were two further attempts to get a full debate on anti-personnel mines at IPU conferences, including one sponsored jointly by the Belgium, British, Canadian, and Swiss delegations in April of this year in Istanbul. The conference decided to select an Egyptian proposal on terrorism. I should explain that in that instance external events influenced voting priorities since, during the previous month, Egypt had hosted the Sharm el Sheikh Summit on Terrorism for heads of government, and, therefore, delegates were especially aware of this issue.

However, there was a general feeling that the IPU ought to make a statement again on land mines on behalf of parliamentarians, particularly as our conference was being held immediately prior to the Final Review Conference in Geneva on the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons. I acted as chairperson of the Twelve Plus Group, a geo-political grouping of the IPU encompassing European countries plus Canada, the United States, Australia and New Zealand. As chair, I prepared a petition calling for an end to the use of anti-personnel mines and for the strengthening of the 1980 Convention. More than 250 parliamentarians from all parts of the world signed this petition, which the International Committee of the Red Cross presented in Geneva.

It was clear to us then that support for a worldwide ban on anti-personnel mines was growing. To add momentum to this movement, we intensified our campaign for a full debate on this subject at the next IPU Conference, to be held in Beijing in mid-September. We saw this also as an opportunity to provide support for the initiatives taken by the Canadian Minister of Foreign Affairs when he announced the holding of a conference in Ottawa in early October to develop strategies for a comprehensive ban on anti-personnel mines.

Taking into account that we had the support of the Twelve Plus countries and to ensure the success of this undertaking, we decided to write to each of the other four geo-political groups — Arab, African, Latin American, and the Asian-Pacific countries — as well as to the ambassadors of all the countries with representation in Canada. We told them of the growing support for a comprehensive ban and noted that where a year ago about 13 countries supported the idea, the number had grown to over 60. The response was overwhelmingly positive. In addition, we worked with the non-governmental organization called "Mines Action Canada" to promote support for our initiative.

The Canadian draft resolution on anti-personnel mines was available in the languages used in debates at IPU conferences, namely English, French, Spanish and Arabic.

At the Beijing Conference, the German group also presented a resolution for a proposed debate on mine clearance. Since the Canadian draft resolution contains several paragraphs about mine clearance, I approached the members of the German delegation about working together and they agreed to do so. Our two proposals were combined to read "worldwide ban on anti-personnel mines and the need for mine clearance for humanitarian purposes." Happily, I can report that our combined proposal was selected for debate in Beijing. Herb Dhaliwal, MP spoke on behalf of Canada in the debate and later served as a member of the drafting committee.

The resolution prepared by the drafting committee was adopted in plenary without a vote. Three countries, Cuba, Libya and Vietnam, expressed a reservation about the resolution as a whole. China reserved itself with regard to the first operative paragraph.

About a month ago, I participated in a round-table discussion on "Anti-personnel mines and the international community" at the recent Ottawa conference on anti-personnel mines. On that occasion, I was able to share the work of the Canadian IPU group in pushing this issue to the fore. Two weeks ago, I participated in another IPU meeting on anti-personnel mines, this time at the annual parliamentarians' day at the United Nations. On that occasion, I was able to speak about the Ottawa declaration on anti-personnel mines, which 50 countries have already signed. Our task as IPU members is to convince the other IPU delegations who supported our resolution in Beijing to take concrete action to support the Ottawa declaration. It is my firm belief that the Inter-Parliamentary Union has played a significant role in coalescing debate on the issue of a comprehensive ban on anti-personnel mines. We can be proud of our achievements.

At each conference, there is a general debate on the political, economic and social situation in the world. This is an opportunity for delegates to speak on a subject of their own choice. I used this occasion to raise the issue of transparency in election financing. This is a subject that the Canadian group proposed for the next conference in Seoul.

I should also mention the report of the IPU Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians. One of the most significant activities of the union has been its continued pressure in the defence of human rights of parliamentarians who have been subjected to arbitrary action because of their work as legislators.

At each conference, this committee provides a status report on the cases currently under consideration, at this time 135 in number. During the first phases of examination, the committee's work is strictly confidential. If, however, an acceptable settlement is not reached within a reasonable period of time, the cases are brought before the Inter-Parliamentary Council so that it can make public appeals on their behalf.

Violations of the human rights of 109 members or former members of Parliament in 13 countries were formally raised in Beijing: Albania, 1; Burundi, 31; Cambodia, 6; Colombia, 8; Gambia, 3; Guatemala, 1; Honduras, 1; Indonesia, 2; Myanmar, 29; Nigeria, 7; Togo, 3; Tunisia, 1; and Turkey, 16.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable senators, I regret to interrupt, but the time period for Senator Bosa's speech is expired.

Is leave granted for him to continue?

**Hon. Senators:** Agreed.

**Senator Bosa:** Along with our conference, the Association of Secretaries General of Parliaments holds separate meetings. Our Clerk, Paul Bélisle, together with colleagues from other countries, participated in sessions on such organizational and procedural matters as the immunity of witnesses, administration of Parliament and the training of staff.

The chairperson of the human rights committee, in his report to the conference, noted the importance of supporting actions by national groups affiliated to the IPU in securing positive developments. Perhaps we might consider how to follow up on these cases.

The IPU is the world organization of the Parliaments of sovereign states. I hope my report today has shown you how the IPU is working on issues of international concern and how it is helping to build a consensus among parliamentarians on major world issues.

The IPU has always been in the forefront of international issues. A senior Canadian diplomat, Thomas Delworth, once told me that, if one wants to know what parliamentarians will be debating in three or four years, one should go to the IPU and see what is on the agenda.

On motion of Senator Berntson, for Senator Di Nino, debate adjourned.

The Senate adjourned until Wednesday, November 6, 1996 at 1:30 p.m.

## **APPENDIX**

Officers of the Senate

The Ministry

Senators

(Listed according to seniority, alphabetically and by provinces)

Committees of the Senate

**THE SPEAKER**

THE HONOURABLE GILDAS L. MOLGAT

**THE LEADER OF THE GOVERNMENT**

THE HONOURABLE JOYCE FAIRBAIRN, P.C.

**THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION**

THE HONOURABLE JOHN LYNCH-STAUNTON

---

**OFFICERS OF THE SENATE****CLERK OF THE SENATE AND CLERK OF THE PARLIAMENTS**

PAUL C. BÉLISLE ESQ.

**CLERK ASSISTANT OF THE SENATE**

RICHARD G. GREENE

**LAW CLERK AND PARLIAMENTARY COUNSEL**

Mark A. Audcent, B.A. (Hon), LL.B

**GENTLEMAN USHER OF THE BLACK ROD**

COL. JEAN DORÉ, C.D.

**THE MINISTRY**

According to Precedence

(November 5, 1996)

The Right Hon. Jean Chrétien	Prime Minister
The Hon. Herbert Eser Gray	Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada
The Hon. Lloyd Axworthy	Minister of Foreign Affairs
The Hon. David Anderson	Minister of Transport
The Hon. Ralph E. Goodale	Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
The Hon. David Charles Dingwall	Minister of Health
The Hon. Ron Irwin	Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
The Hon. Joyce Fairbairn	Leader of the Government in the Senate and Minister with special responsibility for Literacy
The Hon. Sheila Copps	Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage
The Hon. Sergio Marchi	Minister of Environment
The Hon. John Manley	Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Minister of Western Economic Diversification and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development-Quebec
The Hon. Diane Marleau	Minister of Public Works and Government Services
The Hon. Paul Martin	Minister of Finance
The Hon. Douglas Young	Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs
The Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton	Minister of International Trade
The Hon. Marcel Massé	President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure
The Hon. Anne McLellan	Minister of Natural Resources
The Hon. Allan Rock	Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
The Hon. Alfonso Gagliano	Minister of Labour and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
The Hon. Lucienne Robillard	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
The Hon. Fred J. Mifflin	Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
The Hon. Jane Stewart	Minister of National Revenue
The Hon. Stéphane Dion	President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal
The Hon. Pierre Pettigrew	Minister of Human Resources Development
The Hon. Don Boudria	Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie
The Hon. Fernand Robichaud	Secretary of State (Agriculture and Agri-food, Fisheries and Oceans)
The Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew	Secretary of State (Training and Youth)
The Hon. Lawrence MacAulay	Secretary of State (Veterans) (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)
The Hon. Christine Stewart	Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)
The Hon. Raymond Chan	Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)
The Hon. Jon Gerrard	Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development) (Western Economic Diversification)
The Hon. Douglas Peters	Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)
The Hon. Martin Cauchon	Secretary of State (Federal Office of Regional Development-Quebec)
The Hon. Hedy Fry	Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)

## SENATORS OF CANADA

### ACCORDING TO SENIORITY

(November 5, 1996)

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
John Michael Macdonald	Cape Breton	North Sydney, N.S.
Orville Howard Phillips	Prince	Alberton, P.E.I.
Andrew Ernest Thompson	Dovercourt	Kendal, Ont.
Herbert O. Sparrow	Saskatchewan	North Battleford, Sask.
Richard James Stanbury	York Centre	Toronto, Ont.
William John Petten	Bonavista	St. John's, Nfld.
Gildas L. Molgat, Speaker	Ste-Rose	Winnipeg, Man.
Edward M. Lawson	Vancouver	Vancouver, B.C.
Mark Lorne Bonnell	Murray River	Murray River, P.E.I.
Bernard Alasdair Graham	The Highlands	Sydney, N.S.
Raymond J. Perrault, P.C.	North Shore-Burnaby	North Vancouver, B.C.
Maurice Riel, P.C.	Chaouinigane	Montréal, Qué.
Louis-J. Robichaud, P.C.	L'Acadie-Acadia	Saint-Antoine, N.B.
Jack Austin, P.C.	Vancouver South	Vancouver, B.C.
Paul Lucier	Yukon	Whitehorse, Yukon
Pietro Rizzuto	Repentigny	Laval-sur-le-Lac, Qué.
Willie Adams	Northwest Territories	Rankin Inlet, N.W.T.
Peter Bosa	York-Caboto	Etobicoke, Ont.
Stanley Haidasz, P.C.	Toronto-Parkdale	Toronto, Ont.
Philip Derek Lewis	St. John's	St. John's, Nfld.
Dalia Wood	Montarville	Montréal, Qué.
Reginald James Balfour	Regina	Regina, Sask.
Lowell Murray, P.C.	Pakenham	Ottawa, Ont.
Guy Charbonneau	Kennebec	Montréal, Qué.
C. William Doody	Harbour Main-Bell Island	St. John's, Nfld.
Peter Alan Stollery	Bloor and Yonge	Toronto, Ont.
Peter Michael Pitfield, P.C.	Ontario	Ottawa, Ont.
William McDonough Kelly	Port Severn	Mississauga, Ont.
Jacques Hébert	Wellington	Montréal, Qué.
Leo E. Kolber	Victoria	Westmount, Qué.
Philippe Deane Gigantès	De Lorimier	Montréal, Qué.
John B. Stewart	Antigonish-Guysborough	Bayfield, N.S.
Michael Kirby	South Shore	Halifax, N.S.
Jerahmiel S. Grafstein	Metro Toronto	Toronto, Ont.
Anne C. Cools	Toronto Centre	Toronto, Ont.
Charlie Watt	Inkerman	Kuujuuaq, Qué.
Leonard Stephen Marchand, P.C.	Kamloops-Cariboo	Kamloops, B.C.
Daniel Phillip Hays	Calgary	Calgary, Alta.
Joyce Fairbairn, P.C.	Lethbridge	Lethbridge, Alta.
Colin Kenny	Rideau	Ottawa, Ont.
Pierre De Bané, P.C.	De la Vallière	Montréal, Qué.
Eymard Georges Corbin	Grand-Sault	Grand-Sault, N.B.
Finlay MacDonald	Halifax	Halifax, N.S.
Brenda Mary Robertson	Riverview	Shediac, N.B.
Richard J. Doyle	North York	Toronto, Ont.
Jean-Maurice Simard	Edmundston	Edmundston, N.B.
Michel Cogger	Lauzon	Knowlton, Qué.
Norman K. Atkins	Markham	Toronto, Ont.

## ACCORDING TO SENIORITY

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
Ethel Cochrane	Newfoundland	Port-au-Port, Nfld.
Eileen Rossiter	Prince Edward Island	Charlottetown, P.E.I.
Mira Spivak	Manitoba	Winnipeg, Man.
Gerald R. Ottenheimer	Waterford-Trinity	St. John's, Nfld.
Roch Bolduc	Golfe	Ste-Foy, Qué.
Gérald-A. Beaudoin	Rigaud	Hull, Qué.
Pat Carney, P.C.	British Columbia	Vancouver, B.C.
Gérald J. Comeau	Nova Scotia	Church Point, N.S.
Consiglio Di Nino	Ontario	Downsview, Ont.
Donald H. Oliver	Nova Scotia	Halifax, N.S.
Noël A. Kinsella	New Brunswick	Fredericton, N.B.
John Buchanan, P.C.	Nova Scotia	Halifax, N.S.
Mabel Margaret DeWare	New Brunswick	Moncton, N.B.
John Lynch-Staunton	Grandville	Georgeville, Qué.
James Francis Kelleher, P.C.	Ontario	Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.
J. Trevor Eyton	Ontario	Caledon, Ont.
Walter Patrick Twinn	Alberta	Slave Lake, Alta.
Wilbert Joseph Keon	Ottawa	Ottawa, Ont.
Michael Arthur Meighen	St. Marys	Toronto, Ont.
Normand Grimard	Québec	Noranda, Qué.
Thérèse Lavoie-Roux	Québec	Montréal, Qué.
J. Michael Forrestall	Dartmouth and Eastern Shore	Dartmouth, N.S.
Janis Johnson	Winnipeg-Interlake	Winnipeg, Man.
Eric Arthur Berntson	Saskatchewan	Saskatoon, Sask.
A. Raynell Andreychuk	Regina	Regina, Sask.
Jean-Claude Rivest	Stadacona	Québec, Qué.
Ronald D. Ghitter	Alberta	Calgary, Alta.
Terrance R. Stratton	Manitoba	St. Norbert, Man.
Marcel Prud'homme, P.C.	La Salle	Montréal, Qué.
Fernand Roberge	Saurel	Ville St-Laurent, Qué.
Duncan James Jessiman	Manitoba	Winnipeg, Man.
Leonard J. Gustafson	Saskatchewan	Macoun, Sask.
Erminie Joy Cohen	New Brunswick	Saint John, N.B.
David Tkachuk	Saskatchewan	Saskatoon, Sask.
W. David Angus	Alma	Montréal, Qué.
Pierre Claude Nolin	De Salaberry	Québec, Qué.
Marjory LeBreton	Ontario	Manotick, Ont.
Gerry St. Germain, P.C.	Langley-Pemberton-Whistler	Maple Ridge, B.C.
Lise Bacon	De la Durantaye	Laval, Qué.
Sharon Carstairs	Manitoba	Victoria Beach, Man.
Landon Pearson	Ontario	Ottawa, Ont.
Jean-Robert Gauthier	Ottawa-Vanier	Ottawa, Ontario
John G. Bryden	New Brunswick	Bayfield, N.B.
Rose-Marie Losier-Cool	New Brunswick	Bathurst, N.B.
Céline Hervieux-Payette, P.C.	Bedford	Montréal, Qué.
William H. Rompkey, P.C.	Newfoundland	North West River, Labrador
Doris M. Anderson	Prince Edward Island	St. Peter's, Kings County, P.E.I.
Lorna Milne	Ontario	Brampton, Ont.
Marie-P. Poulin	Northern Ontario	Ottawa, Ont.
Shirley Maheu	Rougement	Ville de Saint-Laurent, Qué.
Joseph Gérard Lauri P. Landry	New Brunswick	Cap-Pelé, N.B.
Nicholas William Taylor	Alberta	Bon Accord, Alta.
Jean B. Forest	Alberta	Edmonton, Alta.
Eugene Francis Whelan, P.C.	Western Ontario	Ottawa, Ont.
Léonce Mercier	Mille Isles	Saint-Élie-d'Orford, Qué.
Wilfred P. Moore	Nova Scotia	Chester, N.S.

## SENATORS OF CANADA

### ALPHABETICAL LIST

(November 5, 1996)

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
Adams, Willie	Northwest Territories	Rankin Inlet, N.W.T.
Anderson, Doris M.	Prince Edward Island	St. Peter's, Kings County, Nfld.
Andreychuk, A. Raynell	Regina	Regina, Sask.
Angus, W. David	Alma	Montréal, Qué.
Atkins, Norman K.	Markham	Toronto, Ont.
Austin, Jack, P.C.	Vancouver South	Vancouver, B.C.
Bacon, Lise	De la Durantaye	Laval, Qué.
Balfour, Reginald James	Regina	Regina, Sask.
Beaudoin, Gérald-A.	Rigaud	Hull, Qué.
Berntson, Eric Arthur	Saskatchewan	Saskatoon, Sask.
Bolduc, Roch	Golfe	Ste-Foy, Qué.
Bonnell, M. Lorne	Murray River	Murray River, P.E.I.
Bosa, Peter	York-Caboto	Etobicoke, Ont.
Bryden, John G.	New Brunswick	Bayfield, N.B.
Buchanan, John, P.C.	Nova Scotia	Halifax, N.S.
Carney, Pat, P.C.	British Columbia	Vancouver, B.C.
Carstairs, Sharon	Manitoba	Victoria Beach, Man.
Charbonneau, Guy	Kennebec	Montréal, Qué.
Cochrane, Ethel	Newfoundland	Port-au-Port, Nfld.
Cogger, Michel	Lauzon	Knowlton, Qué.
Cohen, Erminie Joy	New Brunswick	Saint John, N.B.
Comeau, Gérald J.	Nova Scotia	Church Point, N.S.
Cools, Anne C.	Toronto Centre	Toronto, Ont.
Corbin, Eymard Georges	Grand-Sault	Grand-Sault, N.B.
De Bané, Pierre, P.C.	De la Vallière	Montréal, Qué.
DeWare, Mabel Margaret	New Brunswick	Moncton, N.B.
Di Nino, Consiglio	Ontario	Downsview, Ont.
Doody, C. William	Harbour Main-Bell Island	St. John's, Nfld.
Doyle, Richard J.	North York	Toronto, Ont.
Eyton, J. Trevor	Ontario	Caledon, Ont.
Fairbairn, Joyce, P.C.	Lethbridge	Lethbridge, Alta.
Forest, Jean B.	Alberta	Edmonton, Alta.
Forrestall, J. Michael	Dartmouth and Eastern Shore	Dartmouth, N.S.
Gauthier, Jean-Robert	Ottawa-Vanier	Ottawa, Ont.
Ghitter, Ronald D.	Alberta	Calgary, Alta.
Gigantès, Philippe Deane	De Lorimier	Montréal, Qué.
Grafstein, Jerahmiel S.	Metro Toronto	Toronto, Ont.
Graham, Bernard Alasdair	The Highlands	Sydney, N.S.
Grimard, Normand	Québec	Noranda, Qué.
Gustafson Leonard J.	Saskatchewan	Macoun, Sask.
Haidasz, Stanley, P.C.	Toronto-Parkdale	Toronto, Ont.
Hays, Daniel Phillip	Calgary	Calgary, Alta.
Hébert, Jacques	Wellington	Montréal, Qué.
Hervieux-Payette, Céline, P.C.	Bedford	Montréal, Qué.
Jessiman, Duncan James	Manitoba	Winnipeg, Man.
Johnson, Janis	Winnipeg-Interlake	Winnipeg, Man.
Kelleher, James Francis, P.C.	Ontario	Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.
Kelly, William McDonough	Port Severn	Mississauga, Ont.
Kenny, Colin	Rideau	Ottawa, Ont.
Keon, Wilbert Joseph	Ottawa	Ottawa, Ont.
Kinsella, Noël A.	New Brunswick	Fredericton, N.B.



Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
Kirby, Michael	South Shore	Halifax, N.S.
Kolber, Leo E.	Victoria	Westmount, Qué.
Landry, Joseph Gérard Lauri P.	New Brunswick	Cap Pelé, N.B.
Lavoie-Roux, Thérèse	Québec	Montréal, Qué.
Lawson, Edward M.	Vancouver	Vancouver, B.C.
LeBreton, Marjory	Ontario	Manotick, Ont.
Lewis, Philip Derek	St. John's	St. John's, Nfld.
Losier-Cool, Rose-Marie	New Brunswick	Bathurst, N.B.
Lucier, Paul	Yukon	Whitehorse, Yukon
Lynch-Staunton, John	Grandville	Georgeville, Qué.
MacDonald, Finlay	Halifax	Halifax, N.S.
Macdonald, John M.	Cape Breton	North Sydney, N.S.
Maheu, Shirley	Rougemont	Ville de Saint-Laurent, Qué.
Marchand, Leonard Stephen, P.C.	Kamloops-Cariboo	Kamloops, B.C.
Meighen, Michael Arthur	St. Marys	Toronto, Ont.
Mercier, Léonce	Mille Isles	Saint-Élie d'Orford, Qué.
Milne, Lorna	Ontario	Brampton, Ont.
Molgat, Gildas L. Speaker	Ste-Rose	Winnipeg, Man.
Moore, Wilfred P.	Nova Scotia	Chester, N.S.
Murray, Lowell, P.C.	Pakenham	Ottawa, Ont.
Nolin, Pierre Claude	De Salaberry	Québec, Qué.
Oliver, Donald H.	Nova Scotia	Halifax, N.S.
Ottenheimer, Gerald R.	Waterford-Trinity	St. John's, Nfld.
Pearson, Landon	Ontario	Ottawa, Ontario
Perrault, Raymond J., P.C.	North Shore-Burnaby	North Vancouver, B.C.
Petten, William J.	Bonavista	St. John's, Nfld.
Phillips, Orville H.	Prince	Alberton, P.E.I.
Pitfield, Peter Michael, P.C.	Ontario	Ottawa, Ont.
Poulin, Marie-P.	Northern Ontario	Ottawa, Ont.
Prud'homme, Marcel, P.C.	La Salle	Montréal, Qué.
Riel, Maurice, P.C.	Chaouinigan	Montréal, Qué.
Rivest, Jean-Claude	Stadacona	Québec, Qué.
Rizzuto, Pietro	Repentigny	Laval-sur-le-Lac, Qué.
Roberge, Fernand	Saurel	Ville St-Laurent, Qué.
Robertson, Brenda Mary	Riverview	Shediac, N.B.
Robichaud, Louis-J., P.C.	L'Acadie-Acadia	Saint-Antoine, N.B.
Rompkey, William H., P.C.	Newfoundland	North West River, Labrador
Rossiter, Eileen	Prince Edward Island	Charlottetown, P.E.I.
St. Germain, Gerry, P.C.	Langley-Pemberton-Whistler	Maple Ridge, B.C.
Simard, Jean-Maurice	Edmundston	Edmundston, N.B.
Sparrow, Herbert O.	Saskatchewan	North Battleford, Sask.
Spivak, Mira	Manitoba	Winnipeg, Man.
Stanbury, Richard J.	York Centre	Toronto, Ont.
Stewart, John B.	Antigonish-Guysborough	Bayfield, N.S.
Stollery, Peter Alan	Bloor and Yonge	Toronto, Ont.
Stratton, Terrance R.	Manitoba	St. Norbert, Man.
Taylor, Nicholas William	Alberta	Bon Accord, Alta.
Thompson, Andrew	Dovercourt	Kendal, Ont.
Tkachuk, David	Saskatchewan	Saskatoon, Sask.
Twinn, Walter Patrick	Alberta	Slave Lake, Alta.
Watt, Charlie	Inkerman	Kuujuuaq, Qué.
Whelan, Eugene Francis	Western Ontario	Ottawa, Ont.
Wood, Dalia	Montarville	Montréal, Qué.

**SENATORS OF CANADA**  
**BY PROVINCE AND TERRITORY**

(November 5, 1996)

---



---

**ONTARIO—24**

---



---

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
1 Andrew Ernest Thompson	Dovercourt	Kendal
2 Richard James Stanbury	York Centre	Toronto
3 Peter Bosa	York-Caboto	Etobicoke
4 Stanley Haidasz, P.C.	Toronto-Parkdale	Toronto
5 Lowell Murray, P.C.	Pakenham	Ottawa
6 Peter Alan Stollery	Bloor and Yonge	Toronto
7 Peter Michael Pitfield, P.C.	Ontario	Ottawa
8 William McDonough Kelly	Port Severn	Missassauga
9 Jerahmiel S. Grafstein	Metro Toronto	Toronto
10 Anne C. Cools	Toronto Centre	Toronto
11 Colin Kenny	Rideau	Ottawa
12 Richard J. Doyle	North York	Toronto
13 Norman K. Atkins	Markham	Toronto
14 Consiglio Di Nino	Ontario	Downsview
15 James Francis Kelleher P.C.	Ontario	Sault Ste. Marie
16 John Trevor Eyton	Ontario	Caledon
17 Wilbert Joseph Keon	Ottawa	Ottawa
18 Michael Arthur Meighen	St. Marys	Toronto
19 Marjory LeBreton	Ontario	Manotick
20 Landon Pearson	Ontario	Ottawa
21 Jean-Robert Gauthier	Ottawa-Vanier	Ottawa
22 Lorna Milne	Ontario	Brampton
23 Marie-P. Poulin	Northern Ontario	Ottawa
24 Eugene Francis Whelan, P.C.	Western Ontario	Ottawa

---

## SENATORS BY PROVINCE AND TERRITORY

## QUÉBEC—24

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
1 Maurice Riel, P.C.	Chaouinigane	Montréal
2 Pietro Rizzuto	Repentigny	Laval-sur-le-Lac
3 Dalia Wood	Montarville	Montréal
4 Guy Charbonneau	Kennebec	Montréal
5 Jacques Hébert	Wellington	Montréal
6 Leo E. Kolber	Victoria	Westmount
7 Philippe Deane Gigantès	De Lorimier	Montréal
8 Charlie Watt	Inkerman	Kuujuuaq
9 Pierre De Bané, P.C.	De la Vallière	Montréal
10 Michel Cogger	Lauzon	Knowlton
11 Roch Bolduc	Golfe	Ste-Foy
12 Gérald-A. Beaudoin	Rigaud	Hull
13 John Lynch-Staunton	Grandville	Georgeville
14 Jean-Claude Rivest	Stadacona	Québec
15 Marcel Prud'homme, P.C.	La Salle	Montréal
16 Fernand Roberge	Saurel	Ville de Saint-Laurent
17 W. David Angus	Alma	Montréal
18 Pierre Claude Nolin	De Salaberry	Québec
19 Lise Bacon	De la Durantaye	Laval
20 Céline Hervieux-Payette, P.C.	Bedford	Montréal
21 Shirley Maheu	Rougemont	Ville de Saint-Laurent
22 Léonce Mercier	Mille Isles	Saint-Élie d'Orford
23		
24		

## SENATORS BY PROVINCE—MARITIME DIVISION

## NOVA SCOTIA—10

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
1 John Michael Macdonald	Cape Breton	North Sydney
2 Bernard Alasdair Graham	The Highlands	Sydney
3 John B. Stewart	Antigonish-Guysborough	Bayfield
4 Michael Kirby	South Shore	Halifax
5 Finlay MacDonald	Halifax	Halifax
6 Gérald J. Comeau	Nova Scotia	Church Point
7 Donald H. Oliver	Nova Scotia	Halifax
8 John Buchanan, P.C.	Nova Scotia	Halifax
9 J. Michael Forrestall	Dartmouth and Eastern Shore	Dartmouth
10 Wilfred P. Moore	Nova Scotia	Chester

## NEW BRUNSWICK—10

THE HONOURABLE		
1 Louis-J. Robichaud	L'Acadie-Acadia	Saint-Antoine
2 Eymard Georges Corbin	Grand-Sault	Grand-Sault
3 Brenda Mary Robertson	Riverview	Shediac
4 Jean-Maurice Simard	Edmundston	Edmundston
5 Noël A. Kinsella	New Brunswick	Fredericton
6 Mabel Margaret DeWare	New Brunswick	Moncton
7 Erminie Joy Cohen	New Brunswick	Saint John
8 John G. Bryden	New Brunswick	Bayfield
9 Rose-Marie Losier-Cool	New Brunswick	Bathurst
10 Joseph Gérard Lauri P. Landry	New Brunswick	Cap-Pelé

## PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—4

THE HONOURABLE		
1 Orville Howard Phillips	Prince	Alberton
2 Mark Lorne Bonnell	Murray River	Murray River
3 Eileen Rossiter	Prince Edward Island	Charlottetown
4 Doris M. Anderson	Prince Edward Island	St. Peter's, Kings County

## SENATORS BY PROVINCE—WESTERN DIVISION

**MANITOBA—6**

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
1 Gildas L. Molgat, Speaker	Ste-Rose	Winnipeg
2 Mira Spivak	Manitoba	Winnipeg
3 Janis Johnson	Winnipeg-Interlake	Winnipeg
4 Terrance R. Stratton	Manitoba	St. Norbert
5 Duncan James Jessiman	Manitoba	Winnipeg
6 Sharon Carstairs	Manitoba	Victoria Beach

**BRITISH COLUMBIA—6**

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
1 Edward M. Lawson	Vancouver	Vancouver
2 Raymond J. Perrault, P.C.	North Shore-Burnaby	North Vancouver
3 Jack Austin, P.C.	Vancouver South	Vancouver
4 Leonard Stephen Marchand, P.C.	Kamloops-Cariboo	Kamloops
5 Pat Carney, P.C.	British Columbia	Vancouver
6 Gerry St. Germain, P.C.	Langley-Pemberton-Whistler	Maple Ridge

**SASKATCHEWAN—6**

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
1 Herbert O. Sparrow	Saskatchewan	North Battleford
2 Reginald James Balfour	Regina	Regina
3 Eric Arthur Berntson	Saskatchewan	Saskatoon
4 A. Raynell Andreychuk	Regina	Regina
5 Leonard J. Gustafson	Saskatchewan	Macoun
6 David Tkachuk	Saskatchewan	Saskatoon

**ALBERTA—6**

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
1 Daniel Phillip Hays	Calgary	Calgary
2 Joyce Fairbairn, P.C.	Lethbridge	Lethbridge
3 Walter Patrick Twinn	Alberta	Slave Lake
4 Ronald D. Ghitter	Alberta	Calgary
5 Nicholas William Taylor	Alberta	Bon Accord
6 Jean B. Forest	Alberta	Edmonton

---



---

 SENATORS BY PROVINCE AND TERRITORY
 

---



---

 NEWFOUNDLAND—6
 

---



---

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
1 William John Petten	Bonavista	St. John's
2 Philip Derek Lewis	St. John's	St. John's
3 C. William Doody	Harbour Main-Bell Island	St. John's
4 Ethel Cochrane	Newfoundland	Port-au-Port
5 Gerald R. Ottenheimer	Waterford-Trinity	St. John's
6 William H. Rompkey, P.C.	Newfoundland	North West River, Labrador

---

 NORTHWEST TERRITORIES—1
 

---



---

THE HONOURABLE		
1 Willie Adams	Northwest Territories	Rankin Inlet

---

 YUKON TERRITORY—1
 

---



---

THE HONOURABLE		
1 Paul Lucier	Yukon	Whitehorse

---

**DIVISIONAL SENATORS**

---

---

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
1 Normand Grimard .....	Québec .....	Noranda, Qué.
2 Thérèse Lavoie-Roux .....	Québec .....	Montréal, Qué.

---

# CONTENTS

**Tuesday, November 5, 1996**

	PAGE		PAGE
<b>Visitors in the Gallery</b>		<b>Justice</b>	
The Hon. the Speaker .....	1086	Sale of Airbus Aircraft to Air Canada—Alleged Conspiracy to Defraud Federal Government—Knowledge of Government Ministers—Request for Particulars—Request for Answer.	
<b>Pages Exchange Program With House of Commons.</b>		Senator Balfour .....	1089
The Hon. the Speaker .....	1086	Senator Graham .....	1089
<hr/>			
<b>SENATORS' STATEMENTS</b>		<b>Delayed Answers to Oral Questions</b>	
<b>Veterans' Week</b>		Senator Graham .....	1089
Senator Graham .....	1086	<b>Quebec</b>	
<b>The Honourable Jean-Louis Roux</b>		Distinct Society Motion—Legal Opinion Sought on Interpretation of Wording—Government Position. Questions by Senator Andreychuk and Senator Rivest.	
Senator Hébert .....	1087	Senator Graham (Delayed Answer) .....	1089
<hr/>			
<b>ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS</b>		International Examples of the Term "Aboriginal People" (or Equivalents)	
<b>State of Financial System</b>		Questions by Senator Andreychuk and Senator Rivest.	
Report of Banking, Trade and Commerce Committee Requesting Authorization to Travel for Purpose of Pursuing Study Presented. Senator Kirby .....	1088	Senator Graham (Delayed Answer) .....	1089
<b>Yukon Quartz Mining Act</b>		<hr/>	
<b>Yukon Placer Mining Act (Bill C-6)</b>		<b>ORDERS OF THE DAY</b>	
Bill to Amend—Report of Committee. Senator Andreychuk .....	1088	<b>Canada Labour Code</b>	
<b>Adjournment</b>		Bill to Amend—Second Reading—Debate Adjourned.	
Senator Graham .....	1088	Senator Bosa .....	1090
<b>Foreign Affairs</b>		<b>Newfoundland</b>	
Committee Authorized to Meet During Sitting of the Senate.		Changes to School System—Amendment to Term 17 of Constitution—Report of Committee—Motion in Amendment—Debate Continued. Senator Doody .....	1092
Senator Stewart .....	1088	Senator Doody .....	1094
<hr/>			
<b>QUESTION PERIOD</b>		Senator Grafstein .....	1096
<b>The Senate</b>		<b>Canada-European Union Relations</b>	
Absence of Government Leader. Senator Graham .....	1089	Report of Foreign Affairs Committee on Study—Debate Continued. Senator Stollery .....	1096
Senator Lynch-Staunton .....	1089	Senator Berntson .....	1099
		<b>Inter-Parliamentary Union</b>	
		Ninety-Sixth Conference, Beijing, China—Inquiry—Debate Adjourned. Senator Bosa .....	1099
		<b>Appendix</b> .....	i





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