



Debates of the Senate

1st SESSION

•

36th PARLIAMENT

•

VOLUME 137

•

NUMBER 39

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Tuesday, February 17, 1998

THE HONOURABLE GILDAS L. MOLGAT
SPEAKER

CONTENTS

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

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

Published by the Senate

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

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

THE SENATE

Tuesday, February 17, 1998

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

Prayers.

THE HONOURABLE FINLAY MACDONALD

TRIBUTES ON RETIREMENT

Hon. John Lynch-Staunton (Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, last November, a dinner was held at the Château Laurier to honour our recently retired colleague Finlay MacDonald. It was an evening that attracted some 200 people, of whom a dozen or so were asked to share their thoughts and appreciation or, as such events tend to encourage, their lack of appreciation of the guest of honour.

Three senators were among the numbers present that evening. I certainly hope that if the other two speak today, they will not find as inhibiting as I do this adjustment from the freedom allowed by the “off the record, let it all hang out” concept of that event to the “everything you say here will be recorded for posterity” caution imposed on senators’ tributes.

This is not to say that Senator MacDonald’s many activities in this place were ignored; only that narrations of his activities elsewhere attracted more attention and interest, and with good reason, as it turns out. On the other hand, had the speakers on that evening elaborated on Finlay the senator, one evening would not have been enough to list all of his accomplishments during his 13 years here.

Finlay never hid his ambition to be a senator. *The Ottawa Citizen* of March 28, 1987, contained an article which described the long road which brought Finlay to the Senate; a road not at all smooth, by the way:

Finlay MacDonald had worked for it as long as he would remember. He almost had it in the bag once, but it wasn’t going to be. So he’d waited — five years, three months and seventeen days.

It had been a long road for Finlay MacDonald. Provincial Party president, three elections, Chairman of Robert Stanfield’s ’72 campaign, Chief of Staff. He’d been a senior adviser to Joe and Chairman of Brian’s transition team.

Five and a half years in charge of the Party’s war chest. He’d built a PC Canada Fund from nothing, and now it was the envy of the Grits. He’d left it with 65,000 donors, a mailing list to make you green. They had a computer there to make your head swim. He never got a dime for that work.

Honourable senators, lest this confirm that only party loyalty brings you here to this chamber, let me remind you of Finlay MacDonald’s active participation in the broadcasting industry and his numerous community activities, including St. Francis Xavier University and the Shaw Festival. In 1969, he was appointed an Officer of the Order of Canada “in recognition of his efforts and those of some 2,000 volunteer members of the 1969 Canada Games Society, of which he was President, which ensured the success of the First Summer Games.”

Finlay’s passionate support as a member of the Progressive Conservative Party never stopped him from staking out a position of his own when he felt that the PC government was moving in the wrong direction. When sitting on the other side, I would not hide my annoyance at his not toeing the party line, although I have to admit that, when viewed from this side, such behaviour is most commendable and to be encouraged, as it is an example of democracy at its finest.

Honourable senators, I need not give you any kind of a list of the accomplishments that must be credited to the senator from Halifax who, in his 13 years here, was known and appreciated on both sides as a constant attendee and vigorous contributor to the work of the upper chamber. What is more, although Hansard may reveal him as a Conservative of great candour, I can tell you that his voice at caucus was even louder, and his phrasing more colourful when he rose to speak for his various causes. We must always be grateful for this candour, and for his determination in many of the matters we have addressed in recent years.

Senator MacDonald’s work as chairman of the special committee which examined the cancellation of contracts at Pearson airport left this chamber with an example of arduous and long-term work manfully done and honestly reported. Any doubts regarding the conclusions of the majority on that committee have been dispelled by no less an authority than Stephen D. Lerner of Winnipeg, whose specialty is aerospace law. In a detailed and exhaustive analysis entitled “Cancelling the Pearson Airport Agreements: A Case Study” in the 1997 issue of *Annals of Air and Space Law*, Mr. Lerner concludes:

The federal government erred when it cancelled the Pearson Airport Agreements.

As much as this is vindication for the chairman and his colleagues on the committee, it should not take away from the wisdom of Finlay’s reflections on his experiences during the Pearson inquiry, which can be found in the June 18, 1996 Hansard. I commend them to all, as they are from one who, as well as being a diligent and conscientious participant in our deliberations, was an acute and thoughtful observer of the Senate and its role and responsibilities within the Canadian parliamentary system.

While he will be greatly missed in this place, retirement from the Senate for Finlay is only another step in an active life that still has many years ahead of it. I have no doubt that we have not heard the last of or from him.

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, at the dinner for Senator Finlay MacDonald, which was referred to by the Leader of the Opposition and held in Ottawa several weeks ago, the audience was indeed regaled with stories by a host of Tories and a small group of Liberals, including the likes of myself. I had the distinct honour of both eulogizing and vilifying my long-term fellow Cape Bretoner and friend before the largest group of Red Tories gathered together since the Diefenbaker train, fittingly enough, I thought, in the Laurier Room of the Château Laurier.

Early in life, we both became broadcasters — Finlay was much more successful than I — and we dabbled in politics. The 1958 federal election campaign became a watershed from which neither one of us ever turned back. I was the Liberal standard bearer in the great and historic constituency of Antigonish-Guysborough. Finlay was the fund-raiser for the Progressive Conservative Party of Nova Scotia. According to legend, he arrived in Antigonish the day before the election and brought with him a significant amount of aid for the benefit of my opponent — enough to do me in.

A few days after the election, I went to Halifax to seek solace and comfort from my friends. Who better to visit than the legendary “bon ami” himself, who greeted me with arms wide open and a wide, wide grin. “Well, well,” he said, “welcome to the youngest political has-been in Canadian history.” That was 40 years ago. I was scuttled for the second time in a week by my friend — now sitting and smiling up in the gallery. I was crushed and mortally wounded, I thought at the time.

However, what goes around, comes around. Now you are up there, Fin, and I am still down here!

I guess we always had a lot in common. As Shaw once said about the credentials for budding politicians:

He knows nothing, and he thinks he knows everything. That points clearly to a political career.

A lot of people at the time might have thought that applied to us both.

Back to the retirement bash for Senator MacDonald. Never, since the old days when I was the sole Liberal on the Diefenbaker funeral train — in my then position as president of the Liberal Party of Canada — had I really thought: What will history say about all of this? Will I be perceived as a wolf in sheep’s clothing, or the reverse? Maybe history will tell lies, as it often does, or maybe I will be seen as a kind of martyr. As a great man once said: “Yes, martyrdom... the only way in which a man can become famous, without ability.”

However, there we all were, applauding, lauding and laughing with the ageless charmer, the silver fox himself, and celebrating the career of one of the most entertaining people this town has ever known — also one of the hardest working senators on the Hill. He served on many committees, including Legal and Constitutional Affairs and Internal Economy. He was deputy chairman of Banking, Trade and Commerce and National Finance. When he was chairman of Transport and Communications, he and I did a lot of puffing and blowing over the then government’s intention to privatize the Truro-to-Sydney rail line. We chugged along together, making our points, and sometimes, I suspect, mischievously trying to out-manoeuvre the other, always with what we each thought was the public good uppermost in our minds.

Finlay worked hard and supported all good causes in Nova Scotia and many across the country, although on the issue of the shortline sale, I felt at the time that he was on the wrong side of history. No matter, he was always a man of independent mind and believed in what he did, and the devil take whoever tried to dissuade him from his convictions. Not that he was not a team player. He was, most of the time, but he is one of the few people I have met who could vote against his own government, sail through the onslaught, and still be invited to the Prime Minister’s soirées.

Honourable senators, it seems to me that Senator MacDonald’s spirit, determination and incorrigible optimism have made a lot of people happy over the years. As for his enemies? Well, he has picked them very carefully.

Finlay, when I think of you, I think of one of the Tory greats of yesterday, Prime Minister John A. Macdonald, who may have been your match in personal charm and certainly cut the same kind of dapper and rakish figure. Sir John A. once said:

When fortune empties her chamber pot on your head, smile and say “We are going to have a summer shower.”

Senator MacDonald, may the chamber pots of life always turn into the soft and gentle rain of happiness. We certainly miss you down here. Our warmest best wishes to you and Lynn in your retirement years.

Hon. Norman K. Atkins: Honourable senators, I, too, was at the November dinner in honour of our friend, and I wish to pay tribute to him today.

I have known Finlay for over 45 years and have worked with him one way or another on many events since 1953. He was a provincial strategist for the Progressive Conservatives in Nova Scotia and was for a time president of the Nova Scotia PC Party. He served on the national executive of the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada and was a candidate in a federal election in Halifax in 1963. He chaired the Progressive Conservative national campaign in 1972, chaired the PC Canada Fund, and was chief of staff to the Right Honourable Robert Stanfield and to the Right Honourable Joe Clark.

In paying tribute to him today, I have decided to take the high road, to discuss his work, rather than putting on the public record his escapades which occurred while we shared a home together here in Ottawa for 11 years, except to say we had many laughs and interesting times.

•(1420)

Finlay was appointed to the Senate on December 21, 1984, the first appointment made by Prime Minister Brian Mulroney. As we all know in this chamber, it has become commonplace in the media to criticize the method by which people become senators. For years we have been inundated with stories about the superiority of selection through popular election over the present appointment system.

The framers of our Constitution must have had Senator MacDonald in mind when they established the type of Senate that we were to have. It was Sir John A. MacDonald who said:

There would be no use of an Upper House if it did not exercise, when it thought proper, the right of opposing or amending or postponing the legislation of the Lower House. It would be no value whatever were it a mere chamber for registering the decrees of the Lower House. It must be an independent House having a freed action of its own, for it is only valuable as being a regulating body, calmly considering the legislation initiated by the popular branch, and preventing any hasty or ill-considered legislation which may come from that body.

Senator Finlay MacDonald, in what he has done in the 13 years he has been here, typifies the trusts which our constitutional framers placed in the Senate.

The opportunity for Senator Finlay MacDonald to exercise this independence came quickly after his appointment. In his first month in the Senate, namely in January, 1985, he opposed his own government's act to provide borrowing authority based only on Finance Minister Michael Wilson's economic statement the previous November. Since no budget or Main Estimates had been presented at that time, the borrowing bill was held up for over a month until the Main Estimates were presented.

Over the following years, Finlay voted against his own government eight times. He opposed the bill that eliminated the Economic Council of Canada, the Law Reform Commission of Canada and the Science Council of Canada, and other bills too complicated to mention. In 1993, he became ballistic in his fight against the bill which would have merged the Canada Council and the Social Science and Humanities Research Council. He proposed an amendment to kill the merger and, as Hugh Windsor wrote on June 3, 1993:

He made legislative history. It was the first time any Conservative senator had attempted to change, improve,

modify or defeat any piece of government legislation in the nine years since Mr. Mulroney took office.

His amendment was defeated 31 to 27. Undeterred, on third read he managed to convince four Conservative senators, including me, to join with him. He caught his own colleagues unaware by asking other Tory senators to abstain, and then by voting with the Liberals. The entire bill was defeated on a tie vote, 39 to 39. It was the first time that the Senate had defeated a government bill since 1939.

As a matter of fact, every bill the Senate has defeated, namely, the abortion bill, the Pearson airport bill and the death of the gerrymandering Electoral Boundaries Act, has the fingerprints of Senator Finlay MacDonald all over it — and mine, too, I am proud to say. He led the charge in caucus and in the Senate to save Radio Canada International, our shortwave service, the voice of Canada.

The index of *Debates of the Senate* records that since January, 1985 until the present time, he has spoken in the chamber 283 times, and God knows how many times he has spoken during the sittings of the nine committees on which he served, three of them as chairman!

I believe he would say the most interesting time he has spent in this place came during his tenure as chairman of the Special Senate Inquiry into the Pearson Airport Contracts. While others may have shrunk from this onerous task, Senator MacDonald not only volunteered but also actively campaigned for the job. While some in this chamber may have found fault with the majority opinion of that committee, Senator MacDonald steered the committee through the charted waters of summoning by subpoena government witnesses, and through thousands of pages of documents placed in evidence. Above all, under his chairmanship, this committee of inquiry demonstrated the positive work that can be done by this chamber at a fraction of the cost of a royal commission.

It has become popular in the press lately to criticize senators because of their attendance records — that is, records of their lack of attendance. Let me set out the record of Finlay's attendance. Senators are permitted to be absent without excuse for 21 days in each parliamentary session. The Clerk of the Senate, who keeps the attendance, has verified that during his entire 13 years in the Senate, Finlay missed only 25 days. That is less than two days a year. I believe, with Senator MacDonald in this chamber, that Canadians have been well served.

In the years I have known Finlay, I have come to admire him and, in particular, his sense of humour, his boundless energy, his sense of fairness, his political instincts, and his enthusiasm when faced with a difficult challenge. This adds up to a senator who has had a great influence on my life, and one for whom I have great respect.

I want to wish both Finlay and his wife, Lynn, the very best for the future, as they return to Halifax, Nova Scotia. It goes without saying that they will be missed here in Ottawa. I only hope that he will find new challenges to occupy his time. He has energy and enthusiasm, and he is not a person to remain idle. May he continue to serve his community and country for a long time to come.

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I grew up on Inglewood Drive in Halifax. Mr. MacDonald lived on the next street. I was not allowed to call him Finlay in those days; he had to be Mr. MacDonald, in the jargon of the era.

He was a Conservative. That was the only misjudgment my father ever thought Finlay MacDonald had made. My father was a great admirer of what he thought was a genuine, self-made man who had given of his talent and his ability to others — both in the political process and to the many charitable organizations which have not been discussed here, but to which all Nova Scotians know that you have given during your many years of contributions to that province.

Among the admiring things that my father used to say about Finlay MacDonald, there was one in which there was just a tinge of jealousy. On a number of occasions, my father had been placed on the best dressed list for men in the country, but my father was only five foot five and a half inches tall. He was very jealous that Senator MacDonald was equally as dapper, but had more height to give more splendour to the clothes in which he was dressed.

Finlay, you are held in great esteem by this chamber. I want you to know that you are also held in great esteem by my family, despite your political lack of sagacity.

Hon. Philippe Deane Gigantès: Honourable senators, I was conditioned to be suspicious of Conservatives. My father used to say, “Conservatives do not have hearts, they have wallets.”

When I was five, instead of reading me bedtime stories, my mother would read the editorials of the Athens Liberal paper. When I came to this chamber, I retained those prejudices until I met Senator MacDonald. Soon, I said to myself, “Well, if someone like him can be a Conservative, maybe there are some decent Conservatives.” To my great surprise, I found out that, yes, indeed, there are some of you whom I like — not all of you, but I might even say most of my colleagues opposite.

You have failed in one thing, which I will illustrate by relating what occurred when I was coming out through the Senate door with my very beautiful sister-in-law. I was kissing her on both cheeks, following our lunch together. In walks Finlay and he says, “Me, too.” He grabbed her around the waist, did a complete sort of tango flip, and gave her a very long kiss on the mouth. She asked me, “Who is he?” I said, “He is a Conservative senator.” She said, “I think I will vote Conservative next time.”

I wish to suggest to you that if you had used Finlay MacDonald to kiss more Liberal ladies, your party might still be in power.

•(1430)

Hon. John Buchanan: Honourable senators, I also would like to pay tribute to Finlay MacDonald. I know quite a few things about Finlay that I will not relate today. Finlay MacDonald: family man, fellow Cape Bretoner, war veteran, broadcaster, graduate of St. F-X University of Antigonish, politician extraordinaire, member of the Order of Canada and, as a dear friend of his mentioned to me this morning, and as I knew, the life of the party wherever a party was held.

I think Finlay will know who related that to me. He is in Halifax and also a neighbour of his in Chester.

As Senator Atkins mentioned, Finlay was president of the PC Party of Nova Scotia in the mid-1960s. He was a great president of the PC Party. That was about the time that I got involved in politics. In 1963, Finlay ran in the federal election. Although he lost, he won just about every poll in a constituency which two years later was called Halifax-Atlantic. I knocked on many doors with Finlay during that election. His debonair ways, his wit and his excellent campaigning ensured that he would win a majority of those polls.

Many may not recall that in 1969 Finlay was chairman of the Canada Games in Halifax, Nova Scotia. He did a remarkable and outstanding job, as I have been reminded by people who were much involved at that time, including Admiral Debbie Piers. I was a member of the cabinet of Nova Scotia at the time and attended many of the functions. The talk of the neighbourhood where Finlay lived was that the Prime Minister of Canada, Pierre Elliott Trudeau, visited Finlay's home at the time. Many of the people in that neighbourhood, both Liberals and Conservatives, were very pleased that the Prime Minister had taken the time to visit in that part of Halifax. The Canada Games were a huge success, due to the hard work of many, but primarily of Finlay MacDonald.

In the 1960s, Finlay MacDonald was the president of Industrial Estates Limited. IEL had been set up by Premier Robert Stanfield to attract new business and new industry to Nova Scotia. Those who were in Nova Scotia during that era will know that literally thousands of new jobs were created in our province as a result of the work of Industrial Estates Limited. It was a Crown corporation and very innovative in bringing new industries and jobs to Nova Scotia. Finlay, the members of the board, the executive officers and the people who worked at IEL were primarily responsible for that success, and as a result of their travels around the world they brought new industries to Nova Scotia.

It is interesting to note that most of those industries are still in Nova Scotia. They have created jobs in Nova Scotia over the years. All of this is primarily due to the efficiency and hard work of Finlay and the people who worked for him at IEL.

Here in the Senate, Finlay has been a very efficient and hard worker. As Senator Atkins has already indicated, he has been a faithful attender, chairman of many committees over the years, and has always defended the Senate of Canada.

I have known Finlay for almost 40 years. I knew his family in Sydney. His father was a Conservative Member of Parliament from Cape Breton South for ten years.

Finlay, congratulations to you on your good work over the years and on all of the endeavours I have mentioned in which you were involved. You have always been "Mr. Broadcaster" to many Nova Scotians, and for them, you will continue to be simply Finlay MacDonald.

Some of you might not know that Senator MacDonald's real name is not Finlay MacDonald. In Cape Breton and at St. F-X, to many of the young ladies of the day he was known as Ernie Finlay MacDonald.

I bring you greetings, Finlay, from some ladies in the Boston area who told me to ensure that I address you as Ernie Finlay MacDonald. You will know who I mean. I should say that Senator Graham knows those ladies as well. I am getting in deep now.

In closing, Finlay MacDonald is a credit to Cape Breton, a credit to Nova Scotia and a credit to Canada.

Well done, good and faithful servant of Cape Breton and Nova Scotia.

Do not take this wrong, but many were the nights, during annual meetings of the PC Party, that I would go up to the suite where there were a bunch of people and find Finlay and Mavis on the floor doing their exercises. That is why they were both in such good shape. I do mean "exercises" in the common sense.

Finlay, Mavis and I extend our best wishes to you and Lynn as you return to Halifax. Well done.

Senator Graham: I should like to indicate that when Senator Buchanan speaks of the ladies in Boston he is talking about his sister and relatives.

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn: Honourable senators, in December of 1984, I was doing my Christmas shopping on Sparks Street one very snowy and cold day when someone grabbed me by the arm, spun me around and said, "Hey, did you see that I appointed Finlay MacDonald to the Senate? What do you think?" It was Brian Mulroney. I looked at him sternly and said, "It's about time."

So it was. For a long time, Finlay MacDonald has understood and respected the system of government, knowing also that it was not infallible. He knew about the role of political parties in that system better than most, and he regarded politics always as an honourable occupation. He saw communications and culture as absolutely critical to national unity, and I strongly agreed with him all along the way.

As a parliamentarian, he acted with diligence and, as many have said, with integrity and with humour. Finlay MacDonald has been a political opponent of mine for over 30 years, but also a personal friend. I hope he never stops adding to the contribution he has already made to his province and to his country. I wish him and Lynn many happy years together.

•(1440)

DISTINGUISHED VISITORS IN THE GALLERY

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I should like to draw the attention of the Senate to the presence in our gallery of our distinguished former colleague, Honourable Senator Finlay MacDonald.

I note that Senator MacDonald is accompanied by another long-standing senator, Honourable Senator Lorne Bonnell.

PAGES EXCHANGE PROGRAM WITH HOUSE OF COMMONS

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, before we proceed with Senators' Statements, I should like to introduce to you the exchange pages who are with us from the House of Commons this week. On my right is Sue-Anne Fox, from Montreal. She is enrolled at the University of Ottawa in the faculty of administration, with a major in marketing.

[*Translation*]

Maurice Turcot of Saint-Charles, Ontario, is pursuing his studies in criminology at the University of Ottawa. He is enrolled in the faculty of social sciences.

I welcome both of you to the Senate and hope that you will find your week with us a productive one.

[*English*]

THE HONOURABLE M. LORNE BONNELL

TRIBUTE ON RETIREMENT

Hon. Wilfred P. Moore: Honourable senators, I rise today to make a statement in tribute to Senator M. Lorne Bonnell, who retired from this honourable chamber on January 4, 1998, upon the occasion of his 75th birthday.

Senator Bonnell entered public life in 1951 when, while still carrying on a busy medical practice, he was elected to the House of Assembly of Prince Edward Island. He was re-elected in general elections held in 1955, 1959, 1962, 1966 and 1970.

In addition to being an elected member, the good doctor also served his fellow Islanders as Minister of Health, Minister of Welfare, Minister of Tourism and Development, Minister Responsible for Housing, and Liberal house leader.

In 1965, he served as acting leader of the Liberal Party of Prince Edward Island. He knew how to get elected and stay elected.

On November 15, 1971, Dr. Bonnell was appointed to the Senate of Canada by the Right Honourable Pierre Elliott Trudeau. No doubt because of his medical training and experience, Senator Bonnell exhibited a strong interest and deep concern for the youth of our country, their health and education.

Among the highlights of Senator Bonnell's distinguished career in the Senate must be his chairmanship of the Standing Senate Committee on Health, Welfare and Science, which produced a report in 1980 entitled "Child at Risk." That report and its contents are as much in vogue and as relevant today as they were 18 years ago.

Of equal importance was his chairmanship of the Special Committee on Post-Secondary Education which, in December 1997, produced a report that will be an important blueprint respecting the education of our youth and how we approach this very important issue in the years ahead.

Senator Bonnell's office in Room 265-E was a gathering spot for many senators from both sides of the house. There you would be treated to good conversation, lively stories and warm fellowship. The good doctor was quick to dispense medications or libations depending upon your need or request. After such sessions you revelled in frequenting the Café de la Promenade for a meal of Chinese food chased with a beer.

On a personal note, when I came to this place in the fall of 1996, Senator Bonnell took me under his wing. He showed me around. He explained the operations and traditions of this honourable chamber, the functioning of its officers and the interests of the personalities seated herein. We two Maritimers quickly became good friends. I shall always be grateful for the interest that he took in me and the many courtesies he extended to me.

A devout family man of consummate energy, Senator Bonnell has returned to his beloved Murray River where he attends to his patients in his medical practice and oversees his various business interests.

With 20 years in the House of Assembly in Prince Edward Island, 27 years in the Senate of Canada, Senator Bonnell has provided a total of 47 years of service to his fellow Islanders and Canadians, a distinguished record that required commitment, integrity and energy. Senator Bonnell has done his island and Canada proud. We wish him well, we shall miss him.

SENATOR'S STATEMENT

THE SENATE

APOLOGY FOR REMARKS ACCREDITED BY MEDIA AS OPINION OF
LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Hon. Phillippe Deane Gigantès: Honourable senators, I wish to apologize to the members of the Standing Senate Committee

[Senator Moore]

on Legal and Constitutional Affairs on which I have the honour to serve.

In answer to a citizen's letter urging me to support Bill C-220, which would take away the copyright of people found guilty of some offences, I said that I thought the committee considered the bill unconstitutional and badly drafted. I did not have the right to speak on behalf of the committee. It was a mistake on my part. I apologize. I should have said that this was my opinion alone that this bill is unconstitutional, badly drafted and does not do anything for victims' rights. Please forgive me.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (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 Wednesday, February 18, 1998, at 1:30 p.m.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTION PERIOD

NATIONAL DEFENCE

EFFICACY OF ANTHRAX VACCINE DESTINED FOR USE ON
MILITARY PERSONNEL EN ROUTE TO PERSIAN GULF—
REQUEST FOR ANSWER

Hon. Terry Stratton: Honourable senators, I address my question to the Leader of the Government. As he is aware, I asked a question last week concerning the inoculation of our troops with the anthrax vaccine for their work in the Persian Gulf.

I gave him some information because it raised great concern. In that information I gave him, was indicated that it would take six weeks for the vaccine to have an effect or take hold, which might be too late should all heck break loose over there.

Does the honourable senator have a response as yet in regard to this question?

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I have consulted with my colleagues. As late as this morning, I discussed this issue with the Minister of National Defence. I have been assured that he has been assured by the medical doctors in the armed forces that indeed our armed forces personnel will be safe and that immediately upon the inoculation being given, it begins to take effect. My understanding is that at the time that our armed forces might be in any danger areas, they would be fully and adequately protected.

Senator Stratton: Is the honourable senator saying that the vaccine does not take six weeks to take effect? Are we being told that this vaccine takes effect immediately, that once someone is inoculated, they are safe?

Senator Graham: I am sure one would receive many varying opinions from medical experts depending upon their particular field of expertise.

However, I have been informed by the Minister of National Defence that he has the full assurance of medical authorities in the armed forces that the vaccine would take effect in sufficient time so that our Canadian Armed Forces personnel would be fully protected.

•(1450)

IRAQ

POSSIBLE STRIKE BY WESTERN NATIONS—BOMBING OF STORAGE FACILITIES FOR WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION—PROVISION OF PROTECTIVE CLOTHING FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Norman K. Atkins: Honourable senators, can the Leader of the Government in the Senate also assure us that any member of the service who is assigned to the Persian Gulf will be outfitted with the most up-to-date equipment so that he or she is protected from any possible circumstances that might arise there?

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, that is an appropriate and very timely question. Our ships were designed with this kind of threat in mind, and our personnel have been equipped with protective clothing that enables them to carry out their duties safely, should any of the weapons that have been talked about be used.

POSSIBLE STRIKE BY WESTERN NATIONS—BOMBING OF STORAGE FACILITIES FOR WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION—ASSURANCE OF PROTECTION FOR CIVILIANS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Acting Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, my question is for the Leader of the Government in the Senate. The government should have some concern about the safety of Canadian Armed Forces personnel, who we understand will be at the outer edge of the Gulf. However, I must ask: What about protection for the

innocent civilians on the ground in Iraq, should the bombing that has been spoken of be undertaken, and in particular, bombing of the sites where the biological and chemical materials are stored?

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I am sure the Honourable Senator Kinsella appreciates that every humanitarian effort will be taken to ensure that all possible human lives are safeguarded.

POSSIBLE STRIKE BY WESTERN NATIONS IN CONFORMITY WITH INTERNATIONAL CONVENTIONS OF WAR—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Noël A. Kinsella: My very specific question, then, to get to the heart of this issue, is: Does the Government of Canada have assurances, either from its own intelligence staff or from its own international or domestic legal staff that, should the bombing take place, a bombing in which we are acting in a supporting role, it would be consistent with the international humanitarian law conventions, and the Geneva convention in particular?

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government): The answer to that question is a very definite “yes.”

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

VIOLENCE IN ALGERIA—MISSION OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT—LACK OF SENATE PARTICIPATION—REQUEST FOR PARTICULARS

Hon. Eymard G. Corbin: Honourable senators, my question is for the government leader in the Senate. I apologize for not giving him advance notice of this question as perhaps I should have done. He will recall that, before Christmas, I raised in this house the matter of the killing of innocent people in Algeria. During Ramadan, over 1,000 people — most of them women and children, but also men — were atrociously murdered for reasons difficult to accept in terms of human rights.

Recently, we have heard that the Honourable Don Boudria has been trying to organize a visit to Algeria by members of the House of Commons — for what purpose, I do not know; and with what instructions from the Minister of Foreign Affairs for the government, I do not know.

I should like to know what the purpose of the mission is, if I may call it that, who they intend to meet, and what objectives they are aiming at. I think that sort of information would be useful to all members of Parliament.

In addition, would the Leader of the Government inquire why members of the Senate have not been invited to form part of that mission, if there is, indeed, to be a mission?

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government): Yes, honourable senators, I will inquire of my colleagues as to the timing, the complement or make-up of the mission and its leadership, and determine whether or not it is the intention of those responsible to invite Senate participation.

Canada is actively involved in looking for the best way to help the victims of violence in Algeria. An envoy has already been dispatched to Algeria. The results of the visit, I understand, were positive and enabled Canadian representatives to have a frank and open dialogue with the Algerian authorities. The Minister of Foreign Affairs has written to the president of the country, and has received a response which I understand was encouraging, and leads Canada to believe that further Canadian initiatives will be welcomed in that part of the world.

As was indicated, there is hope that the government house leader, Mr. Boudria, will soon be able to go to the area. I will determine very shortly whether or not members of this chamber could be part of the delegation, or at least, as a start, determine what the make-up of that delegation will be.

THE ECONOMY

GAP IN DISPOSABLE INCOMES IN COMPARISON WITH UNITED STATES—POSSIBILITY OF TAX CUT—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Duncan J. Jessiman: Honourable senators, the income gap between Canadians and our American neighbours continues to widen, not only because of the drop in the value of our dollar but because incomes are rising faster in the United States than in Canada.

In the third quarter of 1997, after-tax income per man, woman and child in the United States was just a bit more than \$30,000 in Canadian funds. After-tax income per person in Canada was a bit over \$17,000 Canadian. That is a gap of \$13,000 per annum. Put another way, after income taxes, per capita personal income in the United States is now 75 per cent above Canadian levels.

Would the government leader not agree that the time has come to bring down income taxes so that this gap can be narrowed?

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I cannot prejudge or pre-empt what the Minister of Finance will do in his budget. I can only suggest that we wait. Perhaps that is the only answer I have, except to indicate, as I did the other day in response to Senator Jessiman, that that is the pattern that has existed for a long time. There is an income gap between citizens of the United States and Canada.

However, there are many good news economic indicators in our country which bode well for the future. Whether you want to talk about manufacturing shipments growing by 2 per cent in December, new motor vehicle sales posting their strongest monthly gain of the year, up 14.6 per cent, and so on, all the economic indicators are positive. I would hope that in that process, as we approach and achieve the objective of a zero deficit, the income gap will narrow.

GAP IN DISPOSABLE INCOMES IN COMPARISON WITH UNITED STATES—REQUEST FOR PARTICULARS OF STUDIES CONDUCTED

Hon. Terry Stratton: Honourable senators, I have a supplementary question on the same topic. This gap has been widening for a number of years. It is of particular concern to

Canadians now because it is becoming abundantly clear that we are falling further and further behind as our Canadian dollar has been dropping like a stone.

Has the government done any kind of research to determine the reasons — there cannot be just one reason — behind this ever-widening gap? If such research has indeed been done, could the Leader of the Government make the results known to us so that we can be aware of it as well as the government?

•(1500)

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government): Yes, honourable senators, I shall attempt to provide a more detailed answer for Senator Stratton, as well as for Senator Jessiman.

DELAYED ANSWERS TO ORAL QUESTIONS

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I have a response to a question raised in the Senate on October 30, 1997, by the Honourable Senator Terry Stratton regarding changes to the Canada Pension Plan budget for promotion and advertising, and I have a response to a question raised in the Senate on November 26 by the Honourable Senator Terry Stratton regarding the purpose of the surplus in the employment insurance reserve account.

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

CHANGES TO CANADA PENSION PLAN—BUDGET FOR EXPENDITURE ON PROMOTION AND ADVERTISING—GOVERNMENT POSITION

(Response to question raised by Hon. Terry Stratton on October 30, 1997)

Projected costs of the 1-800 line is approximately \$250,000 for the period September 27, 1997 (tabling of Bill C-2) to February 14, 1998. During the period September 27, 1997 to January 25, 1998, some 32,600 calls were answered. As of February 1, 1998, options for media communications, including print advertising, are still being considered, so there is no estimate of their costs.

PURPOSE OF SURPLUS IN EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE RESERVE ACCOUNT—GOVERNMENT POSITION

(Response to question raised by Hon. Terry Stratton on November 26, 1997)

During the last recession, the EI account began to run a large deficit. In order to ensure the financial integrity of the EI program, the government had to raise the EI premium rate from \$2.25 to \$2.80 in 1991, to \$3.00 in 1992 and to \$3.07 in 1994. Without such action, the EI account would have had a cumulative deficit of about \$20 billion by the end of 1997.

Every year since 1994 EI premiums have been reduced. EI premiums were reduced again for 1998, with premiums declining from \$2.90 to \$2.70.

While EI premiums will be reduced again, the government will not lower premiums such that they have to be raised again in the event of a recession. During the last recession, premiums had to be increased to maintain the financial integrity of the EI account. Clearly, this was not good policy because increasing EI premiums during a recession exacerbates job losses for Canadians.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

CRIMINAL CODE CUSTOMS ACT

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Gigantès, seconded by the Honourable Senator Lucier, for the second reading of Bill C-18, to amend the Customs Act and the Criminal Code.

Hon. Eric Arthur Berntson: Honourable senators, on Bill C-18, I will be responding to the remarks made at second reading by the government side, but it will not be today since I have a little more research to do on the question. I therefore adjourn the debate.

On motion of Senator Berntson, debate adjourned.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT TELEGLOBE CANADA REORGANIZATION AND DIVESTITURE ACT

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. Marie-P. Poulin moved the second reading of Bill C-17, to amend the Telecommunications Act and the Teleglobe Canada Reorganization and Divestiture Act.

She said: Honourable senators, I am pleased to speak today on behalf of Bill C-17, which clears the way for Canada to implement the World Trade Organization agreement on basic telecommunications. Bill C-17 will amend the Telecommunications Act and the Teleglobe Canada Reorganization and Divestiture Act, thus paving the way for the implementation of this WTO agreement on basic telecommunications.

A rigorous consultation process took place between the government, industry and the provinces before the agreement

was negotiated, and there has been valuable input from numerous witnesses into the final shape of the bill that is now before us.

This agreement, which is contained in the WTO General Agreement on Trade in Services, or GATS as it is more commonly known, will benefit Canada and the world. It will not only dramatically expand the global market in telecommunication services, it will also open a multi-billion dollar global market to Canadian telecommunications companies. These markets include the United States, the European Union, Japan, and the developing markets in Asia and Latin America. Colleagues, this bill contains the legislative amendments necessary to meet our GATS commitments, along with several provisions related to the liberalization of the Canadian international telecommunications market.

Allow me to be specific, first in relation to the provisions related to the GATS: They are the repeal of sections of the Teleglobe Canada Act regarding foreign ownership. They are the amendments to the Telecommunications Act to exempt international submarine cables and earth stations from the foreign ownership and control restrictions.

Second, with respect to the provisions of the bill related to the liberalization of our market: They include the repeal of sections of the Teleglobe Canada Act concerning the company's special regulatory regime and the end of its monopoly, and the amendments to the Telecommunications Act that will provide the CRTC with authority to determine the classes of international services that require licences; that will provide the CRTC with the authority to regulate the administration of numbering and other common administrative services; that will provide a regulatory scheme, similar to that found in the Radiocommunications Act, to prohibit the importation, distribution and sale of uncertified telecommunications equipment.

[*Translation*]

Honourable senators, the main purpose of this bill and the agreement it helps implement is to expand, stimulate and liberalize international trade and level the playing field. The purpose of Bill C-17 and the agreement is to open up world markets to Canadian businesses so that they are on a level playing field with their competitors and can thus prosper and create even more jobs for Canadians.

Their purpose is to expand the world telecommunications market so that the telecommunications services available to Canadians continue to grow and improve in quality.

Honourable senators, we know that Canada is a trading country and that international trade contributes strongly to economic growth and job creation. We exported goods worth \$264.2 billion last year compared to \$148.9 billion in 1990.

The importance of foreign trade in goods and services in Canada's economic production ranks it first among the G-7 countries.

In 1995, our goods and services exports accounted for over 40 per cent of our gross domestic product. It is obvious that foreign trade is what drives our economy. We must focus on foreign trade if we are to create the jobs this country needs.

This is why trade expansion is essential to the federal job creation strategy, a partnership involving the federal, provincial and municipal governments, the private sector and the NGOs.

One Canadian job in three depends on exports. For every additional billion dollars in exports, honourable senators, 11,000 jobs are created or maintained.

By contributing to the liberalization of international trade, this bill stimulates economic growth and the creation of quality jobs in Canada.

The telecommunications sector is of particular significance for the economic development of Canada.

Our success in the new knowledge-based economy requires a competitive and dynamic telecommunications industry. This vital sector already accounts for 145,000 jobs and 3.4 per cent of our gross domestic product.

If we encourage the growth of the industry, we will be in a position to compete with the best in the world; otherwise, we are going to condemn our country and our children to second-class status, sitting back to watch our international competitors take advantage of our missed opportunities.

[English]

•(1510)

Honourable senators, some concerns have been expressed about the details of the WTO agreement itself. I want to take this opportunity to address them. Canada and 69 other participating countries have made specific commitments under the agreement setting out the terms and conditions by which foreign companies may supply basic telecommunication services in their markets. For example, the agreement gives Canadian companies full access to the U.S. market in basic telecommunication services. The use of reciprocity tests by the U.S. federal communications commission will be severely curtailed. Furthermore, Canadian companies will be able to enter other telecommunications markets, such as in the European Union and Japan.

All of our major developing-country trading partners have agreed to allow foreign competition into their markets as well as foreign investment. Besides opening their markets, participating countries have also committed to follow the GATS most-favoured-nation treatment and transparency provisions. An important part of the agreement is that all participating countries must establish independent, regulatory bodies that are separate from, and not accountable to, the local telephone company.

In Canada, we already have such a body in the CRTC, which as a model regulatory body is recognized around the world both

for its independence and its transparent and open process. As a result of this agreement, which includes a dispute settlement provision, we will have multilateral rules for trade and investment on basic telecommunications services. It is important to remember that besides benefitting Canada this agreement is good for the world economy. That, too, benefits Canada.

Manufacturers will also benefit from the Information Technology Agreement which will eliminate tariffs on information technology products, including computers, semiconductors, and telecommunications equipment, by the year 2000.

Together, the GATS on basic telecommunications and the Information Technology Agreement, both of which are administered by the WTO, provide a springboard for global economic growth and development. The result will be lower prices for consumers and fewer barriers to the spread of technology which is critical to the development of all countries.

The two agreements cover international business worth over U.S. \$1 trillion, which is roughly equivalent to the world's trade in agriculture, automobiles and textiles combined. These will generate increased demand for Canadian telecommunications products as telecom operators around the world gear up for a new global environment of open markets and competition.

The GATS on basic telecommunications is expected to double or triple the international market for telecommunications over the next decade. Leading Canadian telecom manufacturers, such as Nortel and Newbridge, as well as many other small- and medium-sized companies across the country, will be free to compete in this dynamic and expanding market. The government promised to create jobs for Canadians and to plug Canada into the global knowledge economy. These agreements will do just that.

The GATS will create the same kind of positive conditions for services in trade that the GATT has done for goods and trade. The GATT has contributed to a tenfold increase in the volume of world trade in goods since 1947.

Honourable senators, this is a good agreement for Canada. Our telecommunications companies are among the best in the world, and they are ready to take advantage of the new international business opportunities that this agreement will create. I urge you to act on this bill with all due speed.

On motion of Senator Kelly, debate adjourned.

CANADA HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. Erminie J. Cohen moved the second reading of Bill S-11, to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act in order to add "social condition" as a prohibited ground of discrimination.

She said: Honourable senators, I rise to speak to my motion for second reading of Bill S-11 to amend section 3.1 of the Canadian Human Rights Act to include "social condition" as a prohibited ground of discrimination.

As you know, there are groups of people in our society who are considered vulnerable and in need of special protection from discrimination. These groups are listed in the Canadian Human Rights Act. This bill simply proposes that we add "social condition" to that list in section 2, subsection 3.(1) and subsection 16.(1).

Promoting a society in which all human beings are equally entitled to be treated with respect, dignity and fairness has been an objective of the Canadian government for more than half a century. As you may well remember, I first tabled this bill on December 10 of last year, a date which marked the fiftieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. These past 50 years have presented us with many challenges, but as we struggle to achieve our ideals, we are motivated by the fact that we are improving the quality of life for all Canadians.

We have many sources of pride as Canada is known internationally to be one of the most ardent contenders in the pursuit of human justice and this is a fine accomplishment. However, to quote the 1997 report of the Canadian Human Rights Commission:

Canada's record as a committed proponent of human rights is only as convincing as its latest performance. If a shared belief in the value of equal treatment for all is a measure of our interdependence as citizens, then it is necessary to ask how well the experience of each and every Canadian bears out that belief each and every day.

It is with regret that I report to you that poverty continues to be one of the greatest barriers to equality in Canadian society. Poor Canadians live daily with social stigma and negative stereotypes. Financial institutions, landlords, utility companies, the legal system, public and private media and our governments continue to discriminate against our most vulnerable citizens.

•(1520)

What I am asking you to do today is to look at poverty through a human rights lens, because it is obvious to me that poverty is, first and foremost, a human rights issue. The pervasive social attitude toward the poor has proven to be, time and time again, discriminatory. Yet more than two decades after signing the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Canada has failed to amend its own domestic human rights law with respect to poverty.

Honourable senators, the reason we have a federal human rights law is to provide vulnerable groups with protection against discrimination in areas of federal jurisdiction. We in this chamber have been presented ample evidence which shows that the poorest 20 per cent of our population experience life differently than the majority of Canadians; that our constituents who live in

poverty have been excluded from the enjoyment of any meaningful participation in society's social, economic or cultural life. It is my assertion today that the poor in this country face a prejudice similar to the prejudice faced by the other marginalized groups who are listed within the Human Rights Act. Despite this, there is no direct, legal recognition of poverty as a pervasive source of inequality and disadvantage in Canadian society.

Honourable senators, I am aware that the Canadian Human Rights Commission warns us that the Government of Canada is not able to hand out freedom and equality to Canadians or deliver them from prejudice and discrimination. However, I am also aware that they urge us to work towards the formulation of a coherent, purposeful body of law. In fact, they believe that the Canadian people have every right to expect that our government, in addition to vigorously enforcing existing laws, will act to strengthen and clarify existing human rights legislation.

At this point in time, our human rights law is neither clear nor coherent, for we propose to promote equity for all Canadians; then, by virtue of extending protection to some vulnerable groups and not others, we perpetuate the very kind of discrimination we seek to eliminate. In fact, the likely reason that poverty or "social condition" is not located as a prohibited ground within the act is that the poor are so very marginalized, both socially and economically that they lack the political power needed to achieve any influence within our political system. Let us take it upon ourselves, honourable senators, to rectify this situation.

Honourable senators, you are probably wondering: Why the Senate and Why now? First, I should like to present my argument as to why this is an appropriate undertaking for the executive branch of government.

I first learned of this form of discrimination while working on my report, "Sounding the Alarm: Poverty in Canada." Many of us in this chamber have always lived comfortably. Many of us can also remember when poverty did not carry with it quite the social stigma that it has today. While researching the report, I heard in many cases of how the poor are viewed as though they are worthless simply because they live in poverty. They are often treated as second-class citizens. In time, many internalize these experiences, and begin to feel great shame and low self-esteem. Upon learning this, I felt so strongly about these injustices that as one of the four recommendations made in the report, I asked that the federal government take the necessary steps to extend basic human rights protection to those living in poverty by including "social condition" as a prohibited ground of discrimination.

Well, honourable senators, one year has passed, proving the old adage that if you want something done, you had better do it yourself!

Honourable senators, I am asking you to help our government to correct the omission of "social condition" in our Human Rights Act and, by doing so, improve the lives of those who live in poverty. This chamber has a proud tradition of raising the concerns of our less fortunate citizens. It took two years of travelling from coast to coast and listening to the poor before the

1971 report of the Special Senate Committee on Poverty was tabled. The 1991 report of the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology, entitled "Children in Poverty: Toward a Better Future," reminded us all of our responsibility to the one in five of our nation's children who live without the basic necessities.

In the past, we have also improved our national human rights standards by adding previously excluded groups who could illustrate that they met the definition of needing special consideration in our society. One fine example is our work in relation to Bill S-2, to amend the Human Rights Act to include sexual orientation.

Honourable colleagues, it is completely within our role and mandate within the Canadian parliamentary system to embark on these types of challenges. In fact, I believe that we in the Senate have a duty to maintain the law, and to act to change it when the opportunity presents itself.

It is also important that this bill be introduced in the Senate rather than in the other place. Human rights legislation is, of course, about granting rights to the marginalized and maligned of our society. The fact that a group is in need of protection illustrates that they probably do not enjoy widespread support

By definition, pioneering human rights legislation is inevitably a struggle against popular opinion. The poor are so disenfranchised that their issues are not of great concern to most elected officials. In fact, with the current trend in "poor bashing," few politicians who seek re-election will risk political necks to convince a hardened public of the current plight of the poor.

Considering these factors, it is very unlikely that our colleagues in the other place would be able to initiate a similar bill. We have the luxury of being somewhat protected against political pressures, given our security of tenure, as we review and amend federal bills.

Hoping I have convinced you of the need for the Senate to initiate this bill, I will now move on to explain why I think that this work is timely.

Frustrated with the lack of legislative initiatives in the area of human rights law, activists have begun to use the judicial system to bring about change. In essence, they are able to argue that marginalized groups who are not listed within the charter but who experience similar types of discrimination must be considered analogous to the listed groups, and be treated as such by the law. This is the route gay rights activists took when they tired of waiting for politicians to take action. Noting their success, other equality-seeking groups are starting to follow suit.

We were told during the public hearings on Bill S-5 that anti-poverty groups will soon begin this process. It is currently law that analogous groups be treated the same as the listed groups with respect to the Charter. Their only requirement is to prove to the court that they do, in fact, experience similar

discrimination. Given the testimony I heard, this will not be a difficult argument to make.

Our provinces have also moved several steps forward with regard to social condition as a prohibited ground for discrimination. According to *The Law of Human Rights in Canada*, by Russel Zinn and Patricia Brethour:

Seven provinces prohibit discrimination on the basis of either "social condition," "social origin," "source of income," or "receipt of public assistance." The ground of discrimination applies to all activities covered by the respective legislation, save and except Ontario, in which the prohibition applies solely with respect to the occupancy of accommodation.

It is customary to keep the bodies of law which govern this country in synchronicity, and we should strive to keep abreast of our provincial legislation. Provinces have moved forward to ensure that the poor are protected from discriminatory practices in areas which fall within their jurisdiction, such as housing and utilities. Should we not grant these same rights to the poor in areas which fall under federal control?

I also bring to your attention, honourable senators, the current climate in the field of human rights in our nation. The Chief Commissioner of Human Rights, Michelle Falardeau-Ramsay, in her first public address, stated that she wants to use her position to help combat discrimination against Canada's poor by fighting to have "social condition" included as a prohibited ground. In short, amending the Canadian Human Rights Act to include "social condition" as a prohibited ground of discrimination will meet Parliament's responsibility to respect the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. This amendment will save poor people the hardship, and taxpayers the expense of litigation to bring the act into compliance with the Constitution and Canada's international human rights commitment.

At this time, I think it is necessary to make completely clear what it is that we are actually asking for with this amendment. Bill S-11 does not confer any special privileges to Canada's poor. It deals solely with the proscription of discrimination, that is, prohibiting a burden.

•(1530)

To spell this out even further, I am not proposing that the government make poverty itself a violation to our domestic human rights legislation. Although, our complacent attitude about poverty does contradict what we have signed in international fora, I am not suggesting that our domestic human rights legislation be empowered to take our government to task for not providing an adequate standard of living for all of its citizens. All I am asking is that the poor, whether elderly or disabled, working or in receipt of social assistance, man or woman, not be prejudged and discriminated against.

Including "social condition" under the Canadian Human Rights Act would provide explicit recognition of poverty and its related attributes, such as receipt of social assistance, and would prohibit discrimination against the poor within the federal sphere.

I am also here today in defence of our international reputation. As you know, Canada has generally endorsed the principles enshrined in the international covenants. However, you may not know that when we sign an international covenant, we also agree to a process of review. This is the way the United Nations monitors our compliance. At this time, we are being reviewed to ensure that our government's actions are in keeping with the International Covenant on Social, Economic, and Cultural Rights. Honourable senators, I regret to inform you that we, as a government, are not faring well in this process.

In the report of the last review, the United Nations asked that we take some steps to have our domestic human rights legislation more fully reflect that to which we have signed in international fora. However, although it has been almost a quarter of a century since signing the Covenant, we have failed to amend our Human Rights Act to include these basic rights for our most vulnerable citizens.

The committee also noted that we were not taking the necessary steps to ensure a constant improvement in the lives of the poor and, given the drastic financial cut-backs in social spending, the United Nations Compliance Committee is sure to come to that conclusion again. However, by extending basic human rights protection, we are keeping our promise to continually improve the lives of Canada's poor.

Honourable senators, extending human rights legislation does more than simply uphold an ideal. In fact, by promoting human dignity, justice, fairness and equal opportunity, human rights protection could be one of our most powerful anti-poverty tools. This is true for several reasons.

First, human rights law is a powerful educational tool. By setting standards, we help to create societal behaviours. It also starts a dialogue, so that people and institutions might come to understand more about the lives of those living in poverty.

I have a wonderful example of how poverty education changed the views of an institution and, in turn, the lives of the poor. After years of hard work by the National Anti-Poverty Organization and l'Association coopérative d'économie familiale du Centre de Montréal, the Canadian Bankers Association came to a better understanding of the banking needs of low-income clients. They began to recognize how their institution discriminates against the poor. As a result, they have made a positive commitment to change several banking policies to better accommodate poor Canadians.

Second, there is no question that the housing needs of low income Canadians would be better met with extended human rights protection. I have a short story which illustrates this point. Cathy is a young, stay-at-home mother of two. She and her husband own a small home and pay a modest mortgage. One day, her husband lost his job. After weeks of searching, to no avail, and after draining all other resources, this family was forced on to social assistance. The social worker determined that their monthly mortgage was far less than what they would pay in the private market for an apartment. There is also a two-year waiting

list for public housing. She determined that the most efficient, practical solution was to allow this family to continue with their mortgage.

Several weeks later, the father found a part-time job. While he was looking for full-time work, the family received a "top-up" benefit from social services and their mortgage continued to be paid. Several months passed and the time came to renew their mortgage. Much to their astonishment, the application to renew was denied. The reason: They are social assistance recipients.

No consideration was given to the fact that they, through thick and thin, had, without fail, managed to meet their monthly mortgage payment. No consideration was given to their excellent credit rating. No consideration was given to the fact that social services was prepared to help pay housing costs for as long as it took to get this family back on its feet. In fact, honourable senators, no consideration was given to their personal circumstances at all. They were, quite simply, denied on one criterion: They receive social assistance.

Consequently, this family was required to sell its home and move into a two-bedroom apartment. This apartment cost them a couple of hundred dollars more per month than their previous mortgage. The children lost their bedrooms and their backyard. The equity they had built up in their house just covered the selling costs. They had to move to an urban centre to find accommodation, so the children had to change schools. The father spends almost what he makes commuting to work.

This, honourable senators, is a Canadian tragedy. Housing advocates tell us that it is a tragedy which occurs daily from coast to coast. This type of treatment could be prevented simply by no longer allowing banks to discriminate against social assistance recipients.

Some may feel uncomfortable with the idea of setting further regulations on private enterprise, but you must consider that 96 per cent of housing in Canada is provided by the private sector and therefore requires some regulation if we want to achieve safe, affordable housing for our citizens. Provinces have realized this and have decided that they must take action in the areas which fall under their jurisdiction. To help ensure equity in housing, they have begun to regulate how the private market, or landlords, allocate units.

Take for instance the family who lives in a major urban centre and cannot find housing because landlords do not want to rent to welfare recipients. For a time, a homeless family can take refuge in a shelter while looking for a permanent home, but there is a limit on the time they can stay there, and if they have not found a place by the end of that time, they are forced to take a hotel room at a much higher monthly cost than an apartment. The entire welfare cheque is used to cover housing cost and the family is forced to line up every day at soup kitchens and food banks. Honourable senators, while a family is suffering this kind of misery, it is impossible for the parents to have the time and resources necessary to look for employment.

Front-line workers in social services tell us that there are many families who cannot obtain stable housing because they are discriminated against as social assistance recipients. They tell us that some families live in hotels for months, paying \$300 to \$400 per month more than what they would pay for an adequate apartment. This is the kind of discrimination the provinces are working against. If we work together, we can improve the lives of poor Canadians by making housing more affordable and more available. Yes, honourable senators, this is a powerful anti-poverty strategy.

A similar approach can be taken with regard to utility companies. Recent research by anti-poverty groups shows that the poor are increasingly discriminated against in utility company policies. Phone, gas, hydro and oil companies have now developed two streams of service policy. Customers who score well on income and credit tests are supplied immediate and courteous service.

For those without employment income, the situation is much different. People in these categories are considered "high risk," even if they have good payment histories, and must either pay for service in advance, submit to enormous deposits or, as a result of these barriers, forgo service altogether. Cases are piling up where people have moved to new accommodation and cannot get hydro or phone services activated if they are unemployed. As unimaginable as this may sound, hundreds of Canadians are currently at risk of being denied the essential services of phone, hydro, gas and oil, simply because they are poor.

Phone service, or telecommunications, is the one utility which falls under federal jurisdiction. This new "hard line" with regard to phone service has been identified by the Public Interest Advocacy Centre, or PIAC, a non-governmental group whose main objective is to ensure equity in public utilities. They have testified a number of times to various Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission hearings that the trend in phone service is to classify individuals by their current earnings source, rather than by past payment history or ability to pay. This leaves many people without a telephone, a circumstance that makes looking for work very difficult. It is policies such as these, honourable senators, that are part of a cycle which perpetuates poverty, and helping to break this cycle is another fine, anti-poverty strategy.

•(1540)

Honourable senators, the General Assembly of the United Nations created a guideline of actions for governments to follow with respect to the International Decade for the Eradication of Poverty. One direction was:

...to formulate or strengthen national policies geared to substantially reducing the inequality experienced by low income citizens.

I believe that I have shown how this amendment will help to achieve precisely that goal.

[Senator Cohen]

At the World Summit for Social Development in Copenhagen, the Canadian government declared:

...the new economy has created the human deficit of unemployment and poverty.

As part of this government, honourable senators, we must take notice of the changes around us and help rectify the situation. We need to determine what direction our nation will take as we enter the new millennium. For, as we struggle to balance the competing interests inherent in this new global economy, social instability seems to be the necessary trade-off for continued financial security.

As we attempt to make our way through these massive alterations, untouched and unchanged, the needs of the financially vulnerable are increasingly ignored. The United Nations Human Development Program, or UNDP, has noted that this is the situation faced by most industrialized nations. They have predicted that, in the long term, our resistance to change will produce disastrous results.

The 1997 UNDP report strongly urges us to empower the poor as part of the strategy for empowering our nation. I ask you today to take this advice and heed their warnings. If there is one thing that keeps me awake at night, it is wondering what our nation will look like, how our children and grandchildren will live a generation from now, after the prolonged social exclusion of 20 per cent of our population.

The current reality is that some groups which have been recognized historically as being particularly vulnerable to discrimination have protection, while others do not. Let us work together, honourable senators, to stop the discrimination perpetuated against our most vulnerable citizens.

I urge you to help our government build a society in which there will be a place for all citizens, regardless of their race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, age, sex, sexual orientation, marital status, family status, social condition, disability or conviction for an offence for which a pardon has been granted.

As senators, we must strive to constantly improve the lives of all Canadians, and we must never hesitate to strive for the moon. For even if we miss, we will find ourselves among the stars.

On motion of Senator Chalifoux, debate adjourned.

INTER-PARLIAMENTARY UNION

NINETY-EIGHTH INTER-PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE,
CAIRO, EGYPT—INQUIRY

Hon. Gérald J. Comeau rose pursuant to notice of Thursday, December 4, 1997:

That he will call the attention of the Senate to the Ninety-eighth Inter-Parliamentary Conference, held in Cairo, Egypt, from September 10 to 16, 1997.

He said: Honourable senators, Senator Bosa and Senator Bonnell, now retired, were delegates to the Ninety-eighth Inter-Parliamentary Conference held in Cairo, Egypt, together with Ms Finestone, Ms Catterall, Mr. Dumas, Mr. Hubbard and Mr. Nystrom of the other place.

[*Translation*]

This was the first time the Union held its conference in the Middle East. We did a lot of research on the political situation in that part of the world. The Chairman of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, Mr. Fathy Sorour, the Speaker of the Egyptian Parliament, concluded his three-year mandate in September. It was therefore entirely appropriate for him to say his farewells at a conference held in his own country.

[*English*]

Traditionally, Egypt has played a leading role in the Middle East and has been a cornerstone of regional stability. Egypt was the first state to sign a peace treaty with Israel, and maintaining a pivotal role in facilitating the Middle East peace process remains a key Egyptian foreign policy objective.

Both Egyptian President Mubarak and Foreign Minister Amr Moussa continue to be active in attempts to bring Israel and PLO officials back to the negotiating tables.

Shortly after the conference, we heard many reports about the massacre of tourists in the temple in Luxor, and the problems with extremists. Throughout our stay, we were very much aware of the high level of security in this country, especially at a conference such as ours where the president and top-ranking officials attended various events.

[*Translation*]

In order to maintain its authority, the Mubarak government, with the support of the army, applies a variety of security measures, some of which restrict freedom. The security forces' crackdowns on Islamic militants involve violations of rights and freedoms. Over the past four years, the Egyptian authorities have continually punished violence by militants. Including the 50 tourists recently assassinated at Luxor, terrorists have killed nearly 120 people this year, compared to 160 last year and 360 in 1995. Some 20,000 guerrilla fighters are being held in prison.

[*English*]

Parliamentary elections in late 1995 saw an estimated 45 per cent of the 21 million eligible Egyptian voters cast ballots. Nearly 4,000 candidates competed for the 444 seats in the Egyptian People's Assembly, including hundreds from opposition parties who had boycotted elections in 1990.

I should like to turn now to the conference itself and the work of the Canadian delegation. The two main subjects of the agenda were: ensuring lasting democracy by forging close links between Parliament and the people, and employment in a globalizing world.

I am pleased to report that Mr. Hubbard of the Canadian IPU group was a member of the drafting committee that prepared a resolution for presentation to the final plenary, and he was also elected to the role of rapporteur. This was Mr. Hubbard's first visit to an IPU conference, and he performed quite a task for a new member.

During the general debate of the political, economic and social situation in the world, I spoke about the Canada-United States dispute over Pacific salmon and the need to find a reasonable solution to this issue.

[*Translation*]

As I said earlier, Mr. Sorour of Egypt concluded his term as Chairman of the Inter-Parliamentary Union at the conference. So much of the time in Cairo was spent on choosing his replacement. The election was a particularly important one, because the next chairman will have to set the tone for the Union as it faces the challenges of the 21st century. He will also have to work with the new secretary general, who will be appointed on the retirement of the current one, Mr. Pierre Cornillon, on June 30, 1998.

[*English*]

There were three candidates for the presidency: Mr. Miguel Angel Martinez of Spain, former president of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe; Mr. Eduardo Menem of Argentina, President of the Argentine Senate; and Mr. Sangma of India, Speaker of their Lower House. Happily, I can report that the candidate supported by the Twelve-Plus Group, Mr. Martinez, won by 127 votes to 88 during the second round of voting. Mr. Martinez, who has been active in the IPU since the early 1980s, has a wealth of experience in the union and in other international fora. We hope to have him as our guest speaker at the next annual meeting of the Canadian IPU group in April.

•(1550)

[*Translation*]

The work done in the plenary sessions and committee meetings is, of course, extremely important and useful. I would, however, like to say a few words about the other activities that took place during the Cairo conference. In my view, they are eloquent testimony to the effective role played by parliamentary delegations.

[*English*]

Recently we celebrated the success of Canada in bringing together 121 countries to sign the treaty on a global ban on antipersonnel mines. This event was the culmination of efforts by a wide variety of players: foreign ministers, officials, diplomats, grass-roots organizations, and parliamentarians. The Canadian IPU group is proud of its work in promoting and encouraging a global ban on antipersonnel mines, including the successful introduction of a debate and resolution on the subject at the Beijing IPU conference in September of 1996.

On a personal note, I might add that one of our colleagues, Senator Bosa, has been very forceful on this issue over the years.

As you are aware, three major international players — China, Russia and the United States — did not sign the mines treaty. However, there have been many efforts to encourage these countries to join the Ottawa Process on land mines. In Cairo, the Canadian IPU group organized a meeting with the leader of the Chinese delegation to invite China to be a supporter of this international convention. Although we were not successful in convincing China to sign the treaty, we believe that our work is part of a larger effort to convince Chinese authorities to change their views.

[Translation]

The second initiative I would like to mention concerns our work with the Asia-Pacific group, one of the Union's five geopolitical groups. At the present time, Canada belongs to the 12-plus group, which is made up of the European countries, Canada, the United States, Australia and New Zealand. Australia and New Zealand, however, are members both of the 12-plus group and of the Asia-Pacific group. Given the importance of our involvement in the Asia-Pacific region and our links with this part of the world for over a century, it seemed appropriate that we should ask to become a member of this group.

While we were in Cairo, therefore, two members of our delegation explained to the Asia-Pacific group the reasons behind our request, emphasizing Canada's various links with this region and, in particular, the fact that it had hosted the last APEC conference in Vancouver.

[English]

Another area where members of the Canadian delegation played a vital role was in the promotion of Canada for a non-permanent seat on the Security Council for the term 1999 to 2000. The election will take place in November, 1998. Members of our delegation met with representatives of selected countries, noting that Canada had made a considerable, constructive and sustained contribution to the United Nations. We also underlined that Canada has taken a leading role in promoting effective UN renewal with a view of strengthening the UN's capability to serve the interests of the entire membership. We noted that Canada is the eighth largest contributor to the UN budget and pays its assessments in full and on time without conditions.

[Translation]

Egypt has been eligible for development assistance from Canada since 1976. It has for many years now been one of the main beneficiaries of Canadian assistance. Not long ago, CIDA helped launch a number of projects designed to support the reforms that will enable Egypt to become a more open and more liberal state, through stimulation of its private sector. During our stay, certain members of our delegation made field visits to three projects in the Cairo area.

The first, a community services centre for women from Helwan, is intended to empower women at the bottom of the economic scale, by helping them form a cooperative. The second, run by Egypt's electricity authority, trains people to work in the field of electrical transmission systems. The third, a human rights centre providing assistance to prisoners, seeks to provide prisoners and their families with the means to continue their education by supplying teaching materials and tutorial services. In addition, this project provides prisoners with legal aid in connection with human rights violations.

[English]

Honourable senators, in conclusion, I should like to state once again that I am firmly convinced that parliamentary associations and the delegations which participate in these conferences play a valuable role. The Inter-Parliamentary Union provides a forum where legislators from 135 countries can come together and discuss issues of international importance. It also gives us an opportunity to reinforce and support major foreign policy initiatives such as the ban on antipersonnel mines, increased links with the Asia-Pacific region, and a seat on the Security Council.

I am proud of the work we accomplished and I want to state that the Canadian IPU group will continue to seek opportunities to enhance and expand its effectiveness at future IPU conferences.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, if no other honourable senator wishes to speak on this inquiry, it shall be considered to have been debated.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

MOTION TO ESTABLISH SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO EXAMINE ACTIVITIES OF CANADIAN AIRBORNE REGIMENT IN SOMALIA—DEBATE CONTINUED

Leave having been given to revert to Order No. 1 under "Other Orders":

On the Order:

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

That a Special Committee of the Senate be appointed to examine and report on the manner in which the chain of command of the Canadian Forces both in-theatre and at National Defence Headquarters, responded to the operational, disciplinary, decision-making and administrative problems encountered during the Somalia deployment to the extent that these matters have not been examined by the Commission of Inquiry into the Deployment of Canadian Forces to Somalia;

That the Committee in examining these issues may call witnesses from whom it believes it may obtain evidence relevant to these matters including but not limited to:

1. former Ministers of National Defence;
2. the then Deputy Minister of National Defence;
3. the then Acting Chief of Staff of the Minister of National Defence;
4. the then special advisor to the Minister of National Defence (M. Campbell);
5. the then special advisor to the Minister of National Defence (J. Dixon);
6. the persons occupying the position of Judge Advocate General during the relevant period;
7. the then Deputy Judge Advocate General (litigation); and
8. the then Chief of Defence Staff and Deputy Chief of Defence Staff.

That seven Senators, nominated by the Committee of Selection act as members of the Special Committee, and that three members constitute a quorum;

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

That the Committee have power to authorize television and radio broadcasting, as it deems appropriate, of any or all of its proceedings;

That the Committee have the power to engage the services of such counsel and other professional, technical, clerical and other personnel as may be necessary for the purposes of its examination;

That the political parties represented on the Special Committee be granted allocations for expert assistance with the work of the Committee;

That it be empowered to adjourn from place to place within and outside Canada;

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

That the Committee submit its report not later than one year from the date of it being constituted, provided that if the Senate is not sitting, the report will be deemed submitted

on the day such report is deposited with the Clerk of the Senate; and

That the Special Committee include in its report, its findings and recommendations regarding the structure, functioning and operational effectiveness of National Defence Headquarters, the relationship between the military and civilian components of NDHQ, and the relationship among the Deputy Minister of Defence, the Chief of Defence Staff and the Minister of National Defence,

And on the motion in amendment of the Honourable Senator Forrestall, seconded by the Honourable Senator Beaudoin, that the motion be amended by adding in paragraph 2 the following:

“9. the present Minister of National Defence.”—(*Honourable Senator Murray, P.C.*).

Hon. Lowell Murray: Honourable senators, we have been told during this debate that we must put the Somalia scandals behind us and move on to other things. Senator Rompkey and Senator Bryden have told us that the country must move on, that Parliament must move on, that the Canadian Armed Forces must move on.

It is as if all the evidence of wrongdoing in high places could be wished away. It is as if we could all move on to other things, leaving behind us the cloud of disgrace that hangs over the Canadian Armed Forces and over our reputation as a country.

Honourable senators, we may move on, but the cloud will move with us and will stay with us until the truth is known and responsibility is determined. What is at issue in the motion we are now debating is not just Parliament's right to know the truth. The issue, rather, is our duty, our most serious duty, to hold to account those who act in our name and under the ultimate authority of Parliament. It is that issue of accountability that I would urge upon you in considering your response to this motion.

Let me say in passing that if the changes announced last fall by the Minister of National Defence, Mr. Eggleton, were intended to improve accountability up the chain of command, they are more likely to have the opposite effect. There is to be a Canadian Military Grievance Board. There is to be a Military Police Complaints Commission. There is to be an independent implementation committee. There is to be an ombudsman. There are to be toll-free snitch lines, and civilian committees of one kind or another to oversee this and that. In such a multi-layered, multi-dimensional universe, accountability will not be more clear and more concentrated. It will be more diffuse.

•(1600)

The Chief of Defence Staff and the Minister of National Defence will have more insulation, more cover, more distance between them and what is going on beneath them. Is this really the lesson that our military, bureaucratic, and political leadership have drawn from the events in Somalia? One hopes not.

This is really a matter for another debate, but we should get at it soon. I am aware that there are amendments to the National Defence Act which will probably be here in due course. Perhaps those will provide an opportunity to discuss some of these issues in the appropriate standing committee of the Senate.

Honourable senators, two weeks from today will be the fifth anniversary of March 4, 1993, the incident in Somalia when two Somali civilians were enticed to the Canadian compound at Belet Huen by bait in the form of boxes of food and cans of water laid out there by our soldiers, then shot outside the compound in what has been described as a staged ambush. One of those civilians was killed. It is the opinion of the attending military physician, Dr. Armstrong, that he was executed gang-land style at close range.

Before the night was over, Dr. Armstrong had been told by a captain in our armed forces that a damage control operation was under way. We know what the phrase "damage control" means, do we not? It is a euphemism for officially sanctioned misinformation and cover-up. Indeed, the commanding officer on the scene, Colonel Labbé, caused an in-house investigation to be instituted by one of the people in his chain of command. As a result of that in-house investigation, the platoon was absolved of any criminal wrongdoing and praised for their efforts.

Colonel Labbé wrote to National Defence headquarters in Ottawa to recommend against a military police investigation which, in his words, would discover nothing new. A story was concocted, which is part of the strategy that is now a matter of public record, to the effect that the Somalis who were shot outside the compound were saboteurs. Although the military police argued strongly to National Defence Headquarters in Ottawa that instructions should be given for a military police investigation, this was not done until six weeks had passed, and then only after Dr. Armstrong had threatened to make public his accusation that murder had been committed.

By this time, there had occurred a second even more atrocious incident. I refer, of course, to the March 16 torture, beating and death of the young Somali civilian Shidane Arone, who also had been enticed to the Canadian compound by bait in the form of food and water laid out by our soldiers. This incident caused a police investigation to take place, yet it was two weeks before the news of that atrocity was passed on to the then minister, Ms Campbell. Where was that information during those 15 days? Did the senior officers in Somalia fail in their duty to inform senior officers at National Defence headquarters in Ottawa, or was the information passed on to Ottawa and covered up by the authorities here? We do not know the answers to those questions. Do you not think we have a duty to find out?

We do know for certain that during those two weeks outright lies were passed on to the minister and to the public concerning the circumstances of Shidane Arone's death and the condition of his body when it was examined. A strategy was devised, which is also part of the public record, to de-link the death of Shidane Arone and the attempted suicide of one of the perpetrators.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I regret to interrupt Honourable Senator Murray, but the time is elapsed. Is leave granted?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Senator Murray: I am sorry, honourable senators. I am just getting started.

Before long, the existence of trophy photographs taken by our soldiers became public. Courts martial were held, and convictions in some cases were recorded. The initial cover-up had unravelled quickly. However, let me point out that so far as the public record is concerned, none of those who posed for the trophy pictures has ever been disciplined.

A dozen soldiers stopped by the bunker where the young Somali was being tortured and beaten. Is it true, as reported in the media, that six of those soldiers have since been promoted, the official explanation being that since they were never charged with anything, their promotions could not fairly be denied?

The one thing we do know is that no senior military officer and no senior bureaucrat has ever resigned over what happened in Somalia. None has ever accepted responsibility; none has ever been held to account.

By November, 1994, the so-called damage control exercise was unravelling. The efforts of some journalists had succeeded in uncovering part of the truth. Dr. Armstrong had publicly accused senior officers of having ordered the destruction of evidence.

•(1610)

The government decided that a public inquiry was necessary. The Létourneau commission was appointed under the Inquires Act. I need not recall for honourable senators the unqualified and categorical assurances of the then Minister of National Defence, Mr. Collenette, that the Létourneau commission would be able, fearlessly and fully, to establish the truth and assign responsibility.

It was October, 1995 before the Somalia commission heard its first witness. Approximately five months later, the commission announced that it intended to look into more recent developments, that is developments that had taken place since its appointment in November, 1994. Six months after that — this brings us to September, 1996 — Prime Minister Chrétien declared that the commission was going on too long and was costing too much. Four months later, the new Minister of National Defence, Mr. Young, announced that the inquiry was being called off.

When the Somalia commission reported in June, 1997 they were able to offer some findings and conclusions. They told us what the premature curtailment of their schedule had prevented them from pursuing, and they presented a convincing, documented and shocking narrative of official obstruction of their judicial inquiry.

In chapter 38 of the report, honourable senators will find the commissioner's examination of the incident of March 4, 1993, of the allegations subsequently made of the deficiencies of the summary investigation and of the cover-up that ensued. Let me read one sentence into the record.

...the response of the chain of command... was weak, untimely, inadequate, self-serving, unjustifiable and unbecoming the military leadership that our soldiers deserve and the Canadian public expects.

Let me pause here to report that with regard to the commanding officer in Belet Huen, Colonel Labbé, it is said that his name has been at the top of the merit list for promotion to brigadier general for the past two years. It is said that he is now the subject of a career review board. To what purpose? To facilitate his promotion? To investigate further his response to the incident of March 4, 1993? We do not know.

Vice Admiral Murray, whose implausible explanation of the delay in sending the military police to Somalia after March 4 is part of the commission's record, is now the assistant deputy minister of the Federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans.

What the commission was not able to do because of the government decision to shut them down, is discussed in their report in a few words, when they say this:

...could not address...the behaviour of senior officers and officials for the purpose of assessing their personal accountability, because our hearings were brought to an end before the most important witnesses relevant to that issue and time period could be called. Our schedule was aborted just as we were beginning to question the highest levels of leadership of the Canadian Forces and the Department of National Defence and to the allegations of cover-up with respect to some incidents....The Government's decision effectively allowed many of those in senior leadership positions during the deployment to avoid entirely accountability for their conduct, decisions, and actions during and after the mission.

The commission added:

Once again, history repeats itself, in that only the lower ranks have been made to account for the marked failures of their leaders.

These comments by the commission relate to the March 4 incident and subsequent related allegations. The commission was not able to touch at all on the March 16 torture, beating and death of Shidane Arone.

I wish to draw the attention of honourable senators to the obstruction by senior people in the Canadian Armed Forces and the Department of National Defence of the work of the Somalia Commission. No subject is more relevant to the motion that is now before us and to the need to set up a Senate inquiry. Honourable senators who wish to examine the subject in more detail may do so by reading chapter 39 of the commission report.

It is clear from the narrative related by the commission that from the very beginning the military authorities and the Defence Department systematically obstructed the efforts of the Somalia Inquiry to obtain documents relevant to its mandate. As a result, the work of the inquiry was delayed. The staff was constantly preoccupied with these problems. The commission decided that the matter was so serious that they should launch special hearings on issues related to the non-production of documents.

These hearings went on from the fall of 1995 through the winter of 1996. Some commentators have criticized the commission for having allowed itself to become bogged down in such a multitude of details, not all of them central to the inquiry. Perhaps those critics are right, but the commission was faced early in its mandate with clear evidence of obstruction, document tampering and the concealment of documents so felt that it was absolutely necessary to pursue these matters wherever they land.

The commission ran up against an ad hoc team of civilian officials and military officers called the Somalia Inquiry Liaison Team, better known by its acronym SILT. As to the *modus operandi* of this team, the commission said:

...rather than assisting with the timely flow of information to our Inquiry, SILT adopted a strategic approach to deal with the inquiry and engaged in a tactical operation to delay or deny the disclosure of relevant information to us...

Later, the commission reported the:

...fragmented, dilatory and incomplete documentary record furnished to us by DND...

Please bear in mind, honourable senators, that the people being spoken of in these terms are senior officers of the Canadian Armed Forces. They are senior people in the Department of National Defence, public servants who have taken an oath of allegiance, who have sworn to faithfully carry out the responsibilities entrusted to them in their high offices. Bear in mind also that this was their response to a judicial inquiry established by Order in Council to ascertain the truth. Here is what the judicial inquiry said of these people:

During the hearings, many details of the affair were examined, and witnesses for the most part denied responsibility. It was clear, however, that the Department had failed blatantly to comply with our order for production. The actions of the Department were, we concluded, dishonest and deliberate. To cover the original deception, the severity of misdeeds had escalated from artifice to lies, to non-compliance with an order for production and, finally, to the attempted destruction of evidence.

•(1620)

These are the words of a commission of inquiry consisting of a judge, a retired judge who also happens to be a distinguished veteran of World War II, and a journalist. They are words of a commission of inquiry to describe the activities of public servants who are ultimately responsible to us, to Parliament.

How can we, in good conscience, follow the advice of our friend Senator Rompkey to turn the page, to stop scrutinizing the past and to look to the future? How could we possibly justify such an abdication of our responsibility to hold to account those who act under the authority of our laws? Deception, lies, artifice, non-compliance with a judicial order, attempted destruction of evidence — so far, those responsible for all of this have got away with it. The very people whose conduct was being investigated seem to have succeeded, in January 1997, in persuading the then defence minister Mr. Young to close down the inquiry.

From March 4, 1993, when the damage control operation began, through the orchestrated in-house investigation, through the conceiving, conspiring, conniving and sanctioning of lies and misinformation, through the tampering with documents and the destruction of evidence, to the successful campaign to shut down the Somalia inquiry, people in high places for whom we are ultimately responsible have evaded accountability, escaped responsibility and eluded the efforts of properly constituted civilian authority — Parliament, government, a Royal Commission — to establish the truth.

For all that has happened, the bottom line so far is that no one in authority knew anything; no one was responsible; no one is accountable. How can we, in the Parliament of Canada, leave it at that? If we do not insist on accountability, who will?

This is not a very pleasant matter, to put it mildly, but in one's mind's eye, one goes back to the night of March 16 and the beating and death of Shidane Arone at the hands of our men. The Somalia commission was shut down before they could even inquire into this.

Shidane Arone was 16 years of age. He was 5 feet 4 inches in height. He weighed 120 pounds. He tried to steal some food and he was set upon by brutes who wear our uniform. During a long night, he was kicked and beaten and punched and suffocated and burned with cigars, beaten to a pulp with a metal bar, sodomized with a riot stick, and killed.

A dozen soldiers passed by the compound, watched the beating, and then made their fateful, moral choice. They turned their backs and walked away. In the words that we have heard so often from colleagues on the other side, they moved on to other things.

Still worse is the complicity from that day to this of those up the chain of command, military or civilian, who have dissembled and lied and covered up.

This motion presents us with a moral choice — whether to do our duty and insist on accountability, ascertain the truth, fix responsibility, however difficult and painful it is, or whether to turn our backs and walk away.

Hon. Philippe Deane Gigantès: Honourable senators, I share in the horror that Senator Murray feels. We all feel that way about what happened to that young Somali. However, I

remember, too, the dismay I felt when I looked at CPAC night after night at the conduct of this so-called commission of inquiry. For instance, Mr. Desbarats, who could not manage his way out of a wet Kleenex, tried to impugn the honour of an officer because he did not know what was happening five kilometres away.

Perhaps Judge Létourneau went to war. Maybe he worked in an ideal situation where he could foresee everything and he knew exactly what someone was doing 1,000 yards away.

I remember that once our ship was firing badly and missing when normally we did not. We discovered later that our chief gunner's mate had heard in a letter that his wife had had an affair with an American soldier. He was devastated and his aim went wrong. If we had known that, we could have replaced him with someone else. We did not know. We were responsible, but things of this sort, unforeseeable, were happening in war time, all the time, everywhere.

People in the commission of inquiry were trying to pin down an officer for something he could not possibly have known at that time. They were questioning with a sort of Kenneth Starr feeding frenzy that was debasing the Canadian idea of justice and injuring the morale of the armed forces.

If they had treated those officers as fellow citizens with whom they wanted to cooperate in order to get at the truth, it would have been a totally different situation. They treated them from the beginning, before anything was proven, as guilty parties. I resented that and so did the military and they were right. It was time to put an end to that "Starr chamber."

Senator Lynch-Staunton: Shame!

On motion of Senator Poulin, debate adjourned.

CANADA-JAPAN INTER-PARLIAMENTARY GROUP

EIGHTH ANNUAL MEETING WITH JAPAN-CANADA
PARLIAMENTARIANS FRIENDSHIP LEAGUE—INQUIRY

Hon. Dan Hays rose pursuant to notice of December 11, 1997:

That he will call the attention of the Senate to the Eighth Annual Meeting between the Canada-Japan Inter-Parliamentary Group and the Japan-Canada Parliamentarians Friendship League, held in Japan, from November 8 to 16, 1997.

•(1630)

He said: Honourable senators, I would like to address the Senate with respect to the eighth annual meeting of the Canada-Japan Interparliamentary Group and the Japan-Canada Parliamentarians Friendship League which took place in November of last year.

These were the most successful bilateral meetings to date, both in terms of content and interest on the part of Diet members. To that effect, the Canadian delegation was honoured to receive the largest number of Diet members to ever attend the bilateral talks, which included numerous former ministers and former prime minister Kaifu. He was in office in 1989 when this organization was first created under his leadership and that of then prime minister Mulroney.

The bilateral talks dealt with political and economic developments in Japan and in Canada, bilateral trade, investments, tourism, security issues, the forthcoming COP3, or Kyoto conference, APEC, as well as administrative reform and deregulation in Japan. The talks were particularly interesting in light of the current changes Japan is undergoing to its society, institutions and economy.

Changes to the fiscal structure of Japan's economy are of great importance to Canada. Japan is our second largest trading partner after the United States. In the opinion of some of the Diet members, changes to Japan's economy, institutions and society going on at the present time rival in magnitude those it experienced after World War II.

A highlight of the bilateral talks was the announcement that Prime Minister Hashimoto would announce, while on an official visit to Ottawa, that Japan would sign the Convention to Ban Anti-personnel Mines.

Senator Comeau spoke earlier about the good work of the Inter-Parliamentary Union. I can confirm that the Canada-Japan relationship, as well as the multilateral relationship that organization has with Asia-Pacific countries, has served Canada well in encouraging other countries to follow the Canadian example of signing the convention banning anti-personnel mines, which took place in December of last year.

Following the bilateral talks in Tokyo, the delegation visited the Island of Kyushu. Kyushu has a population of 15 million and produces 1 per cent of the world's GDP. It is sometimes referred to as silicon island because of its high-tech production. It offers great possibilities for Canadians in the export of forest products, housing products, consumer goods and agricultural products such as beef. We were able to meet with the Canadian consul, in addition to visiting a beef production cooperative and robotics plant on Kyushu Island. Both Hiroshima and Nagasaki are on that island, and the delegation visited the Nagasaki Atomic Bomb Museum and Peace Garden.

The global economy in technology has made it such that changes occurring in Japan and Asia will have an impact worldwide.

In view of the importance of the Asia-Pacific to Canada, in particular our economy, it is of prime importance that Canadian parliamentarians be aware of these changes. Two-way trade now amounts to \$22 billion with Japan, exports and imports roughly

in balance. Japanese tourism represented approximately \$690 million in revenue to Canada in the last fiscal period.

I wish to thank members of the delegation for the successful bilateral talks to date, in particular my colleagues from the Senate who attended, Senators Murray and Poulin. I also wish to note the professionalism and dedication of our Canadian embassy officials, and I encourage colleagues in this place to join the Canada-Japan Inter-Parliamentary Association.

This eighth bilateral meeting and our multilateral relationship with the Asia-Pacific characterize a number of initiatives that affirm Canada's commitment to Japan and the Asia-Pacific as key to our future success as a trading nation. We share a Pacific coast with a diverse and dynamic series or set of countries that happen to be home to most of the world's peoples and responsible for an increasing share of the world's economic activity.

In 1997, Canada hosted the Asia-Pacific Parliamentary Forum in January and the APEC conference in November-December. Team Canada made a successful visit to the region. Our Speaker, Senator Molgat, paid an official visit to Japan, returning the visit that Speaker Saito of the House of Councillors of the Japanese Diet made in 1996. These and other important exchanges have served us well and will continue to serve us well.

I should like to conclude with a comment on one of the most important things going on in the Asia-Pacific region, and that is its crisis in currency and in the economies of a number of Asian-Pacific countries. Japan is not as affected as a number of the countries due to its \$100 billion trade surplus and \$200 billion currency reserve, but even Japan's economy can be profoundly affected by what is happening in that region.

In recent meetings of the Asia-Pacific Parliamentary Forum, we learned of the Thai people, who are subject to IMF scrutiny at the present time, having gone through three revisions of their budget in recent months. They complain that program spending has produced a downward spiral in terms of their economy and economic activity, and this is typical of the problems occurring in that area. It is also important for us to understand the impact of this crisis because it is not within the range of the normal experiences we have observed in that region or anywhere since the Depression. If the region attempts to export its way out of the problem, it will have a profound effect on the economies into which they are exporting and the job creation there. In fact, the United States has said they will not accept countries in this crisis exporting principally into the United States to solve their problems.

That prompts the question: What is the solution for those countries? I will close with a quote that I think indicates the way in which the crisis will have to be met. I am referring to an article by Bruce Koppel called "Fixing the Other Asia." It appears in the current issue of *Foreign Affairs*. Mr. Koppel writes:

It is clear that Asia's substantial economic gains have been squeezed from minimal structural change.

This refers to the great success some countries have had with very high year-over-year increases in GDP or a high growth rate. The article goes on to state:

The region's leaders must now invest in the human resources and infrastructure needed to improve productivity across the entire economy, particularly in the agricultural and service sectors that employ 85 per cent of the work force. As the experience of Japan, Korea, and Taiwan suggests, increased agricultural productivity and consumption lay the foundation for a successful industrial growth strategy, since productive rural households have more cash to purchase agricultural equipment, invest in their children's education, and purchase consumer goods. The result is sustainable growth driven not only by exports, but by healthy, domestic demand.

Creating that healthy, domestic demand is a very significant and serious challenge for many of those countries.

Having been there in my role as Chairman of Canada-Japan Inter-Parliamentary Association and the Asia-Pacific Parliamentary Forum, I sincerely believe that they are up to the challenge. The time-frames within which that will be met, however, are not clear. I repeat, it is of absolute importance that we understand, as best we can, what will happen.

I read that the world's growth, which was predicted to have been around 4 per cent, will probably turn out to be 2.5 per cent given the Asian crisis, and perhaps even less than that, depending upon the extent to which Latin American economies are affected by the crisis.

I note that the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs will hold follow-up hearings shortly on an interim report tabled by that committee on the Asia-Pacific region and its importance to us. I am encouraged by that and also by the interest of colleagues in this chamber in Canada and Japan, as well as our relationship with the region in general.

•(1640)

Hon. Lowell Murray: Honourable senators, in rising to speak to this report, allow me to thank Senator Hays for the leadership he has given to the Canada-Japan Interparliamentary Group as its Chairman since 1994. Senator Hays has followed political and economic developments in Japan closely. He has stayed in touch with our friends in the Japanese Parliament, and they with him. The federal government has wisely taken advantage of Senator Hays' knowledge and contacts in Japan, and has sought his assistance and cooperation in canvassing interest and support among Japanese legislators on such matters as the Asia-Pacific Conference, the Land Mines Treaty and the Kyoto Conference on the Environment.

Senator Hays succeeded another of our colleagues, Senator Oliver, as chairman of the Canada-Japan group. Senator Oliver continues to take a close interest in what is happening in Japan and in our relationship with Japan. Their success as chairmen

demonstrates, among other things, the valuable continuity that comes from having a senator at the head of an interparliamentary group such as this one. I have no doubt that one day our friends in the House of Commons will insist that it is their turn to be chairman. It occurs to me that since Japan, like Canada, has a bicameral Parliament, we might consider providing for that day by having co-chairs, one from the Senate and one from the House of Commons, as is done with the Canada-U.S. parliamentary group.

It is important that we maintain and, if possible, increase our contacts with Japanese parliamentarians and political figures. Japan must undertake extensive economic, financial and administrative changes. The social and — in the large sense of the word — cultural implications must be daunting. In the past few years, the political scene has been more turbulent than at any time in the post-war history of that country. Since we were there in November, the largest opposition party, the New Frontier Party, which was itself in part a breakaway offshoot of the governing Liberal Democrats, seems to have unravelled. This is only the most recent example of what might be called political restructuring.

While Japanese politics has always been marked by factionalism and conflict of strong personalities, I do believe that the present and recent upheavals reflect also the difficult dilemmas that confront politicians in that country by reason of the financial and economic predicament in which it finds itself. The most obvious of those dilemmas, and the one which must cut very deeply at the level of Japanese voters and their elected representatives, is whether the national, political, social and economic fabric can stand the abandonment of the no-layoff practice that is the result of a lifetime employment tradition in Japanese companies. Japanese unemployment, now at 3 per cent, is described as being at record highs. The response of the Japanese political leadership, as well as of its political and corporate leadership, to this and many other pressing and urgent questions of restructuring will have an important impact on the Japanese economy and, therefore, on the world economy. Canadian parliamentarians do well to keep in touch with them.

Japan is, after all, as Senator Hays has pointed out, the second biggest economy in the world. As it happens, it is Canada's second largest trading partner. While the volume of our trade, at \$22 billion annually, does not even approach the size of our trade with the United States, it is still significant, and quite important in some regions of our country. Sawmills are closing in British Columbia, for example, because of soft demand for lumber in Japan.

The economic and financial crisis in southeast Asia could not have come at a worse time for Japan. The so-called "Asian 'flu'" seems to have begun in Thailand and, as happens with such a virus, it exposed and worsened economic and financial weaknesses in southeast Asia and then South Korea. It was in its early stages when we were in Japan in November. Japan, as Senator Hays has pointed out, was vulnerable because it is a major trading partner with those countries, and because they owe so much money to Japanese banks.

The timing was terrible for Japan because the Japanese domestic economy was already flat. Fiscal stimulus, urged by many, was problematic because government deficits were already considered too high. Japan had still not absorbed all the repercussions of the spectacular speculative boom of the 1980s, the so-called "bubble" which sent real estate and other values soaring and then plummeting. It left the financial sector, among others, badly shaken.

It must be noted, as the Governor of the Bank of Canada has done in a recent speech, that Japan does have the financial capacity to cope with its banking problems, and measures to address these problems and to boost economic recovery have been taken. Still, the extent of the economic and financial restructuring, privatization, downsizing and administrative reform that seem to be contemplated, and seem to be necessary in Japan, makes Canada's experience in the 1980s and 1990s look relatively modest, and we all know what political commotion and controversy we have had here on these issues.

Our interest in the success of our Japanese political friends in dealing with these problems is obvious. The problems in their domestic economy, and the more serious weaknesses in some other Asian economies, seem to feed on each other. The impact of all this on the world economy and on commodity prices for nickel and copper, for example, have a negative impact on such companies as Inco and Noranda. I saw a press report recently to the effect that Seagram's had suffered a 50 per cent fall in sales of liquor to Asia because of the region's currency and economic troubles.

Beyond the economics, and inevitably affected by it, are the questions touching on Japan's growing but special role in regional and world security and international development issues. The months and years ahead in Japan will be truly challenging for that country's political, bureaucratic and business leadership, and for the population as a whole.

I made my first visit to Japan more than 30 years ago as a tourist, and I have been back there over the years at periodic intervals on government or parliamentary business. This was my third meeting in as many years as a member of the Canadian parliamentary delegation. I came away, as I believe did all our Canadian colleague, and as Senator Hays said, confident that Japan will come through the looming challenges stronger than ever.

The opportunities that were provided to us, through the excellent work of the Canadian Embassy in Tokyo, to meet with Japanese business people and with Canadians doing business in Japan was extremely valuable to us in improving our understanding of the Japanese scene and of the nature of our commercial and political relationship. The attendance of Japanese parliamentarians was more numerous, and their participation more active and over a broader agenda than at any previous meeting I have attended.

The Canada-Japan Interparliamentary Group is one which I would strongly recommend to our colleagues in this chamber and in the House of Commons. It is very much in our national

interest that we maintain the closest and most active relationship with our counterparts in Japan.

The Hon. the Speaker: If no other honourable senators wishes to speak, this inquiry is considered debated.

IRAQ

CANADA'S POLICY IN CURRENT CRISIS— INQUIRY—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. Jeremiah S. Grafstein rose pursuant to notice of February 12, 1998:

That he will call the attention of the Senate to Canada's policy respecting the Iraq crisis.

He said: Honourable senators, as I open this inquiry, I urge all senators to read the debates of the other place last week on the question of Canada's participation in relation to the crisis in Iraq, and I urge all senators to reread the debate that took place there and here in this chamber in 1990 prior to the advent of the Gulf War in 1991. Those debates project interesting snapshots of Canada's history on the run.

With rare exception, the debate last week in the other place lacked facts and, therefore, clarity, cohesion or context respecting Canada's aims, objectives or options.

•(1650)

Above all, we are missing current facts and the invaluable trail of facts that led from Iraq's unconditional agreement to unlimited UN inspection as a precondition to cessation of hostilities in 1991, to the present impasse.

By comparison, honourable senators, I recently read Churchill's war speeches given in the Parliament at Westminster *in camera* during World War II. They serve as models of perception and precision.

Honourable senators, what should be Canada's preconditions to war engagement at this time? Our policy appears to me to be more opaque than pellucid, even more so than before. Let me raise a number of questions that I hoped would have been addressed more cogently by all parties in the other place.

First, what are Canada's primary war aims? Are the American war aims the same? If they differ, how and why?

Second, what are Canada's precise political and geopolitical objectives respecting the United Nations and that region? What of the other aberrant, adjacent nations in the region?

Third, what are Canada's terms of engagement and the nature of the command structure under which Canadians may be placed in harm's way? In Canada's post-military era, as Richard Gwyn so aptly put it the other day, are Canada's defence forces appropriately organized to efficiently and effectively respond to such a crisis?

Fourth, what principles of international law govern Canada's participation in this engagement? Honourable senators, what is the precise role of the UN in the current situation with respect to the command structure and diplomatic actions?

Fifth, what specific UN resolutions have been breached, and why has it taken the UN or the UN coalition so long to hold Iraq to account?

Sixth, what are the consequences for peace and security in the region if the primary war aims of the United States are achieved?

Seventh, what happened to the sanctions option heralded by some in this chamber and the other place in 1991 as an alternative to the Gulf War? If they failed, why and when? Are there any sanction alternatives left?

Eighth, if Iraq, as a condition of cessation of hostilities in the Gulf War agreed to open arms inspection, who is responsible for the delay in enforcing the inspection process since 1991 and why?

Ninth, what happened to the Hague War Crimes Tribunal initiative for war crimes against humanity against the leadership and the specifically named members of the leadership cadre in Iraq, as a prophylactic against egregious or abhorrent individual conduct since 1993, when that tribunal was re-established?

Tenth, what happened to countries whose exports provided — and may still be providing — military weapons or elements necessary to build or rebuild Iraq's chemical war arsenal and their military delivery systems? Those countries were listed and named in 1991, and included major members of the Gulf coalition such as Britain, France and Germany, and non-members of the coalition such as China. What has happened since?

Eleventh, what steps are being taken, or will be taken, to limit the impact on innocent civilian populations in Iraq and its adjacent neighbours from chemically poisoned emissions by the proposed bomb strikes?

Twelfth, what happened to the initial steps taken by the free world after the Gulf War to build an anti-authoritarian, democratic coalition within and without Iraq to provide a political alternative to the people of Iraq?

Honourable senators, I raise these questions in order to provide — at least for myself — a clearer framework within which to consider Canada's role in the Iraq crisis.

It is clear that Iraq has obviously breached its international obligations.

It is clear that Iraq is in breach of UN resolutions. It is equally clear, however, that there are serious reservations within the Security Council and beyond, within the Gulf coalition and with adjacent neighbouring states who were part of the original Gulf coalition, and who are not yet prepared to support America's war aims.

Some say adjacent Arab states are unwilling because they are still considered to be in harm's way, and threatened, since the Gulf War mission was not satisfactorily completed.

What of Russia and its substantial outstanding debt with Iraq, its trade links and desire to regain influence in that region? What of France, its trade links and its equal desire to gain influence in this region? What of China, in its continuing efforts to be a supplier in the arms trade with Iraq?

Honourable senators, what did happen last September 23 in the United Nations when China, Russia and France threatened to use their vetoes in the Security Council against modest United Nations sanctions to prohibit international air travel by certain Iraq officials? There is no doubt in my mind that the failure to approve these most modest sanctions sent a signal to Hussein that the Gulf coalition was weakening and losing its political will. It encouraged him to intensify his challenge to the work of the UN inspection team. Serious questions, honourable senators, but little or no facts.

In future, Canada will be approached from time to time to support military intervention. What are — or should be — the guidelines and principles set out in advance as benchmarks of action for both parliamentarians and the Canadian public?

It seems to me that we are faced with a crisis in Iraq because of the failure of political will to deal appropriately with the threat that Saddam Hussein and his leadership cadre has posed to his neighbours and to the stability and peace of the region since 1991, when he suffered his weakest moments. That threat continued unabated, and indeed grew, after the Gulf War in that region and elsewhere. Will that situation pertain if America's war aims are achieved?

Before honourable senators offer their views, I would suggest it might be helpful, as I said at the outset, to examine the debates in the Senate on or about November 20, 1990. Many of the arguments which were heard then are still appropriate today. I await, and welcome, other senators' views before I attempt to answer some of these questions myself that I have raised in this inquiry.

Honourable senators, to place this crisis in at least one historical perspective: Almost 1,600 years ago, St. Augustine, while in North Africa, wrote his enduring classic, *City of God*, where he contrasted the spiritual gulf between the ideas of Jerusalem and the ideas of Babylon.

Regrettably for Canada and the world, and despite the onslaught of the intervening centuries, that gulf still exists. The human condition, honourable senators, remains ever-ready for renovation.

I eagerly await other senators' thoughts on Canada's policy on this crisis.

On motion of Senator Kinsella, debate adjourned.

The Senate adjourned until Wednesday, February 18, 1998, at 1:30 p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, February 17, 1998

	PAGE		PAGE
The Honourable Finlay MacDonald			
Tributes on Retirement. Senator Lynch-Staunton	1027		
Senator Graham	1028		
Senator Atkins	1028		
Senator Carstairs	1030		
Senator Gigantès	1030		
Senator Buchanan	1030		
Senator Fairbairn	1031		
Distinguished Visitors in the Gallery			
The Hon. the Speaker	1031		
Pages Exchange Program with House of Commons			
The Hon. the Speaker	1031		
The Honourable M. Lorne Bonnell			
Tribute on Retirement. Senator Moore	1031		
<hr/>			
SENATOR'S STATEMENT			
The Senate			
Apology for Remarks Accredited by Media as Opinion of Legal and Constitutional Affairs Committee. Senator Gigantès	1032		
<hr/>			
ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS			
Adjournment			
Senator Carstairs	1032		
<hr/>			
QUESTION PERIOD			
National Defence			
Efficacy of Anthrax Vaccine Destined for Use on Military Personnel En Route to Persian Gulf—Request for Answer.			
Senator Stratton	1032		
Senator Graham	1033		
Iraq			
Possible Strike by Western Nations—Bombing of Storage Facilities for Weapons of Mass Destruction—Provision of Protective Clothing for Military Personnel—Government Position.			
Senator Atkins	1033		
Senator Graham	1033		
Possible Strike by Western Nations—Bombing of Storage Facilities for Weapons of Mass Destruction—Assurance of Protection for Civilians—Government Position. Senator Kinsella	1033		
Senator Graham	1033		
Possible Strike by Western Nations in Conformity with International Conventions of War—Government Position.			
Senator Kinsella	1033		
Senator Graham	1033		
Foreign Affairs			
Violence in Algeria—Mission of Members of Parliament—Lack of Senate Participation—Request for Particulars. Senator Corbin ..	1033		
Senator Graham	1033		
The Economy			
Gap in Disposable Incomes in Comparison with United States—Possibility of Tax Cut—Government Position.			
Senator Jessiman	1034		
Senator Graham	1034		
Gap in Disposable Incomes in Comparison with United States— Request for Particulars of Studies Conducted.			
Senator Stratton	1034		
Senator Graham	1034		
Delayed Answers To Oral Questions			
Senator Carstairs	1034		
Human Resources Development			
Changes to Canada Pension Plan—Budget for Expenditure on Promotion and Advertising—Government Position.			
Purpose of Surplus in Employment Insurance Reserve Account— Government Position. Questions by Senator Stratton.			
Senator Carstairs (Delayed Answers)	1034		
<hr/>			
ORDERS OF THE DAY			
Criminal Code			
Customs Act (Bill C-18)			
Bill to Amend—Second Reading—Debate Continued.			
Senator Berntson	1035		
Telecommunications Act			
Teleglobe Canada Reorganization and Divestiture Act (Bill C-17)			
Bill to Amend—Second Reading—Debate Adjourned.			
Senator Poulin	1035		
Canada Human Rights Act (Bill S-11)			
Bill to Amend—Second Reading—Debate Adjourned.			
Senator Cohen	1036		
Inter-Parliamentary Union			
Ninety-Eighth Inter-Parliamentary Conference, Cairo, Egypt— Inquiry. Senator Comeau	1040		
National Defence			
Motion to Establish Special Committee to Examine Activities of Canadian Airborne Regiment in Somalia—Debate Continued.			
Senator Murray	1043		
Senator Gigantès	1046		
Canada-Japan Inter-Parliamentary Group			
Eighth Annual Meeting with Japan-Canada Parliamentarians Friendship League—Inquiry. Senator Hays	1046		
Senator Murray	1048		
Iraq			
Canada's Policy in Current Crisis— Inquiry—Debate Adjourned. Senator Grafstein	1049		



If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:
Public Works and Government Services Canada
Publishing
45 Sacré-Coeur Boulevard,
Hull, Québec, Canada K1A 0S9