



Debates of the Senate

1st SESSION

•

36th PARLIAMENT

•

VOLUME 137

•

NUMBER 78

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Wednesday, September 23, 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

Wednesday, September 23, 1998

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

Prayers.

SENATORS' STATEMENTS

OLYMPIC WINTER GAMES

BID BY VANCOUVER-WHISTLER TO HOST GAMES IN 2010

Hon. Pat Carney: Honourable senators, I rise today to inform you of the bid by Vancouver-Whistler for the 2010 Olympic Winter Games. On Monday of this week, Arthur Griffiths, Chairman of the Vancouver-Whistler 2010 Society, and Ian Waddell, B.C.'s Minister of Small Business, Tourism and Culture, announced details of the bid that has Vancouver-Whistler competing for the Canadian bid to host the 2010 winter games.

Some of the highlights of our bid are: new venue development plans, including the construction of a long-track speed-skating oval and a new arena at the University of British Columbia, which will give the university the largest dedicated sport field house in Canada to serve both the community and Canadian sport; a Nordic sport complex integrating cross-country skiing, ski-jumping and biathlon at the Callaghan Valley, near Whistler, making the area one of the premier Nordic facilities in the world; and bobsled and luge facilities at Grouse Mountain, which will give spectators the fabulous backdrop view of Vancouver.

The promise of outstanding training facilities for Canadian athletes comes with a total combined bid legacy of \$482 million, which includes a post-games legacy fund for Canadian sport and athletes of \$240 million, new summer and winter community facility legacies of \$237 million and \$5 million for the Legacies Now training facilities.

Honourable senators will know that Whistler is the number one rated ski resort in North America. Vancouver has already proven itself as an outstanding host to the world in such events as Expo '86. It is already the site of many excellent facilities including General Motors Place, Whistler and Blackcomb Mountains, B.C. Place Stadium and the Pacific Coliseum, which will all be integrated into the Olympic program.

The games are expected to generate \$250 million in tax revenues and more than 25,000 person-years of employment. Television broadcasting to millions around the world is also expected to generate economic growth after the year 2010 games following the pattern set by Expo '86.

At our British Columbia all-party caucus meeting this morning, which was also attended by Senator Austin of the other side, there was strong support for this proposal. I should like to

take this opportunity to support the Vancouver-Whistler bid. We hope to see you all there in the year 2010.

THE HON. PHILLIPE DEANE GIGANTÈS

ADDITIONAL TRIBUTES TO STAFF

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, our former colleague Senator Phillippe Deane Gigantès has asked me to say something that he apparently forgot to say in his closing remarks in June. When he spoke of his staff, he failed to say how much he owed to two of them in particular.

Christine Dearing researched and drafted "Only Work Works," a massive and complex report of which Senator Gigantès was particularly proud. Michel Rochon served as a one-man brain trust for the senator and, among other things, helped him conceive and push through the legislation putting an end to the drunken defence. Senator Gigantès wished to say that he could not thank them enough.

FIREARMS REGISTRATION

Hon. Gerald J. Comeau: Honourable senators, yesterday 11,000 Canadians came to the Hill to express reasonable concerns with firearms registration. I wish to join those Canadians, and the many Nova Scotians who agree with that sentiment.

A great number of Canadians are asking that the government reconsider the implementation of firearms registration. There are many reasons why the registration initiative should be scrapped. The actual costs, estimated once at \$85 million, has already exceeded \$134 million, and could well reach a half-billion dollars by the year 2002.

• (1340)

There is still no evidence to conclude that registration will significantly reduce the number of serious crimes. In fact, it has been demonstrated that the government used false statistical crime figures to justify the registry. Many fear that the registry will actually increase black market sales of firearms. Most rank-and-file police officers oppose the registry. Many believe that the money would be better spent on improving the justice system — increased policing, a DNA data bank; in fact, fighting crime. Many people question the costs and priorities at a time when government is cutting back on health, education, services to seniors, veterans, and other essential services.

The Attorneys General for Ontario, Alberta, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and the two territories have challenged Bill C-68 and may opt out of the administration of the gun control law in their respective provinces.

When the bill was being debated in Parliament in 1995, Senator Buchanan, Senator Forreestall and I travelled to various parts of Nova Scotia to seek the views of Nova Scotians. The feedback we received was that responsible gun owners do not agree with the gun registry provisions. They were angry and hurt that Chrétien and then justice minister Rock were distorting the facts and resorting to the manipulation of emotions to get their way. Many law-abiding Canadians feel that their own government is making them out to be criminals, and they deeply resent it. At no time have I heard such disappointment from Nova Scotians in their government and their so-called leaders.

Allan Rock once said:

I came to Ottawa with the firm belief that the only people in this country who should have guns are police officers and soldiers.

It is this kind of arrogance and disdain for the average Canadian that has people so upset.

The Liberals have taken polls which show that the majority of Canadians support firearms control. That may well be. Who am I to argue with polling statistics? However, polling is no evidence that the registration of firearms will make us safer. What about respect for the opinions of the minority, those who do not agree with these polling statistics? Should the government simply disregard the opinions of the minority? Is this the Liberal way of dealing with minority opinions? Where is this country going? Are Suharto's goons to be more trusted with concealed handguns than Canadians with their hunting firearms?

HUMAN RIGHTS

COMMITMENT OF MEMBERS OF CABINET TO ISSUES

Hon. Consiglio Di Nino: Honourable senators, for the past several weeks, Canadians have been treated once again to the spectacle of Mr. Chrétien attempting to bluff and blarney his way out of yet another blunder, this one caused by his desire to be what Privy Council documents refer to as "personally involved" in security arrangements surrounding the visit of former Indonesian dictator Suharto to Vancouver last year.

The Prime Minister tells us he knows nothing. He says the RCMP are completely responsible for what happened. Mr. Chrétien's attitude — "arrogance" is a better word — should come as no surprise to any one in this country. His contempt for the truth and due process are well known. We need look no further than his reversal on abolishing the GST, the Airbus affair, the Pearson International Airport incident, pay equity, and his conversations with street people for examples.

What is surprising is the degree to which his malady seems to have spread to cabinet and, indeed, the entire Liberal caucus. Witness the Minister of Foreign Affairs. Once the paragon of human rights virtue, Mr. Axworthy has been reduced to the role of "chief understrapper" to visiting dictators. The depth of his descent was revealed recently in a letter to Indonesia's ambassador to Canada. In this letter, he characterized criticism of Suharto here in Canada as outrageous and excessive. In other

words, for Mr. Axworthy, normal, healthy democratic dissent is wrong. It is unacceptable. It is, somehow, un-Canadian.

Where are those Liberal caucus members who continually and constantly remind us of their support for human rights, for democracy, and for the defence of law and order? Their tremendously deafening silence speaks volumes. Together with the comments of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Foreign Affairs, it portrays starkly the blatant hypocrisy and deceit underlying this government's so-called commitment to the issue of human rights.

[*Translation*]

SOUTH AFRICA

VISIT OF PRESIDENT NELSON MANDELA TO CANADA

Hon. Fernand Roberge: Honourable senators, Canada is honoured by the visit of a great statesman whose personal courage and conviction will place him among the giants of this century.

For an entire generation, Nelson Mandela was the embodiment of resistance to racial injustice in one of the most repressive and insensitive regimes of our time. He paid dearly for defending the most basic rights of his people. Imprisoned for 27 years, he never stopped believing that his cause would one day triumph.

More admirable still, he continued, even in these inhuman circumstances, to speak out in favour of reconciliation of black and white South Africans and democratization of that country's political system.

After his release, one sign from Mandela could have plunged South Africa into a bloody civil war that would certainly have involved neighbouring countries and obliged the great democracies to step in.

However, Mandela showed the true extent of his wisdom, courage and vision by becoming the self-styled apostle of reconciliation and peace in South Africa. As the democratically elected president of his country, he continued to work to build a more harmonious and progressive society in South Africa.

Antoine de Saint-Exupéry wrote:

The finest calling of all is that of uniting mankind.

No one in recent history has exercised this calling with greater success than Nelson Mandela. Rarely in the world has any one person had such influence over the respect of human rights and the improvement of his fellow citizens' living conditions.

I would like to add my voice to those of other Canadians paying tribute to President Mandela on the occasion of his visit here for the example he has set and the work he has done.

My feelings of pride and my emotion swell all the more in my tribute to this great man, who will soon retire from public life with the affection and admiration of his colleagues the world

over, because his visit reminds us of the historic role Canada, and specifically its Prime Minister, the Right Honourable Brian Mulroney, played in his release and in the dismantling of the hateful apartheid regime.

The triumph of evil often requires nothing more than the apathy of good people. For far too long, the white minority in South Africa cruelly oppressed the black majority, because too many countries and too many heads of government chose to look the other way. Some put the economic interests of their country ahead of the fundamental rights of the people of the country they were trading with.

Shortly after his election as Prime Minister, Brian Mulroney took the lead of the anti-apartheid movement and relentlessly fought Pretoria's racist regime until Mandela was freed and democracy established in South Africa.

He was not afraid to remind government leaders as powerful as Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher of their duties. Under the tutelage of Brian Mulroney, it was Canada and not Margaret Thatcher's England that defended the honour of the Commonwealth and it was Canada and not Ronald Reagan's United States that imposed the strictest sanctions against the racist government of South Africa.

The existence of a government founded on racial discrimination and the corruption of law enforcement and legal institutions is a blot on the history of the 20th century.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, the time allocated to Senator Roberge is now up. Does he have permission to continue?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Senator Roberge: Thanks to Brian Mulroney, during that period, Canada wrote one of the finest chapters in its foreign policy.

Those countries which tolerated this injustice, out of self-interest or indifference, cannot celebrate the triumph of Nelson Mandela with the same pride as ourselves. I hope that, as we celebrate the accomplishments of Nelson Mandela, all Canadians will also keep in mind that, through his courage and determination, the Prime Minister of the day, Brian Mulroney, gave Canada a place of honour throughout the world.

[English]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

MARITIME HELICOPTER PROJECT— STATISTICS ON VARIOUS MODELS

Hon. J. Michael Forrestall: Honourable senators, later this afternoon I will be asking the Leader of the Government in the Senate a question about ship-borne helicopters. Before I do that, I wish to bring to the attention of honourable senators some vital statistics in this regard. This comes from *Jane's All the World's Aircraft 1997-98* and as well from *Periscope's* United States Naval Intelligence Military Database.

[Senator Roberge]

The volume in cubic metres for the Bell 412 is 6.24, compared to the Sea King at 28 and the EH-101 Cormorant at 29. The cabin height in the Bell 412 is just 125 metres, a little over 4 feet, compared to 1.92, a little over 6 feet, for the Sea King, and 1.83, still over 6 feet, for the EH-101. Maximum take-off weight for the Bell is 5,398 kilograms, compared to 9,752 for the Sea King and 14,600 kilograms for the EH-101.

More important, honourable senators, the maximum useful load for the Bell 412 is 2,257 kilograms. This translates into mission payload capability. Both the Sea King and the EH-101 have almost double that maximum useful load. As well, the Bell 412 operates on skids, which cannot be used on our ships.

I cite these facts to stress the importance of a question which I will ask the Leader of the Government in the Senate later today concerning seeking assurances that the government will not, for either political or economic reasons — expediency being one of them — offer a program in an aircraft that cannot do the job.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

BANKING, TRADE AND COMMERCE

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE TO MEET DURING SITTINGS OF THE SENATE

Hon. Michael Kirby: Honourable senators, I give notice that on Thursday next, 24 September, 1998, I will move:

That the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce have the power to meet while the Senate is sitting between September 29, 1998, and November 30, 1998, for the purpose of its study of the present state of the financial system in Canada, and specifically on the report of the task force on the future of the Canadian financial services sector and that rule 95(4) be suspended in relation thereto.

QUESTION PERIOD

HEALTH

COMPENSATION FOR VICTIMS OF HEPATITIS C— AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Acting Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, I have a question for the Leader of the Government in the Senate concerning the terrible situation in which the victims of hepatitis C find themselves. Given the lack of leadership from this government and the Minister of Health, who talks about cash and care — the minister who had closed the file — the question that we have is that, according to the various press reports, even the Prime Minister is in on the act, telling young Joey Haché that the government now has insufficient funds to compensate hepatitis C sufferers.

I should like to know from the Leader of the Government how this government can afford excursions into provincial jurisdictions, as we saw last spring with the millennium scholarship to the tune of \$3 billion, or the extraordinary about-face on MMT, which is costing taxpayers \$20 million. How, then, is this government not able to afford a bit of assistance to all the victims of hepatitis C, particularly the children like Joey Haché?

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, the government is prepared to provide funds to victims of hepatitis C in a manner which was outlined by the Minister of Health at the meeting of ministers of health a few days ago. The federal government has proposed a partnership with the provinces to help identify those who were infected with hepatitis C through the blood system, to support research and other actions that address hepatitis C as a disease, to enhance regulations in surveillance of the blood system, to try to avoid such tragedies in the future and to ensure that those who were infected with hepatitis C through the blood system are not required to pay out of pocket for medical expenses.

Joey Haché, by the way, is entitled to compensation because he was infected in the period between 1986 and 1990.

Hon. John Lynch-Staunton, Leader of the Opposition: Honourable senators, I have a supplementary question. Is the Leader of the Government conscious of the fact that the policy which he has just given us, being that of the government, goes against a motion that was passed in this very house on June 18 and supported by all members, including the said Leader of the Government?

That motion was to the effect that this Senate supports recommendation number 1 of the Commission of Inquiry on the Blood System in Canada. That recommendation was that, without delay, the provinces and territories devise statutory no-fault schemes for compensating persons who suffered serious adverse consequences as a result of the administration of blood components or blood products. There was no time limit put on that recommendation by Justice Krever. This Senate, only three months ago, supported that recommendation wholeheartedly without any dissent.

Now we are told by one of those who voted in favour of that motion that the recommendation we supported is being ignored by the government, of which the leader is a member. I gather he is telling us that he negates the vote in which he joined with the rest of us last June. I find that contradiction not only surprising but distressful.

Senator Graham: Not at all, honourable senators. I applaud Senator Lynch-Staunton, who brought forward the motion last spring. Negotiations for the 1986-90 period are ongoing. If a deal is reached, it will settle a number of legal actions against the federal government. Those matters must be taken into consideration. These negotiations will include compensation for the same medical expenses that will be covered by the non-1986-90 group, as well as an amount for economic losses: that is, loss of income, other medical services, and so on.

The federal government's proposal is based on the fundamental belief that when people are sick they should receive care, not necessarily cash, and I should add that a number of the provinces support this proposal.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: May I ask a final, supplementary question of the Leader of the Government? If a similar motion to that which was passed in June is reintroduced, would he and his colleagues support it?

Senator Graham: I would be happy to consider that at the appropriate time.

BRITISH COLUMBIA

CANCELLATION OF PROGRAM TO DESTAFF LIGHTSTATIONS— AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR BOATING SAFETY ISSUES— GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Pat Carney: Honourable senators, I wish to ask the Leader of the Government in the Senate a question regarding the spending of money on automating west coast lighthouses that were, in fact, never automated.

• (1400)

Honourable senators will remember that this past March, just before the by-election in B.C.'s Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam riding, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, David Anderson, reversed his highly unpopular decision to destaff the lightstations.

My colleague in the other place, John Duncan, who co-chaired the ad hoc parliamentary committee on lightstations, asked for and received information that the Coast Guard spent \$2.3 million on this program to take lighthousekeepers off the lights. There is a crying need for a greater life-saving presence on our coast. As an example, there are about 20,000 paddlers in British Columbia. The Ministry of Finance in B.C. has found that approximately 20 per cent of B.C. households have a boat of some sort.

Could the Leader of Government explain why this money was spent on a program that compromised public safety instead of improving it?

As a point of interest to politicians in respect of accountability, why did the minister allow his department to defy his instructions to stop destaffing? Some of this money was spent after his decision was announced.

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I would be happy to bring forward that information. I will consult with my colleague.

However, while I am on my feet, I should like to congratulate Senator Carney on two points. First, I would congratulate her on her recent marriage.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

Senator Graham: We are all delighted to see her back in the chamber looking blissful and beautiful, and obviously enjoying life. We wish her a happy life.

Second, I would also congratulate her on the work she has undertaken and the success she has achieved in the cause she undertook with respect to the lightstations on the West Coast of our country.

Senator Carney: If I may respond to the generous remarks of the honourable senator, I assume that they would have been just as generous had I married a Conservative. I would assure the minister that I am in excellent health, and I appreciate the sentiments he has expressed.

Senator Graham: We all look forward to her husband's first visit to Ottawa.

ECONOMY

STRENGTHENING OF ECONOMY OF ATLANTIC CANADA— COMMENTS OF SOLICITOR GENERAL—REQUEST FOR UPDATE

Hon. Brenda M. Robertson: Honourable senators, my question is to the Leader of the Government in the Senate and it relates to an issue that I raised in this chamber last February. I speak of an issue that is close to the hearts of all members from Atlantic Canada, relating to our concerns respecting the high rates of unemployment and poverty particular to our area.

Last February, I asked for details regarding unspecified plans that the Solicitor General, in his capacity as the Atlantic regional minister, was working on to strengthen the region's economy, to tackle our persistently high unemployment, to further reduce the wage gap between the region and the rest of Canada, and to boost our overall economic growth.

The minister was quoted in the press at the time as saying that he was dealing routinely with the premiers on this issue and was looking forward to arriving at a comprehensive policy.

The minister also indicated that he was talking about a comprehensive, long-term plan for the region — no more band-aid solutions and second-class programs.

I have been anxiously awaiting evidence which would demonstrate what Minister Scott was speaking about. Could the Leader of the Government make inquires and provide the Senate with a progress report on this supposedly new regional economic development initiative?

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I thank the honourable senator for her question. Senator Roberston always brings to this chamber her keen interest and concern for her fellow citizens in Atlantic Canada, most particularly those in New Brunswick.

I would indicate that all of the economic indicators in that part of the world are positive. As matter of fact, if you read the latest

analysis by the experts of the Toronto Dominion Bank, you will find that the forecasted growth in the four Atlantic provinces is expected to exceed that for most of the rest of the country. That is not, however, a result of the individual efforts of any particular regional minister, although Minister Scott, on many occasions, has discussed with me and other cabinet colleagues, his particular concerns with respect to growth in New Brunswick specifically, and in Atlantic Canada generally. He has talked about shipbuilding and many other programs. I will discuss this again with Minister Scott.

I know that there are areas or pockets of real concern in my province as there are in Prince Edward Island, in Newfoundland, and in Northern Ontario. Unfortunately, all parts of the country have not reaped the same benefits from the growth in job creation that has occurred in the country.

Given the situation in Asia and the crisis in Russia, the economic house of Canada is in very good shape on a comparative basis. Thank God for that, otherwise we would be suffering, and it would be much more difficult to deal with what is happening in other parts of the world.

Senator Robertson: I thank the honourable senator for that lesson in Atlantic economics. I would advise the honourable senator that my province of New Brunswick has the highest rate of children living in poverty that they have had in 10 years. Those children are living in homes with poor parents. Children do not live in poverty in isolation.

I believe it would be in order to debate this matter in depth in a more appropriate forum.

As a supplementary question, could the Leader of the Government determine whether reports this summer that appeared in Atlantic newspapers to the effect that, after months of discussions and draft proposals, Ottawa and the provinces are at an impasse and that the Solicitor General's highly touted approach to economic development may be going nowhere? I am referring to the particular proposal he spoke to which has never evolved in an identifiable form.

Senator Graham: Honourable senators, if there is anyone my colleagues listen to more attentively than me from the Atlantic region, it is Minister Scott. He is a concerned individual who has put forward innovative proposals. We will continue to promote economic growth in Atlantic Canada as we will in the rest of the country.

I would also mention that I happen to find very interesting the most recent Toronto Dominion Bank forecast for growth. With respect to Canada in general, economic growth is projected at 1.8 per cent for 1999. For Newfoundland, it is 4.8 per cent; for Prince Edward Island, it is 2.2 per cent; for Nova Scotia, it is 3.1 per cent; and for New Brunswick, it is 2.1 per cent. Each of those numbers is generally higher than the number for the balance of the country.

Senator Robertson: We will wait and see.

SOLICITOR GENERAL

TREATMENT OF PROTESTORS AT APEC CONFERENCE BY RCMP— POSITION OF PRIME MINISTER— REQUEST FOR PARTICULARS OF PRECEDENTS

Hon. David Tkachuk: Honourable senators, I have a question for the Leader of the Government regarding the APEC conference and the actions of the RCMP towards the demonstrators at that conference.

Yesterday, in the other place, Preston Manning, the Leader of the Opposition, asked a number of questions of the Prime Minister about the pepper-spray incident. The Prime Minister denied any involvement in that incident and the effort to quell the demonstration that was taking place. Preston Manning said:

Mr. Speaker, that is very interesting because that is not what the RCMP say. They say they were instructed to suppress peaceful protesters even if they were not a security risk.

RCMP memos say things like “PM’s specific wish” or “PM wants the protesters out.” That PM was not me and it was not the Minister of Finance. Who was it?

The Prime Minister, in reply, said:

Mr. Speaker, I know at least one of the two will not become the PM.

He went on to say:

I have been in politics for a long time. As a minister, I have seen many people in departments speaking on behalf of their ministers or on behalf of the prime minister, not knowing...

• (1410)

Then there is a dash because honourable members did not allow him to finish his answer. However, my guess is that he was saying that people in departments often speak and write memos on behalf of the Prime Minister and on behalf of ministers of the Crown without the Prime Minister or the ministers knowing that those memos are being sent.

Is it common practice for the RCMP to send out memos in the name of the Prime Minister, the Minister of Justice or the Solicitor General without the knowledge of those people? Could the Leader of the Government in this place provide other examples of this practice by the RCMP?

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, first let me make it clear that if any government member talks to the RCMP, it would be the Solicitor General and not the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister has made it perfectly clear to everyone — as a matter of fact he has made it perfectly clear to me personally — that he did not talk to the Solicitor General.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: He talks to the homeless.

Senator Graham: It is important to point out —

Senator Lynch-Staunton: That is what he said about Airbus, too.

Senator Graham: Senator Lynch-Staunton, perhaps I could be allowed to conclude.

It is important to understand that under domestic and international law, the government has a legal obligation to protect foreign dignitaries at international events in Canada. Security arrangements implemented by the RCMP for the protection of foreign visitors must take into account the responsibility of the government in this area. Therefore, it is proper, indeed, necessary for the government to coordinate with the RCMP to fulfil this responsibility. However, that coordination did not come from the Prime Minister. We should also understand that the government does not direct the RCMP in its operational role as peace officers, including the protection of foreign dignitaries or in conducting criminal investigations. The RCMP alone decides and has decided on these issues.

Senator Tkachuk: Honourable senators, I may agree with the Leader of the Government that the RCMP have that responsibility, but I do not believe that that responsibility allows the suppression of the constitutional rights of assembly and free speech of the citizens of this country in endeavouring to protect members of foreign countries.

The honourable senator did not answer the question about whether it is common practice. The Prime Minister seemed to say that it was common practice that departmental officials and, obviously, the RCMP would send out memos using the name of the Prime Minister — or Paul Martin who, for all I know, could be the Prime Minister — in performing their duty and executing their orders.

Is it common practice that they would do so? Does the government approve of that practice? The Prime Minister says it happens often. In what other instances did this “common practice” happen?

Senator Graham: Honourable senators, I presume that, for instance, when President Mandela visits with us later today and tomorrow, there will be a coordinated effort between the security forces of this country and the security forces of South Africa to ensure his safety.

Incidentally, I should like to commend Senator Roberge for his comments about the fight that former prime minister Mulroney waged against apartheid in South Africa. When historians look at the record of former prime minister Mulroney, they will probably say that that was one of his finest hours.

To return to the subject, as I said earlier, it is proper and, indeed, necessary for the government to coordinate with the RCMP to fulfil this responsibility. We are responsible for the protection of visiting dignitaries. We are responsible for maintaining order. We are responsible for safety. We try to avoid embarrassment. There was a specific area provided for demonstrations in this free society, in this democracy called Canada, the greatest democracy in the world.

Senator Tkachuk: Honourable senators, obviously this is common practice, but the result of the common practice seems to be the arrest of Canadian citizens who did not commit any crimes.

I come back to that question. The Leader of the Government in the Senate may be avoiding the question, but I will continue to ask it every day until I get an answer, or at least an attempt at an answer. Does the Prime Minister approve of the practice of the RCMP sending out memos in his name suppressing the civil rights of Canadian citizens to speak and to assemble?

I will also ask my first question again, because he seems to be saying that this is a common practice. I want to see other examples of this practice of the RCMP sending out letters on behalf of the Prime Minister or the minister without their authorization.

Senator Graham: Honourable senators, I honestly do not know of any other precedents, but the Prime Minister and this government have the utmost confidence in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and they are treated at arm's length with respect to their responsibilities in maintaining law and order in this country.

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I rise on a point of order.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: Out of order!

The Hon. the Speaker: You cannot raise a point of order prior to Orders of the Day.

COMMISSION OF INQUIRY INTO TREATMENT OF PROTESTORS
AT APEC CONFERENCE BY RCMP—
REQUEST FOR PARTICULARS OF PRECEDENTS

Hon. Marjory LeBreton: Honourable senators, as my colleague was asking his question, I could not help but think that this is another example of government officials doing things without the knowledge of the Prime Minister or ministers. I leave it to you to guess what it is I am referring to.

My question concerns the serious issue of the rights of individual Canadians. I am on the record of this place on numerous occasions with regard to the abuse of the rights of individual Canadians. Of course, I was referring on those occasions to the rights of an individual Canadian citizen by the name of Brian Mulroney.

Canadians should be concerned, and the media should not be treating these questions in the House of Commons and in this place so cavalierly. This is very serious. Question Period is not a game of one-upmanship where MPs are scored on whether they won or lost against the Prime Minister.

In yesterday's *Globe and Mail* it was reported:

Prime Minister Jean Chrétien cannot duck a subpoena if the RCMP Public Complaints Commission wants him to testify about the treatment of demonstrators at last year's Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation summit in Vancouver, Solicitor-General Andy Scott said yesterday.

'The calling of witnesses is, in fact, the prerogative of the public complaints commission, and I don't think there are limits on what they can do in that regard,' Mr. Scott, the minister responsible for the Mounties, told reporters.

Would the Leader of the Government in the Senate confirm that the Prime Minister will indeed appear before the commission if called?

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, that is a hypothetical question. I thought I made it perfectly clear yesterday that the complaints commission of the RCMP is completely independent of the government.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: Oh, come on!

Senator Graham: Senator Lynch-Staunton says, "Oh, come on." The terms of reference were devised by the government of which he was a part. That commission was set up under the previous administration, and Senator LeBreton was the deputy chief of staff in the Prime Minister's office when it was done.

Senator LeBreton: Honourable senators, one cannot help but wonder what the headlines would have said if citizens of this country had been pepper sprayed when Brian Mulroney was Prime Minister. We would have all been hung from the Peace Tower.

It is no secret, and it is not the RCMP reporting it: Memos before the commission are traced back to people in the Prime Minister's office expressing his wishes. It is no secret that the Prime Minister had a direct hand in ordering the RCMP to violate the rights of peaceful protesters during the APEC summit last year. He was asked about this matter in Question Period yesterday, and his only defence was to say that we must wait for the commission to complete its deliberations.

• (1420)

Can the Honourable Senator Graham tell this chamber whether he can recollect any instance in Canadian history where the Prime Minister's Office has ordered the RCMP to put down a peaceful demonstration? In other words, can the government present to honourable senators any precedent concerning political orders being given to break up peaceful demonstrations?

Senator Graham: Honourable senators, I disagree with the preface of the honourable senator's question. The Prime Minister's Office did not order the RCMP to put down a peaceful demonstration.

TREATMENT OF PROTESTORS AT APEC CONFERENCE
BY RCMP—EXCESSIVE USE OF FORCE—
POSITION OF PRIME MINISTER

Hon. Terry Stratton: Honourable senators, I wish to refer to a question that was posed in the House of Commons yesterday. It concerned the use of pepper spray, and the fact that the Prime Minister is surrounded by members of the RCMP throughout his daily life, wherever he travels, no matter for how long. Yet, he professes a complete ignorance of pepper spray.

Is the Leader of the Government saying that the Prime Minister now knows what pepper spray is?

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government): Yes, he does.

Senator Stratton: My question goes to the credibility of this issue, namely, how can the Prime Minister possibly not know what pepper spray is, or what effect it has? Does he know what happens when it hits someone in the face, in the eyes and in the mouth?

Senator Graham: Yes, honourable senators.

Senator Stratton: Does the Leader of the Government agree that the use of that product against peacefully protesting students constituted an excessive use of force?

Senator Graham: Honourable senators, the use of pepper spray was the prerogative of the RCMP.

Some Hon. Senators: Shame!

Senator Stratton: That is not what I asked. I asked if there was an excessive use of force.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

MARITIME HELICOPTER PROJECT— ASSURANCE SOUGHT ON APPROPRIATE CHOICE OF MODEL

Hon. J. Michael Forrestall: Honourable senators, I wish to ask the Leader of the Government in the Senate a question in relation to a statement I made earlier under the rubric Senators' Statements.

I am sure the minister is aware of a written response that I received yesterday with respect to these matters, as well as his own verbal suggestion to me that the question of ship-borne replacement helicopters was the subject of a core project within the department.

It recently came to my attention that the highly criticized Griffon helicopter of Auditor General's report fame is now available in the so-called maritime variant. I am also informed that several of our land versions are held in storage, and that there may be plans to outfit these surplus "dinky toys" with the naval package. We know the Griffon is not a maritime helicopter and, indeed, that it is not even a totally satisfactory land helicopter.

Will the minister give Canadians, in particular naval Canadians, and honourable senators the assurance that we will not see a naval version of the Griffon on the backs of Canadian warships, out of political expediency?

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, as my honourable friend knows, the maritime helicopter project is now under review. The bidding will be totally transparent. It is hoped that, no matter what

helicopter is the eventual winner, even Senator Forrestall will find it comfortable to sit in.

Senator Forrestall: Honourable senators, I have suggested once before that the Leader of the Government have a little chat with whoever is supplying his briefing book. He is talking out of four sides of his mouth now. He has said one thing while the minister responsible, in almost the same breath but in the other place, has said that there are no plans to go ahead with this project at all. The Leader of the Government ought to read some of the written responses with which I have been furnished, because they make no sense whatsoever.

I do not want to see on the back of Canadian naval warships a helicopter which is neither designed for nor capable of a ship-borne role.

Senator Graham: Honourable senators, I understand exactly the honourable senator's representations. I have made my own representations on his behalf, and on behalf of all of the people in this chamber who have like concerns. I have no knowledge of the assertions being made by the honourable senator at the present time. However, I certainly shall be happy to bring them to the attention of the Minister of National Defence.

Senator Forrestall: I suggest that the honourable leader read the answers he sent over to me yesterday.

HEALTH

EFFICACY OF DRUG APPROVAL PROCESS— CHANGES IN POLICY RELATING TO FOOD AND DRUGS ACT— GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Mira Spivak: Honourable senators, testimony before the Public Service Staff Relations Board has raised serious questions about the drug approval process at Health Canada and the priority placed on the protection of public health.

One of the six drug evaluators, whose research suggests more studies are needed to ensure the safety of drugs given to food-producing animals, testified as to what the newly appointed bureau director had announced to his staff last spring. He said:

We are now working in a new environment in government. We are serving industry. They are our clients.

The drug evaluators were told by this same individual that if they did not cooperate with this new style of risk management, they could be "sent off to another department of government, such as Environment, where they would never be heard from again." No witnesses were called to contradict this testimony.

My question for the Leader of the Government in the Senate is this: Has there been a formal change in the policy regarding the fundamental mandate for the human safety requirements of the Food and Drugs Act and regulations, which is to investigate and report every risk to human health associated with a veterinary product?

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, as my honourable friend knows, the health of Canadians is the government's first and foremost concern in any matter of this kind. I am not aware, nor have I been made aware, of any formal changes that have either been made or are contemplated in that particular system. However, I will seek an answer for my honourable friend.

THE SENATE

PROVISIONS OF RULE 46—POINT OF ORDER

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, before we proceed with Orders of the Day, the Honourable Senator Carstairs rose on a point of order earlier. I will now hear that point of order.

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, during the Question Period that has just concluded, one of our members read from a House of Commons Hansard of yesterday. According to rule 46, it is out of order to quote from a debate in the House of Commons of this current session.

Since that rule is on our books, we should abide by it. I hope that honourable senators will do that.

The Hon. the Speaker: If no other senator wishes to speak to the point of order, the point of order is well considered. Rule 46 is clear: We are not to quote directly from any speech in the other place during the course of this current session. That is to say, no speech made in this session in the other place can be quoted here in this chamber.

• (1430)

CANADA-UNITED STATES INTER-PARLIAMENTARY GROUP

THIRTY-NINTH ANNUAL MEETING HELD IN NANTUCKET, MASSACHUSETTS—REPORT OF CANADIAN DELEGATION TABLED

Leave having been given to revert to Tabling of Reports from Inter-Parliamentary Delegations

Hon. Jerahmiel S. Grafstein: Honourable senators, as co-chair of the Canadian delegation, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the report of the Canadian delegation to the thirty-ninth annual meeting of the Canada-U.S. Inter-Parliamentary Group held in Nantucket, Massachusetts from May 14 to 18, 1998.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

EXCISE TAX ACT

BILL TO AMEND—THIRD READING— MOTIONS IN AMENDMENT—ORDER STANDS

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Di Nino, seconded by the Honourable Senator DeWare, for the third reading of Bill S-10, to amend the Excise Tax Act,

And on the motion in amendment of the Honourable Senator Maheu, seconded by the Honourable Senator Ferretti Barth, that the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be amended in clause 1, on page 1, by replacing line 8 with the following:

“ture or other reading material, including any pictorial representation or other expressive media approved for use by an educational institution in its programs, but not including any material that

(a) contains an age restriction imposed by law on its sale, purchase or viewing;

(b) is either obscene within the meaning of section 163 of the Criminal Code, or of a pornographic nature; or

(c) contains more than five percent advertising.”

And on the subamendment of the Honourable Senator Di Nino, seconded by the Honourable Senator Kinsella, that the motion in amendment be amended

(a) by adding the word “or” after paragraph (a);

(b) by deleting the word “or” after paragraph (b); and

(c) by deleting paragraph (c).—(Honourable Senator Fairbairn, P.C.).

Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Acting Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, Bill S-10 amends the Excise Tax Act, and was originally sponsored by Senator Di Nino. An amendment was moved by Senator Maheu and a subamendment was then moved by Senator Di Nino. It is on that subamendment that debate was commenced, and Senator Fairbairn took the adjournment of the debate on the subamendment.

There are thus three elements to this order, and some honourable senators may want to deal with the amendment and not the subamendment. Indeed, some way wish to address the original question put forward by Senator Di Nino.

Senator Fairbairn has stood the debate on the subamendment. Could we get an indication as to when she will speak on this matter, or will she step aside so that other honourable senators can carry on the debate?

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn: Honourable senators, I would certainly step aside and encourage any honourable senator who wishes to take part to do so now. I am not ready at the moment.

Order stands.

PRIVATE BILL

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC EPISCOPAL CORPORATION
OF MACKENZIE—BILL TO AMEND—FIRST READING

Leave having been given to revert to Introduction and First Reading of Private Bills:

Hon. Nicholas W. Taylor presented Bill S-20, to amend the Act of incorporation of the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Mackenzie.

Bill read first time.

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

On motion of Senator Taylor, bill placed on the Orders of the Day for second reading on Tuesday next, September 29, 1998.

The Senate adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, September 23, 1998

	PAGE		PAGE
SENATORS' STATEMENTS		Senator Graham	1928
Olympic Winter Games			
Bid by Vancouver-Whistler to Host Games in 2010. Senator Carney	1924	Solicitor General	
The Hon. Phillippe Deane Gigantès			
Additional Tributes to Staff. Senator Carstairs	1924	Treatment of Protestors at APEC Conference by RCMP—Position of Prime Minister—Request for Particulars of Precedents.	
Firearms Registration			
Senator Comeau	1924	Senator Tkachuk	1929
Human Rights			
Commitment of Members of Cabinet to Issues. Senator Di Nino	1925	Senator Graham	1929
South Africa			
Visit of President Nelson Mandela to Canada. Senator Roberge	1925	Commission of Inquiry into Treatment of Protestors at APEC Conference by RCMP—Request for Particulars of Precedents.	
National Defence			
Maritime Helicopter Project—Statistics on Various Models. Senator Forrestall	1926	Senator LeBreton	1930
<hr/>			
ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS		Senator Graham	1930
Banking, Trade and Commerce			
Notice of Motion to Authorize Committee to Meet during Sittings of the Senate. Senator Kirby	1926	Treatment of Protestors at APEC Conference by RCMP— Excessive Use of Force—Position of Prime Minister.	
<hr/>			
QUESTION PERIOD		Senator Stratton	1930
Health			
Compensation for Victims of Hepatitis C—Availability of Funds— Government Position. Senator Kinsella	1926	Senator Graham	1931
Senator Graham	1927	National Defence	
Senator Lynch-Staunton	1927	Maritime Helicopter Project—Assurance Sought on Appropriate Choice of Model. Senator Forrestall	1931
British Columbia			
Cancellation of Program to Destaff Lightstations—Availability of Funds for Boating Safety Issues—Government Position. Senator Carney	1927	Senator Graham	1931
Senator Graham	1927	Health	
Economy			
Strengthening of Economy of Atlantic Canada—Comments of Solicitor General—Request for Update. Senator Robertson ...	1928	Efficacy of Drug Approval Process—Changes in Policy Relating to Food and Drugs Act—Government Position.	
<hr/>			
ORDERS OF THE DAY		Senator Spivak	1931
Excise Tax Act (Bill S-10)			
Bill to Amend—Third Reading—Motions in Amendment— Order Stands. Senator Kinsella		Senator Graham	1932
Senator Fairbairn			1933
Private Bill (Bill S-20)			
The Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Mackenzie— Bill to Amend—First Reading. Senator Taylor			1933



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