



Debates of the Senate

1st SESSION

•

36th PARLIAMENT

•

VOLUME 136

•

NUMBER 91

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Thursday, November 5, 1998

—

THE HONOURABLE GILDAS L. MOLGAT
SPEAKER

CONTENTS

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

Debates: Chambers Building, Room 943, Tel. 995-5805

Published by the Senate
Available from Canada Communication Group — Publishing, Public Works and
Government Services Canada, Ottawa K1A 0S9,
Also available on the Internet: <http://www.parl.gc.ca>

THE SENATE

Thursday, November 5, 1998

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

Prayers.

REMEMBRANCE DAY

TRIBUTES TO THE LATE JOHN MCCRAE, PHYSICIAN, POET

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, Dr. John McCrae was already a much respected teacher and physician by the time he signed up in August 1914 to answer the call to duty on the Western Front. A veteran of the South African War, he would be assigned as brigade surgeon to the First Brigade of the Canadian Forces Artillery. McCrae would serve in the trenches near Ypres, Belgium — in a place called Flanders — where some of the heaviest fighting of the “war to end all wars” would take place. He tended hundreds of wounded, was surrounded by the dead and the dying, and wrote home of the gunfire, rifle fire and the awful slaughter of a world gone mad.

When one of his closest friends was killed in the fighting and buried in a makeshift grave with a simple wooded cross, wild poppies were already beginning to grow — ‘between the crosses, row on row.’ McCrae’s tribute to his friend and to all the dead — who ‘short days ago lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow’ — that wonderful poem which was first published in England’s *Punch* magazine in December 1915 — soon became the symbol of the agony, the courage and the ultimate sacrifice.

The simple, wild poppy of Flanders became a badge of faith, hope and remembrance for Canadians across the decades and across the generations — a badge which traditionally marks the beginning of veterans’ week and will culminate this November 11 with the eightieth anniversary of the First World War Armistice. That simple flower marks a sacrifice which interrupted the dream of youth and meant families never raised, children never known, lives never lived, and all of those leaders lost to us forever.

John McCrae was himself buried with full military honours in Wimereux Cemetery, not far from the fields of Flanders. With his death, and that of one in ten of the 650,000 Canadians who served in the killing fields of France and Belgium, the torch was passed. “The torch,” he had written, “be yours to hold high.”

•(1410)

Honourable senators, in the days and hours to come, we honour the sacrifice of generations. We honour the young men and women who fought side by side in defence of Canada, those who fought in two world wars and in Korea, all those to whom the torch was passed. We honour all those who have served at sea, on the land and in the air. We honour all those who never broke the faith.

Here in this chamber, where we are privileged to sit under eight of the forty huge and wonderful oil paintings commissioned by Lord Beaverbrook as part of the Canadian War Memorial Fund, a remarkable series of three-by-four metre paintings which were to tell Canadians and the world at large about the war to end all wars, now so beautifully restored, we remember. We remember the voices of the messengers of the past. In this place and in this chamber, the walls whisper with their sacrifice. They have much to tell us about hope, about faith, about courage, and about the power of the human heart.

Lest we forget. Lest we forget the lessons that they would have taught us had they lived: lessons about the spirit of commitment and the spirit of tolerance which Canada is and always will be; lessons about the high price of freedom and democracy; lessons about the meaning of a country which is a symbol of hope in countries where hope has been forgotten, a country loved and respected across the planet.

[Translation]

Here, in this special chamber, we hear their voices. We hear their words. Here, where the walls have a history to tell, we guard the memory of those who sacrificed their lives and their futures so that we may live in peace.

[English]

MEMORIES OF WORLD WARS I AND II

Hon. Orville H. Phillips: Honourable senators, Tuesday morning I attended a very special and impressive ceremony in this chamber in which the World War I paintings gracing this chamber were rededicated. I express my thanks to those who organized the ceremony and especially to our Speaker for his contribution and his remarks.

It was appropriate that that ceremony should be held in the year when we are marking the eightieth anniversary of World War I. Seventeen of the 430 survivors of World War I attended. Among those was Corporal Harold Lidstone, whom I have known for years. I am a friend of his family. At 102 years of age, he is going back with the Canadian delegation to mark the end of World War I. I should point out that Harold is not the oldest. I believe the oldest is 103 and the youngest is 99. I was with Harold and Mr. Spears on the trip to Vimy. He entertained the French citizens by step dancing, and he intends to do the same thing on this occasion.

The ceremony was made more delightful for me in that I had as my seatmate on that occasion Sergeant Smokey Smith, VC. He has told me he is prepared to come back and be my seatmate at any time.

It is impossible, honourable senators, to imagine, understand, or describe the combat conditions in World War I: the mud, standing up to your knees in freezing water, the trenches a few yards from the enemy trenches. They were under combat conditions 24 hours a day. I think we owe them a special gratitude.

I have been fortunate to visit the battle fields of World War I, and they confirm what we already know: They were not only battlefields; they were slaughter fields. The casualties in World War I are beyond our comprehension. There were 55,000 Allied troops killed in one day in one battle.

The recent issue of the *Maple Leaf*, the magazine published by the Department of National Defence, contains a story entitled *Unknown Sergeant Remembered*. A sergeant in the Princess Patricia Canadian Light Infantry, killed in September, 1918, was buried as an unknown soldier. Recently, that grave has been identified and a new headstone erected. As is customary, the family of the deceased was allowed to write the epitaph. I think it expresses the feelings of all Canadians:

In remembrance of the sacrifice made for freedoms enjoyed today.

Unfortunately, World War I, which was described as the war to end all wars, was followed 21 years later by World War II, a war that was waged by an even more brutal regime, Hitler's Nazi Germany. The improvements in armaments and transportation made the spread of the conflict throughout Europe and North Africa easier. World War II was a more mobile war than World War I, which was mainly trench warfare.

After the Japanese entered the war on the side of Germany and Italy, the Asian and Pacific areas became involved. Canadians served in all areas and in all three services: the Navy, the Army, and the Royal Canadian Air Force. We are proud of the contributions made by Canadians in all three services.

I remember the convoy duty in the freezing North Atlantic. I recall the newsreels of Canadians on Corvettes chopping ice. We would see those Corvettes at the crest of the wave start down into the trough. I used to hold my breath and wonder if they would ever come out from that trough.

Dieppe, Normandy, Caen and northeast Europe will always be household names in Canada.

•(1420)

Canadians will also remember the air war fought in Europe and that carried out by Bomber Command. We can be proud of Canadian heroism and our contribution in all parts of the world.

In World War II, for some reason, humanity reverted to a form of brutality that we have not seen since the Middle Ages. We had the Holocaust, in which 6 million Jews were exterminated, the killing of the Polish officers to deprive the Polish army of leadership, and that spread through Russia. In the Asian war, 30 million people were killed in what I call the "democide." It

will be difficult for future generations to realize that man could be so inhumane at this stage of our civilization.

When speaking of the "democide," we must remember the Canadians who were caught up in the Hong Kong situation. When I was being released from the air force, I saw Canadians who had been prisoners of war of the Japanese, and had been released in May and in September of that year. They were so thin and debilitated that they were barely able to walk. I can remember seeing those fellows attempting to learn to walk at Camp Hill Hospital. It was inconceivable to me that any human being could be treated in that way.

Canadians who served in wartime were volunteers. In all, 1.7 million Canadians served in wartime, and 115,000 Canadians gave their lives.

It has been my pleasure to represent the Senate on a number of occasions at ceremonies marking the various anniversaries. I wish to share with you two remembrances that I have. The first is a visit to Dieppe. The South Saskatchewan Regiment was unveiling a monument. The warrant officer was describing the call for mobilization and he said that the lads from the farms in southern Saskatchewan answered the call, but they did not come alone. Most of them brought a brother or a friend with them. The regiment was forced to turn these people away. There were no uniforms or boots and, something that is very important for an infantryman, no rifles. I hope, honourable senators, that we never go back to that stage where we are so unprepared to defend ourselves.

I also wish to share with you my visit to an air force cemetery in Germany. The air force crews are buried in Germany; the army casualties were buried in Holland. A heavy bomber crew consisted of seven men. The crew are buried side by side, each headstone outlining what duty the individual had within that crew: air gunner, pilot, navigator and so on. One crew of seven, buried together, were all 19 years of age. Today, we think of young men of that age as being high school graduates. These men were more than that.

Today, Canada has assumed a new role in peace-keeping. We are very much in demand as peace-keepers. In these times, we hear Canadians asking why we should be sending peace-keepers to various local conflicts. This is a very necessary alternative, in order to prevent the spread of local conflicts from becoming the third global conflict.

Yesterday, an announcement was made concerning a new War Museum. I should like to think that the Senate played a part in that.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

Senator Phillips: Mr. Cliff Chatterton of the National Council of Veterans Associations asked the Senate Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs to hold hearings on the proposed expansion to the present War Museum. The motion received full support from the Senate, and our committee provided a forum wherein all groups could come and express their views. It raised public interest and, I believe, contributed greatly to the solution reached.

I am proud of the number of staff in the Senate who volunteered to assist. Many of them put in a great deal of time on one occasion when the Senate was on Christmas recess. I believe the hearings at the Senate did play a part in the announcement. I am pleased with the work that the Honourable Barney Danson and Dr. Jack Granatstein have done since those hearings. Yesterday's announcement, I am sure, gave a great deal of pleasure to all of us.

Veterans groups, however, have expressed concern that no funding was mentioned in yesterday's announcement. It is my hope that all senators will follow up on the funding required. On an earlier occasion this year, I pointed out that money was available for arts groups, and I did not see why a War Museum should need to go searching for funds. I hope you will remember those remarks.

This year the Royal Canadian Legion and Veterans Affairs Canada are cooperating in a project called "A Wave of Silence for 1999." It is to be considered a millennium project. Each ocean contains more than one wave, and I see no reason why we cannot begin this year by making Remembrance Day 1999 a wave of remembrance, and get the nation in a mood for the 'wave of silence' of two minutes in 1999. If we do that, honourable senators, we are showing our appreciation for the sacrifices that were made to give us the freedom we enjoy today.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

•(1430)

WORLD WAR I HEROES OF PINE STREET, WINNIPEG, MANITOBA

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, this November 11 will mark the eightieth anniversary of the end of the First World War.

Remembrance Day is a time to reflect upon the enormous sacrifices of war and, indeed, of the very mistakes made to force one into war. We must not forget the human side of war, and also the very human acts and deeds of those men and women who fought for the ideals of democracy, freedom and the security of person.

Of these acts and deeds of Canadians during World War I, some of them simple, others compelling, 63 warranted the highest honour in the Commonwealth, the Victoria Cross. Of these men, three hailed from the same neighbourhood in Winnipeg and, indeed, from the very same street, Pine Street.

On April 24, 1915, near Ypres, Belgium, when a wounded man, lying some 15 metres from the trench, called for help, Frederick William Hall of the 8th Manitoba Regiment endeavoured to reach him in the face of heavy enemy fire and bring him back. Perhaps Company Sergeant-Major Hall was the type of fellow to give anyone the shirt off his back, but in this instance he gave his life, for he died in the rescue attempt. Mr. Hall lived on Pine Street.

On September 9, 1916, near Pozières, France, Leo Clarke was detailed with his section to cover the construction of a "block" in a newly captured trench. With most of his party dead or wounded, the enemy counter-attacked. The corporal almost single-handedly held off the onslaught, suffering a bayonet

wound in the process. Not giving up, he chased the retreating group, managing to capture one of the enemy. Leo Clarke was obviously not the type to give up easily. Despite his wound, he quickly recovered but later died in action at Étretat, France, on October 19 of the same year. He lived on Pine Street.

On October 26, 1917, at Passchendaele in Belgium, Robert Shankland rallied the remnants of his platoon and men of other companies, disposed them to command the ground in front and inflicted heavy casualties on the retreating enemy. Later, he dispersed a counter-attack, and then personally communicated to headquarters an accurate and valuable report as to the position on the brigade frontage. The lieutenant of the 43rd Battalion of the Manitoba Regiment carried on until relieved. No doubt, Mr. Shankland's leadership and ability to get the job done and see it to the end were invaluable to the Canadian Expeditionary Force, and to the war effort. He lived on Pine Street.

Honourable senators, acts of bravery in a war are often the embodiment of values that society has instilled in the hearts and minds of its people. These men from Pine Street are a perfect illustration of how fundamental values become extraordinary deeds. Their valour and courage contributed much to the war effort, and were provoked by the same types of values that have made Canada a great nation of a strong and diverse people.

In commemoration of their acts, Pine Street, which is a very small street in the city of Winnipeg, is now known as Valour Road, and stands as a testament to the efforts of three men, and of a nation.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

KOREAN WAR HEROES FROM PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

Hon. Archibald Hynd Johnstone: Honourable senators, I rise today to commemorate the United Nations operations in Korea from 1950 to 1953.

On June 25, 1950, the military forces of North Korea crossed the 38th parallel into the Republic of Korea. The magnitude of the assault made it clear that it was a full-scale invasion.

The United Nations called for an immediate cessation of hostilities. However, it was evident that the North Koreans had no intention of complying. The United Nations then rallied to the defence of South Korea, but by June 28 the North Koreans had occupied Seoul, confining the UN forces to the Pusan Perimeter.

Following a successful amphibious landing on September 15, the United Nations forces moved rapidly northward. Soon, Seoul was recaptured and the UN forces quickly crossed the 38th parallel, reaching the border of Manchuria, which brought the Chinese into the war.

Canadians played their part, despite the fact that Korea, up until then, was to them only a small peninsula on the map of Asia. More than 26,000 Canadians of our air, naval and land forces rallied to the cause of a country on the other side of the earth. More than 1,200 were wounded and 516 gave their lives, among whom were two young Prince Edward Islanders. All who died paid the supreme sacrifice for a country about which they knew little but for what they knew to be a just cause.

[Senator Phillips]

Short days ago — less than a month in fact — the Honourable Senator Norman Atkins and I were privileged to join a group of Canadian Korean veterans under the leadership of the Honourable Fred Mifflin, Minister of Veterans Affairs, to participate in service after service at the graves of Canadian soldiers in Korea, some of whom were only 19 and 20 years of age. It was a sad and emotional experience.

Honourable senators, I hope you will permit me to say that our experiences on this commemorative pilgrimage evoked in me memories of another war, one which the Honourable Senator Orville Phillips and I remember well, both having served on four-engine bombers flying out of Yorkshire, England during World War II. In particular, there were those mornings when, on rising, we counted the empty beds. Where were our comrades? Had they been blown to bits? Were they prisoners in the hands of the Nazis? Or were they in hiding, enduring untold hardships trying to find their way back to Britain? Sometimes we never found out.

Next week, on November 11, as we stand before one of the many cenotaphs across this great and free land, let us keep in mind that Remembrance Day is not just another holiday but a day on which we remember and honour those who were wounded physically and mentally. Most of all, let us remember and honour those who gave their all.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

TRIBUTES TO VETERANS—
RESURRECTION OF PEACE AND SECURITY INSTITUTE

Hon. Marcel Prud'homme: Honourable senators, I wish to join in what has been said.

I was honoured to sit with Senator Phillips on the Veterans Affairs Committee when it dealt with the issue of the Canadian War Museum. I am thinking about the future with sadness since the departure of the Honourable Senator Marshall, who defended veterans in this Senate while he was here. The time is fast approaching when we will lose two more senators who have championed the cause of our veterans. I am reminded of this fact, upon hearing the interventions made today by Senator Phillips and Senator Johnstone. I hope and pray that there will be senators who will take up this cause and who will speak for the veterans of Canada — especially those who served during the Second World War and who face many difficulties ahead. Those veterans are now all in their 70s and early 80s. I hope that someone will undertake to specialize in this domain, and become a champion of their cause, as those people expect of the Senate.

•(1440)

Could we not begin a project today to explore the possibility of resurrecting the Peace and Security Institute, something that was created in 1984, which showed the way to many people? The Peace and Security Institute was the last gesture of the Right Honourable Pierre Elliott Trudeau. I had the honour to chair that institute until it was disbanded. From today forward, I will work on re-establishing this institute. It was called peace and security. Why? Because too many people have a tendency to concentrate solely on the peace aspect of the world, and forget

that terrible people still exist. Other people have a tendency to concentrate their activities solely on the security aspect of the world, but have no interest in the peaceful aspect of society. That is why the Peace and Security Institute was created. However, it was disbanded in an effort to save money while other institutes were created.

One way to honour our veterans and to prepare our young people is to think about a project that we might undertake in the near future, for the year 2000. One project could be a consideration of who will fill the void that will be left after Senators Johnston and Phillips are no longer here. Few people have specialized in the concerns of veterans. That is what we should reflect upon today, namely, who will champion the cause of veterans when these two honourable senators leave us?

What a nice way to approach young Canadians, namely by showing them, through the Peace and Security Institute, how the world should work together, as we did in the old Foreign Affairs and National Defence Committee. Senator Forrestall was a member of that committee, as were many others. People were forced to sit down together. However, soon the committee was split in two. One committee was created for defence and one was created for foreign affairs. I never approved of that decision. I am of the opinion — and more so today than ever — that the people who prefer to sit in their corners should sit on the same committee, so that the people who used to be known as “do-gooders” can sit together, alone. They have no preoccupation about defence, or vice versa. We have national defence committees that have no preoccupation with peace, development, CIDA, and so on.

We should take this opportunity to reflect on these two concrete proposals: namely, who will come after those who have experience, and who among us will become the champions of the veterans' cause and the Peace and Security Institute?

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, we will not be meeting again before Remembrance Day on November 11. I intend to ask you to rise for a moment of silence. Before I do so, however, I should like to call your attention to visitors in our gallery. We are very pleased to receive today the Teacher's Institute, who were here this morning in the chamber as temporary senators. I am very pleased to have them here with us, and I would ask them to join with senators in observing a moment of silence in tribute to Canadian servicemen.

(Honourable senators then stood in silent tribute.)

SENATORS' STATEMENTS

THE SENATE

OUTCOME OF LIBEL ACTION AGAINST REFORM PARTY

Hon. Edward M. Lawson: Honourable senators, some months ago, in response to that scurrilous Reform Party website, I announced that I was filing a lawsuit against the Reform Party.

In their statement of defence, which we received just a few weeks ago, one of the things that they said is that they had copied the allegations against me from the February 1998 issue of *B.C. Business Magazine*.

The Reform Party said, "You did not sue the *BC Business Magazine*. Why are you suing us?" As most of you know, copying and republishing false statements is not a defence, nor is it libel. However, they had a good point, so we made a demand on *BC Business Magazine* for a retraction, an apology and \$10,000 paid to me, which I would donate to the charity of my choice. We asked that the retraction and apology be published in a satisfactory and prominent place in the beginning pages of the November issue of *BC Business Magazine* before any feature articles. In any event, they have agreed to publish the following apology:

In the February 1998 issue of the B.C. Business, in a story about the deceased stock promoter David Ward, certain statements were made about Senator Ed Lawson and his relationship with Ward and his partner, Ed Carter. We have since been advised by Senator Lawson that those statements are not true. We accept that the statements are false and unfounded. We are pleased to withdraw those statements. We apologize to Senator Lawson for their publication and we regret any embarrassment or inconvenience they may have caused.

On the subject of damages, my lawyer stated:

...your article has caused Senator Lawson considerable distress, embarrassment, and legal expense. The statement in the article, as I told you, has been picked up and republished elsewhere, resulting in litigation.

Here he is referring to the Reform lawsuit. He went on:

Surely, one would expect a journalist and an editor of a magazine to verify the truth of such remarks with the person whose reputation is being scotched prior to publication. Yet, your clients never checked the accuracy of the statement with Senator Lawson.

However, in view of your prompt response, Senator Lawson will accept \$5,000 which he will direct to the charity of his choice...

I had the pleasure last Thursday, at our regular meeting of the Vancouver Police Foundation, an organization in Vancouver of citizens who raise money for projects of the Vancouver Police Department that are not covered by their budgets, and in which organization I have served for 23 years as a trustee, to present them with that cheque for \$5,000.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

Senator Lawson: This is the sixth libel action that I have won in my career: four after trial, and two in court. This proves, honourable senators, that we do not need to continue turning the other cheek and taking all this vilification and abuse from Reformers and others. We need to fight back. We can fight back, and we can win.

[Senator Lawson]

Next, I will turn to the subject of Senator Ghitter and his lawsuit. He was savagely and viciously attacked — and if you read the material, you will know what I am saying. What was his crime? What wrongdoing had Senator Ghitter engaged in? He accepted a constitutionally appointed seat to the Senate by the constitutional Prime Minister of the day, which he was constitutionally qualified to accept.

•(1450)

The claim by the Reform Party was that he had accepted a seat that had formerly been occupied by our deceased colleague Senator Waters, who ironically had been constitutionally appointed by the same Prime Minister and was constitutionally qualified to accept the seat. However, Reform said, "No, Senator Ghitter betrayed, and was a traitor to, the Province of Alberta because he accepted a seat that belonged to an elected senator from Alberta," and they wanted him to refuse to accept it or, failing that, after he had accepted, resign until such time as they were able to manipulate Premier Klein of Alberta into calling a bogus election to elect a couple of counterfeit senators.

When I say "bogus election," what I mean is here you have a provincial government authorizing a municipal election to elect federal candidates to a federal house where no vacancies exist and in which no official federal party has participated. That is the bogus election I am talking about. When I talk about "counterfeit senators," as it turned out — surprise, surprise — the two winners were two provincial Reformers. I say "counterfeit senators" advisedly. *Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary* defines "counterfeit" as "to imitate or copy closely especially with intent to deceive...Something likely to be mistaken for something of high value" — for example, a legitimately appointed senator like Senator Ghitter.

The question I ask is: Why should Senator Ghitter be subjected to the costs of defending this lawsuit as an individual? He was not the target. He was merely cannon fodder. They made this savage attack on him in a fund-raising attempt for this bogus election. When they were asked to apologize, they said, "This has been our most successful fund-raising. We raised more than \$50,000." All they had to do was attempt to destroy Senator Ghitter's reputation.

When I ask the question as to why he should be obliged to pay for that, I do so because of an article last year in *The Hill Times* which reported that the House of Commons spends hundreds of thousands of dollars on MPs' legal fees, and they cited a number of cases. Currently, there is a case in which a senior official of CSIS is suing Reform member Meredith for liable. The House of Commons Board of Internal Economy is funding that case. There are at least four Reform MPs who are being sued by their employees for wrongful dismissal. The House of Commons is funding those cases. The list goes on and on.

It occurred to me that, with respect to the very two cases we are talking about, mine and Senator Ghitter's, the Board of Internal Economy of the House of Commons may very well be funding their defence. Something is very wrong. We are told that the House of Commons committee does it on a case-by-case basis, and I agree with that.

Other senators were libelled by that infamous website. One in particular has a clear winning case of libel, and I asked him, "Why do you not sue?" He said, "My lawyer said it would cost \$50,000 and I cannot afford it." Defence against an attack on the Senate as a whole should not be funded by an individual senator who cannot afford to defend both his reputation and the Senate's reputation. It seems to me that our Internal Economy Committee should be following the same procedure as the House of Commons, considering funding on a case-by-case basis. If there is clear wrongdoing by an individual senator, we should not deal with it. If it is a case affecting the institution as a whole, I think we have an obligation to defend those cases. We have a duty. This Senate institution has so much going for it, it is worth defending. However, the burden should not be carried by individual senators, it should be carried by the Senate as a whole.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

NATIONAL DEFENCE

TRIBUTE TO CREWS FLYING SEA KING HELICOPTERS FROM CFB SHEARWATER ON SEARCH AND RESCUE MISSIONS

Hon. J. Michael Forrestall: Honourable senators, I wish to draw the attention of the Senate today to the very valuable and the tremendously supporting and helpful work being done by the Sea King crews and their support units operating particularly out of Canadian Forces Base Shearwater in Dartmouth, Nova Scotia.

Honourable senators, for a variety of reasons, the Sea King crew's efforts in search and rescue have not been really acknowledged by this government, nor has the fact that the 35-year old Sea Kings have been filling in for 35-year old Labradors for months, if not years. The reason is somewhat plain to some of us, if not to all: The government cancelled the EH-101, but is embarrassed to admit a defeat. The consequence of that involves not risk management but a gamble with the lives of our men and women. It was a mistake to have cancelled that program then. It is plain to see now.

Honourable senators, the Sea King crews are a proud group, proud of their ability to fly a 35-year-old unreliable helicopter in the most adverse conditions, one that has a 35 to 45 per cent serviceability rate. These young men and women have an esprit de corps found only in a select few military units. Their primary task, keep in mind, was to have been the eyes and ears of our new warships, the Canadian patrol frigates. However, because of government — and I rarely use a word like this — irresponsibility, the Sea King crews have taken over primary search and rescue responsibilities that until recently had fallen heavily on the Labrador fleet. This has happened so that Canadians on both unforgiving coasts and, indeed, in the Arctic as well, will have access to some level of search and rescue.

Honourable senators, I am informed, for example, that one Sea King detachment already exists on each coast tasked with the primary role of search and rescue. That is fine and we welcome it. However, it means that, as each day goes by, these crews lose their currency in skills needed to land on and take off from the pitching decks of destroyers in the Atlantic, and it is an unforgiving task.

Unfortunately, the government appears to have no intention of taking up any of the options that are available to them to replace the Labradors. They will not even take risk-management action by grounding the Labradors, particularly those that are awaiting engines, and passing the primary search and rescue responsibility over to the Sea King fleet because it would be, quite obviously, a public relations nightmare.

I ask honourable senators to join with me today in recognizing the very brave efforts of our Sea King crews in all their duties, and search and rescue in particular.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT PROPOSALS

TABLED DOCUMENT REFERRED TO LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Deputy Leader of the Government), with leave of the Senate and notwithstanding rule 58(1) (f), moved:

That the document entitled: "Proposals to correct certain anomalies, inconsistencies and errors, and to deal with other matters of a non-controversial and uncomplicated nature in the Statutes of Canada and to repeal certain acts that have ceased to have effect," tabled in the Senate on November 5, 1998, be referred to the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs.

Hon. Eymard G. Corbin (The Hon. the Acting Speaker): Is leave granted, honourable senators?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

•(1500)

CANADA-EUROPE PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

ORGANIZATION FOR SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE— SEVENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY, COPENHAGEN, DENMARK—NOTICE OF INQUIRY

Hon. Jerahmiel S. Grafstein: Honourable senators, I give notice that on Wednesday, November 18, 1998 I will draw the attention of the Senate to the report of the Canada-Europe Parliamentary Association (CEPA) on the Seventh Annual Session of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), held in Copenhagen, Denmark from July 7 to 10, 1998.

QUESTION PERIOD

SOLICITOR GENERAL

COMMISSION OF INQUIRY INTO TREATMENT OF PROTESTORS
AT APEC CONFERENCE BY RCMP—PROVISION OF FUNDS FOR
DEFENCE OF COMPLAINANTS—RE-EXAMINATION OF ISSUE—
GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Acting Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, another chapter has opened in the saga of the forces of darkness. Yesterday, we learned that lawyers for the RCMP are taking the issue of the RCMP Public Complaints Commissioner's impartiality back to the Federal Court. We also know that the issue of the commissioners' impartiality critically affects the students, the complainants and their rights to have their complaints investigated properly.

For the sake of the principles of equity and the integrity of our Constitution, surely something must be done. The government has attempted to rely on this Public Complaints Commission process. The forum is now back in the Federal Court which is not an informal body but a formal, judicial body.

Will the federal government now provide funding for the students' legal representation?

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, the response is still in the negative. As the Honourable Senator Kinsella knows, I read into the record the letter of the Public Complaints Commission, and that situation has not changed. We will follow any further developments with great interest.

Senator Kinsella: Honourable senators, perhaps the Leader of the Government in the Senate could help us to understand this part of the saga. Is Mr. Whitehall the government's lead lawyer in that hearing?

Senator Graham: I do not know that he is the lead lawyer but he is certainly one of the lawyers.

Senator Kinsella: Could the Leader of the Government in the Senate advise this house whether Mr. Whitehall or other counsel for the government take instructions from the Solicitor General and, if not, from whom?

Senator Graham: Honourable senators, I am not quite sure who is directly responsible for providing official direction to the counsel for the government.

TREATMENT OF PROTESTORS AT APEC CONFERENCE BY RCMP—
TIMELY NAMING OF INQUIRY UNDER INQUIRIES ACT—
GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Acting Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, if the government lawyers answer to the Solicitor General as their client, and given that the RCMP falls under the responsibility of the Solicitor General and that the RCMP lawyers are now taking the matter of the apprehended bias of panel members to the Federal Court, my question is this: Did the government know that the RCMP were going to make that application?

[Senator Grafstein]

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, as spokesman for the government in this case, I was not aware of the application. However, I understand from media reports that lawyers for the RCMP members were bringing the allegation of bias against Mr. Morin to the Federal Court. I learned that from the newspapers.

Senator Kinsella: Honourable senators, I am quite confused by this process. I would not be surprised and I certainly would make no judgment if the Leader of the Government in the Senate, while being very open and frank with us, finds the larger phenomenon somewhat foggy.

This situation is so seriously confusing that we do not even know if we have an appropriate system in place to respond to the question of whether serious violations of human rights in Canada have occurred. In the beginning, the government was arguing that the RCMP Public Complaints Commission was the vehicle to determine whether there were any abuses. This was to be an informal process. Within the context of that more informal process, rather than a formal legal or judicial process, the government advanced the argument that this commission would look after the complainants.

Now the matter is before the Federal Court. First, the commission lawyer, Mr. Considine, went to the Federal Court. Then Mr. Whitehall, the lawyer for the government, said they did not want to take the matter to court and it was withdrawn. Then, lo and behold, the lawyers for the RCMP say they will take the matter back to court.

At the same time, the RCMP is reporting to the Solicitor General. The government lawyer is reporting to the Solicitor General. Allegations have been made that the Solicitor General himself is biased. What are Canadians to think of this?

To the Leader of the Government in the Senate, would it not be fair and equitable now to name an independent inquiry under the Inquiries Act?

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

Senator Graham: Honourable senators, I do not believe that that time has come nor do I believe it will ever come. The government is confident that the commission and the Federal Court can sort out the entire matter.

•(1510)

NOVA SCOTIA

TIMING AND PARTICULARS OF TRANSFER OF LAND AT
BASE SHEARWATER TO PROVINCE BY DEVELOPMENT
CORPORATION—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. J. Michael Forrestall: Honourable senators, yesterday the Premier of Nova Scotia said that the Government of Canada was negotiating a price for Base Shearwater with the Shearwater Development Corporation — here it becomes confusing — and that the corporation would then negotiate a price for the province. When members of the other side play with fire, there is bound to be a reckoning somewhere. It is that reckoning that I am attempting to sort out before we all get burnt.

The premier said later when confronted by journalists that he was having a personal conversation. Indeed, he put it in the plural sense, as having a number of conversations with the Minister of National Defence, and that the Province of Nova Scotia wanted the Shearwater waterfront. Who is involved in these negotiations? What is the plan for the hand-over of all lands to the province, if it is to be all lands?

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, there have been discussions ongoing between the provincial government and the Minister of National Defence with respect to the price for any hand-over. As I indicated yesterday, I would be pleased to bring a full statement to the Senate as soon as it is available.

Senator Forrestall: Honourable senators, the Leader of the Government claims that his government is a government of great transparency. However, Government of Canada Access to Information staff flatly turned down a request from me for certain fundamental, basic information with respect to this matter. The fact of the matter is that I received from the minister's office a detailed letter giving me most of the information that Access to Information said I could not have.

We have the Government of Canada saying the docks at Shearwater are off limits and not for sale, that they are presently bound up by certain NATO agreements. Indeed, it is the only spot in Halifax Harbour where nuclear submarines may tie up. What is the government's position with respect to the waterfront? Is the Port of Halifax to continue to have relatively safe and efficient docking for nuclear military vessels?

Senator Graham: The honourable senator's information is correct. The Shearwater Base offers tremendous potential for industrial development, while at the same time preserving its present military role.

My honourable friend is also correct in suggesting that there may be NATO obligations with respect to the docking of nuclear submarines, which is very infrequent in that particular harbour. My understanding is that any transfer of those facilities, whether to Shearwater Development Corporation or to the province would still involve some priority rights for docking purposes with respect to certain types of naval vessels.

Senator Forrestall: Honourable senators, we are told that the value is \$1.6 million for the CFB Shearwater lands. It is a multimillion-dollar venture. The lands have been there for 70 years or 80 years, and there is a lot of land in the area. One is lucky if one can get a lot for \$20,000; yet, the government is selling it for \$3,000 an acre. Honourable senators will forgive me if I appear suspect as to what is going on.

Senator Graham: I urge the honourable senator, as a senator from Nova Scotia, not to suspect but to applaud any initiative that would give them such valuable land for industrial development. At the price he has suggested, I think the sale would be a tremendous boon for the economy of Nova Scotia. Those of us who call Nova Scotia home should welcome such a development and applaud the Government of Canada for being so generous in its terms of negotiation.

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

APPOINTMENTS TO CANADA PENSION PLAN INVESTMENT BOARD— GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Terry Stratton: Honourable senators, my question concerns the appointments made to the CPP Investment Board last week. In its March report on the CPP Investment Board, the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Committee noted:

The Committee, like the witnesses, believes that the primary qualifications for the appointment as a director are experience and expertise, and that politics should play no role.

Are we to believe that politics played no role in the appointment to that board of David Walker, a past MP and a parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Finance, of Joseph Regan, who has contributed to the Liberal Party of Canada in each of the past three years, and of Richard Thomson, a man responsible for putting Jean Chrétien on the TD board of directors in 1987?

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I believe that all the aforementioned individuals are eminently qualified and a great credit to the CPP board. I applaud the selections, which were made in consultation with the provinces.

Senator Stratton: Honourable senators, Mary Arnold already sits on the board of directors of Atomic Energy Limited of Canada. I cannot confirm her politics, but I have my suspicions that the Prime Minister put her on the AECL board in March 1996 and that someone by that name has given the Liberal Party \$1,000 in each of the last two years.

It is very rare for anyone to hold two Order in Council positions. Could the Leader of the Government in the Senate please advise whether Ms Arnold will be allowed to serve on both boards?

Senator Berntson: She is multi-talented.

Senator Graham: If she has the talent, perhaps she could sit on three boards.

The CPP Investment Board members have been appointed. As I suggested in my first answer, that board contains a very impressive list of Canadians to oversee the Canada Pension Plan. I believe it is a well-qualified and balanced board.

I should point out that the members were selected in consultation with the provinces from a list of highly qualified candidates recommended by a joint federal-provincial nominating committee. When Senator Stratton is doing his research, I hope that he also determines whether any of the aforementioned individuals contributed to other national political parties at one time or another. That would be to their credit for supporting the political process in our country.

Hon. John Lynch-Staunton (Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, how can the Leader of the Government in the Senate call this a well-balanced board when all its members except two come from the business community? One is an actuary and the other is a former judge. The others are all associated with business.

•(1520)

In order to be a well-balanced board, there should have been representatives from labour and representatives from consumer groups to bring views from areas that are directly affected by the policies of this board. As it is, it is a very narrow board made up of individuals who come from a narrow sector. It is appalling that neither labour nor the consumer is represented on the board, and I should like to know why, because it is obviously deliberate.

Senator Graham: Honourable senators, the legislation requires that there be a sufficient number of members with proven financial ability or relevant work experience to enable the board to effectively achieve its mandate. I believe that this requirement has been satisfied.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: Does that mean also that no one in the consumer or labour field meets those requirements?

Senator Graham: All of the people who have been named to the board should be, and are, regarded as consumers with considerable labour experience.

APPOINTMENTS TO CANADA PENSION PLAN INVESTMENT BOARD—
ENTITLEMENT OF APPOINTEE TO RECEIVE TWO SALARIES—
GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. A. Raynell Andreychuk: As a supplementary on the comments about Mary Arnold, am I to take it that it is acceptable now to have someone draw two sources of income from the government? My understanding is that perhaps she could serve in two capacities, but would she be able to draw two distinct cash benefits from the government?

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government): I would need to seek further information on that point, Senator Andreychuk. Mary Arnold is a Fellow of the Institute of Chartered Accountants.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: Is she a consumer?

Senator Graham: Yes, she is a consumer, too, and she holds a number of business, social, artistic and charitable directorships. Indeed, she does sit on the board of Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, and on the board of the Alberta Credit Union Deposit Guarantee Corporation, where she is chairman of the audit committee and, as well, Ms Arnold is a director of EP Core, the Edmonton Community Foundation and the Alberta Performing Arts Stabilization Fund.

Senator Andreychuk: My question was whether she would be entitled to draw two cash benefits from serving at the same time in the government? I wish to know whether that is in compliance

with the rules and regulations as presently set out by the government.

Senator Graham: That is an interesting question, and I will undertake to determine the answer.

AGRICULTURE

DROP IN MARKET PRICES FOR PRODUCE AND LIVESTOCK—
EFFECT ON INCOMES OF FARMERS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Leonard J. Gustafson: My question is directed to the Leader of the Government in the Senate and it relates to the state of agriculture and what is happening today.

I am not certain whether or not I am allowed to refer to the work of the Senate Committee on Agriculture as part of a question. However, if I am not supposed to do that, I stand corrected.

We have done extensive work, to the credit of the committee, and today we heard some astounding reports from both the Canadian Wheat Board and the Canadian Federation of Agriculture. One report indicated that there has been a 55 per cent drop in farm income. Yesterday, there were loads of hogs at the Toronto market for which there were no buyers. The Canadian Federation of Agriculture indicated today that the price for those hogs was a low of 30 cents per pound.

This is turning out to be a serious problem, concerning major input costs et cetera, and on down the line. Bankruptcies abound a town neighbouring mine. There, a family that has been in business selling John Deere equipment for three generations — 84 years — went bankrupt. We are not running into it; we are in it, and honourable senators should be aware of that.

What is the government prepared to do about it? I know that the Minister of Agriculture made a statement yesterday but he did not say anything specific. I ask the Leader of the Government in the Senate what he is hearing on this situation from the government. Is the government fully aware of the situation? They must become aware of the serious nature of the situation.

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government): This is a serious situation, and Senator Gustafson would understand that better than any of us in this chamber. I wish to assure him that the Minister of Agriculture is very much aware of it. He has brought this matter to the attention of his cabinet colleagues.

The government is indeed concerned about the farm income situation. The Minister of Agriculture and Agri-food met yesterday with the farm industry leaders and representatives from provincial governments to share information and views, and to discuss options for improving the situation for Canadian farmers.

There is no question about it. Hog prices, cattle prices and grain prices are all in a cyclical downturn. The situation is worsened, of course, by the economic crisis in Asia. This year, the result is a decline in net farming, down from the higher levels in 1997.

Senator Gustafson: Honourable senators, as a supplementary, it is evident that there is some short-term help which must come to the farmers. Is the government anticipating a long-term program that will solve the problem? Is the government looking at something that will give ongoing help?

In 1993, different members of the committee sat as a joint committee with the Agriculture Committee of the House of Commons, and this idea was discussed. We are now down the road six years and nothing has been done in this regard, and nothing is in place to deal with such a situation.

There is a short-term problem here, but also an ongoing problem, and the witnesses we heard today were very clear that this crisis will not be over in a matter of months. It may take a number of years. Is there a long-term program that the government will be considering?

Senator Graham: Honourable senators, the Government of Canada invests something in the order of \$600 million per year in agricultural safety net funding, and I believe the provinces spend an additional \$400 million, approximately.

Perhaps Senator Gustafson could correct me on this, but with the exceptionally good prices that have prevailed in the past few years, Canadian farmers have saved approximately \$2.5 billion of their net income for just this type of situation. I believe it is called the Net Income Stabilization Account.

Having said that, I wish to assure Senator Gustafson and other honourable senators that Agriculture and Agri-food Canada is monitoring market developments and their effects on farm income in order to manage the situation effectively. I have spoken to the minister directly and I know he has spoken to his cabinet colleagues. His officials are working with the provinces and with the industry on further refinements of the safety net system.

I wish to assure Senator Gustafson that the Minister of Agriculture takes this matter seriously, and is working on the plan on a daily basis.

Senator Gustafson: There is no question that it has been a good program. The fact is that most farmers have already drawn that money out. The question now is: How soon will the government act? This situation cannot go on until spring. There must be some action, and quickly. Has the minister any idea how soon this might happen?

Senator Graham: I know that the Minister of Agriculture regards this as a matter of urgent importance. While I cannot indicate exactly what may develop, I assure the honourable senator that the minister is giving this matter his daily attention.

DELAYED ANSWER TO ORAL QUESTION

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I have a response to a question raised in the Senate on October 29, 1998, by the Honourable Senator Noël A. Kinsella, regarding the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

UNITED NATIONS

INTERNATIONAL COVENANT ON ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL RIGHTS—RECENT RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS FROM COMMISSION—REQUEST FOR COPY

(Response to question raised by Hon. Noël A. Kinsella on October 29, 1998)

In order to supply material in response to the United Nations Committee's questions in the briefest possible time, Canada sent an initial response on September 30, composed of all responses already received from various jurisdictions at that time. Subsequently, two more responses have been received, translated and were transmitted separately. The translation of the complete package is under way and the 150-page document will be available shortly for public distribution.

•(1530)

SOCIAL HOUSING PROGRAMS

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AUTHORIZE ABORIGINAL PEOPLES COMMITTEE TO EXTEND DATE OF FINAL REPORT

Leave having been given to revert to Notices of Motion:

Hon. Charlie Watt: Honourable senators, I give notice that on Tuesday, November 17, 1998, I will move:

That, notwithstanding the Order of the Senate adopted on Thursday, May 28, 1998, the Standing Senate Committee on Aboriginal Peoples, which was authorized to examine and report on the damaging consequences of the recent decision of the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) to terminate all of its "Social Housing Programs," excepting Rural Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Program (RRAP), be empowered to present its report no later than April 28, 1999.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

CANADIAN PARKS AGENCY BILL

THIRD READING—MOTION IN AMENDMENT—
DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Fitzpatrick, seconded by the Honourable Senator Ruck, for the third reading of Bill C-29, to establish the Canadian Parks Agency and to amend other Acts as a consequence.

Hon. Lowell Murray: Honourable senators, having followed the debate at second reading, and to this point at third reading, and having read every word of the discussion at committee stage, I regret that I cannot think of a good word to say for this legislation. As one of the witnesses before the Senate committee put it, the devil in this case is not in the details; the devil is in the underlying philosophy.

Parks Canada is presently located in the Department of Canadian Heritage, and its minister is responsible to Parliament. It was moved from the Department of the Environment to the Department of Canadian Heritage about five years ago in a government reorganization. That move turns out to have been a mistake. It is no criticism of the ministers or the officials involved to say that national parks do not make and have not made a good fit with cultural policy and national cultural institutions, which is what the Department of Canadian Heritage is mostly all about. A bill that I would have supported gladly is one which would return national parks to the Department of the Environment.

In years gone by, Parks Canada was under the wing of the Department of Northern Affairs, as it was then called. One of the ministers who distinguished himself by his interest in the parks side of the portfolio and by his interest and active involvement in parks matters was none other than Jean Chrétien. Before his time, such prominent figures in the public life of the country as Alvin Hamilton from Saskatchewan and Jean Lesage from Quebec were in charge.

I mention those names only to underline the fact that there is a fine tradition in this country where the political authority not only recognized that national parks are a precious asset, but they recognized equally and took seriously their own responsibility as the political authority in the country, as trustees for the national parks system on behalf of future generations of Canadians. They nurtured the parks. They protected them. They were jealous of the integrity of the parks system. They would never have dreamt of hiving off the national parks to what the British call a “quango,” some kind of quasi-autonomous governmental agency at arm’s length from government and Parliament. That is what is happening, or about to happen, with this bill.

What would be created by this bill is a contrivance, what one of the government witnesses before the committee described as “a legislative departmental corporation.” What on earth does that mean? The same witness went on to speak proudly of the “internal de-layering” that would take place once this agency was created. Internal de-layering sounds like something in which a gastroenterologist would take an interest.

Another witness, perhaps the Secretary of State himself, spoke of the new agency as being “somewhere between a government department and a Crown corporation.” Some of the government witnesses emphasized the autonomy that the new agency would have from government and Parliament. Other government witnesses were at pains to talk of the increased parliamentary scrutiny that would be possible.

Honourable senators, you cannot have it both ways. The fact of the matter is, and I cannot put it any more gently than this, this

bill gives the lie to the idea that there will be increased parliamentary scrutiny or oversight of the parks system.

The argument the government made before the committee is that there will be a simpler, more efficient organizational structure for the parks, and that there would be new financial and administrative authorities for this proposed new agency. Quite a number of senators on the committee, including Senators Taylor, Ghitler, Kenny and Spivak, pointed out to them that this simplicity, this efficiency, could be achieved without creating this new agency and hiving off parliamentary and governmental responsibility. To that contention made by a number of senators on the committee, there was no convincing response.

What they really want, honourable senators, is to get out from under Treasury Board and the Public Service Commission in terms of personnel matters. I ask myself, and I ask honourable senators, why should they be allowed to do so. What makes them so very different from any other governmental department or agency? If there is a problem with the regulations and the procedures of Treasury Board of the Public Service Commission — that is, if those agencies or their regulations are an impediment to sound administration and good government — then change the regulations. What will be the next agency or department to come professing its uniqueness and demanding a dispensation from the rules and from what passes for due process in the government?

•(1540)

The other thing they want is a freer hand for this agency to raise money through commercialization and to spend that money and to put as much distance as possible between those activities and Parliament and the political process. They deny it, of course. They would do so. Under this bill, they point out, the minister will still be boss and the minister is responsible to Parliament.

Honourable senators, I invite you to read the bill and to examine the powers that are vested in the agency and, specifically, in its chief executive officer. Ask yourselves who will really be in charge. Is it the minister or is it the chief executive officer and the agency? The CEO has exclusive authority over hiring and firing. The agency may acquire or sell land and may set fees and exercise other ministerial powers that the minister may choose to delegate to them. As one witness said at committee, this agency will be part of the government when it suits the minister to say so; at other times it will be independently run by a CEO. It will be, as the witness said, “half in and half out of the government structure.” Is this really what we want to do with a treasure, an asset such as the national parks system in this country?

Government officials testifying before the committee were full of assurances that accountability of the agency would be maintained, indeed enhanced, under this new legislation. There was much talk of all the documents that would be tabled in Parliament: management plans, the summary of the corporate report and the biannual report on the state of the national parks and historic sites. There was also much talk about the fact that the so-called stakeholders, whoever they are, will be canvassed and their views will be taken into account.

Honourable senators, a reading of the bill will convince you that the lines of accountability and responsibility to Parliament are blurred and will be further blurred. The minister will be able to invoke the statutory authority of the agency and of the CEO or to claim that she has delegated to them some of her own powers. The CEO will invoke commercial confidentiality or third party confidentiality, or some other exemption, to conceal the details of various transactions when it suits them.

For at least a generation, the importance of Parliament has been in decline. Much talk and effort has tried to reverse this trend, but it has all been at the periphery; for example, more staff for MPs, better facilities for MPs in their ridings so that they may better discharge their responsibilities as service providers to their constituents, more trips abroad for MPs, more contacts with their foreign counterparts, more policy studies by House of Commons committees that could be better done by the Senate. None of this, however useful it may be, comes close to addressing the central problem, which is that Parliament, in particular the House of Commons, has lost control of the government.

Government has gradually slipped away from Parliament, and the conventions by which MPs used to hold the power of the purse and used to hold ministers accountable have become, for the most part, empty rituals. Several generations of MPs and of parliamentary journalists have come and gone, believing that the essence of responsible government is the 40 minutes of amateur histrionics called the "Oral Question Period" in the other place.

I mention all this only to say how baffling I find it that MPs who continue to profess concern about the aggrandisement of the ministry and the executive at Parliament's expense would be complacent in a bill that further weakens their authority, their control, their relevance and their influence, in an area of public policy that many Canadians hold close to their hearts.

Parliament did not lose its status in one dramatic power grab by the executive at some fixed point in the past. It happened incrementally and gradually, through bills like this.

Our national parks have an important place in our collective appreciation and understanding and our consciousness of our country, Canada. Why, then, would Parliament so casually acquiesce in a move to weaken its own oversight of the system and to put more distance between the elected government and the management of our national parks?

Not every Canadian family can afford to go to California or to Florida or to Europe on school holidays. Our national parks should be kept affordable. The amendment that our friend Senator Bolduc moved the other day to remove the admission fees from the parks would have sent a message to the government and to the administration of the national parks about our views on this matter. It would have been an important signal. Unfortunately, it was defeated.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable Senator Murray, I regret to interrupt you, but your 15-minute period has expired. Are you requesting leave?

Senator Murray: Yes, Your Honour.

The Hon. the Speaker: Is leave granted?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Senator Murray: The Auditor General of Canada is often regarded as a bean-counting, bottom-line functionary whose annual stories of mal-administration capture the headlines. Less noticed — and often overlooked — are his admonitions to us about the state of our national assets. He warned Parliament in 1996 that the ecological integrity of our existing parks is under attack.

Honourable senators, be assured that this bill will increase their vulnerability one hundredfold. As matters now stand, this bill and the underlying philosophy behind will require each park to commercialize as much as possible the activity in the park to maintain its level of operations. This will be done through various leases, licences, concessions, even land sales, all of which are within the power of the proposed new agency.

The pressure on every park will be to extract the maximum dollar from every visitor to the park. This bill may make sense as a business plan. I do not know about that. I am not sure. However, it is unworthy of an institution that served Canadians so well for over a century and has been a source of pride.

•(1550)

In this bill, lip service is paid to ideals and principles but, in fact, it is goodbye to the public philosophy which has guided the park system in the past, and it is hello Disneyland north, and there is nothing that we or our hapless colleagues in the other place will be able to do about it.

MOTION IN AMENDMENT

Hon. Lowell Murray: Honourable senators, I move, seconded by the Honourable Senator Phillips:

That the bill be not now read a third time but that it be read a third time this day six months hence.

The Hon. the Speaker: It is moved by the Honourable Senator Murray, seconded by the Honourable Senator Phillips, that this bill be not now read a third time but that it be read a third time this day six months hence.

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

Some Hon. Senators: Yes.

Some Hon. Senators: No.

The Hon. the Speaker: Does any other honourable senator wish to speak?

Hon. Dan Hays: Honourable senators, I had anticipated speaking to the main motion. However, I will more profitably speak to Senator Murray's amendment, and in so doing deal both with some of the comments that he has made and comments that I should like to make on the main motion.

Senator Murray, as always, is very persuasive, but I should like to make some points on the other side of this issue.

The points that Senator Murray makes about the responsible ministry are interesting. I am not sure that the parks' moving from Northern Affairs to Environment to Heritage has much to do with this particular bill and his proposed amendment to delay our dealing with it. The responsible ministry may change in future, as it has in the past.

The nature of the agency, however, is something he does not like. Other senators opposite have expressed displeasure through proposing amendments all of which have been defeated. In the case of Senator Murray's comments, I think perhaps it is worth going over his reasons, not as he has done in a negative way but rather as they have been put to us as simple facts and ways of dealing with problems that we are faced with today in terms of the fiscal environment and what we must do to adapt to that environment.

As part of government cut-backs, Parks Canada appropriations have been reduced by \$104 million a year. Operating at this financial base, programs must still continue to manage the parks' resources, with emphasis on respecting ecological and commemorative integrity. They must continue to provide high-quality service at existing parks and sites, deliver on government commitments with respect to completing the national parks system and expanding the system of national historic sites and national marine conservation areas. They must continue to contribute to national and local tourism economies and continue to present heritage through interpretive and educational programs.

The authorities provided through the creation of the agency maintain full ministerial direction. Senator Murray feels that it is a bit distant but that is the case, and it is written in the legislation that a minister will be responsible — currently the Minister of Canadian Heritage or the Secretary of State for Parks who has taken on special responsibility for this agency and will continue to remain accountable. The bill's provisions are designed to assist the agency to meet the above program objectives with benefits flowing to the Canadian public through more efficient delivery of services and additional dollars for investment in new parks and sites.

I would, as Senator Murray and Senator Bolduc and others would, I am sure, wish admission to parks and museums to be at no cost. I admire the Americans for being able to do that at the Smithsonian institutions, although I am not sure about their parks. Canada is not able to do that without impairing its fiscal objectives and the future of programs to expand and maintain the parks and these treasures in the way we want them maintained and expanded.

These authorities, not generally available, in the case of the agency, through government departments, therefore include: full retention and reinvestment authority for all revenues; a two-year rolling budget, eliminating the issue of year-end spending and carry-overs and allowing for fund advances; a dedicated, non-lapsing account for new parks and historic sites funded by

Parliament, augmented by the ability to retain revenues from the sale of surplus assets and general donations; a common service option allowing the agency, with Treasury Board approval, to choose its suppliers based on service and price; and increased approval limits for real property and contract transactions.

Regarding the sale or change of park boundaries, I do not think this has been suggested but I want to confirm that they are not threatened in any way because of the establishment of park boundaries as sacrosanct. In fact, we will be examining legislation in the near future which will make it impossible to deal with a park boundary or, for that matter, a development plan within the park, except through Parliament speaking on that subject.

As well, the agency has full responsibility for collective bargaining, for the establishment of the terms and conditions of employment, for the establishment of the agency's classification and staffing regime, and for the development of its own human resource policies and systems. Senator Murray refers to this as a negative feature. I think it can also be seen as a positive development in terms of dealing with such matters outside the way in which they are dealt with now as part of the federal civil service. These authorities are required to maintain and enhance services to Canadians and other visitors to the parks in the current fiscal context, through simplified human resources and administrative rules and more flexible financial authority.

With the establishment of the agency, Parks Canada will become a legal entity dedicated to managing and preserving for future generations systems of national parks, national historic sites and related protected heritage areas and activities for the use and enjoyment of Canadians — arguably a step in the right direction in terms of preserving the integrity of the parks and ensuring, through this step away from government, that they will be less subject to whimsical or adverse decisions.

Senator Murray refers to this as an evolution taking power away from Parliament and holding governments to account. Of course, we will be looking at similar legislation for agencies in the case of Revenue Canada. We have an agency currently in the Food Inspection Branch. It is a way of bringing efficiency and flexibility to the provision of services to Canadians and protecting such things as parks.

Has Parliament lost control of the government thereby? I have been here, not as long as many, but during my time here, I believe Parliament, in particular this body, has been effective in holding governments to account, and I believe that it will find the means, if they are not readily available to Senator Murray right now, of continuing to be effective in holding governments to account. I also think, in dealing with this legislation, we are not casually acquiescing to some diminishment of our power and roles but rather modernizing a system of management and ensuring the integrity of our parks, which I urge each and every one of you to support by defeating the amendment proposed by Senator Murray and, subsequently, if we are successful there, by supporting the bill.

On motion of Senator Andreychuk, debate adjourned.

COMPETITION ACT

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING—ORDER STANDS

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Callbeck, seconded by the Honourable Senator Poy, for the second reading of Bill C-20, to amend the Competition Act and to make consequential and related amendments to other Acts.

Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Acting Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, for some time this item has been standing awaiting the participation in the debate of my colleague the Honourable Senator Oliver. However, by virtue of an order of this house, the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce was authorized to sit while the Senate is sitting. Senator Oliver is a member of that committee. He is required as a member of that committee to attend to the business of that committee.

This has the consequential effect of Senator Oliver not being in the chamber and therefore unable to participate in this debate. He is ready to participate when he is absolved of his duty with the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce. I make the point that this is one of the consequences of this house issuing an order allowing committees to sit, doing clearly important business, but doing so when the house is also doing its business.

It is my understanding that committee is concluding its work shortly, and I expect Senator Oliver to be in the chamber and speaking to this motion when we return after the Remembrance Day break.

Order stands.

**MERCHANT NAVY WAR SERVICE
RECOGNITION BILL**

SECOND READING—ORDER STANDS

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Forrestall, seconded by the Honourable Senator

Atkins, for the second reading of Bill S-19, to give further recognition to the war-time service of Canadian merchant navy veterans and to provide for their fair and equitable treatment.

Hon. J. Michael Forrestall: Honourable senators, it is now over a month since debate began on this piece of legislation. I am wondering when we might get around to completing it. Is there some suggestion that it is being deliberately stalled at this stage, awaiting Minister Mifflin's bill sometime in the next month or so from the other place?

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Deputy Leader of the Government): Thank you for the question. Senator Perrault is not here. The one day that he was here we did not get to this particular item. I understand he will deliver his prepared speech at the next sitting of the Senate.

Order stands.

ADJOURNMENT

Leave having been given to revert to Government Notices of Motion:

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 Tuesday, November 17, 1998, at 2 p.m.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

The Senate adjourned until Tuesday, November 17, 1998, at 2 p.m.

THE SENATE OF CANADA
PROGRESS OF LEGISLATION
(1st Session, 36th Parliament)
Thursday, November 5, 1998

GOVERNMENT BILLS
(SENATE)

No.	Title	1st	2nd	Committee	Report	Amend.	3rd	R.A.	Chap.
S-2	An Act to amend the Canadian Transportation Accident Investigation and Safety Board Act and to make a consequential amendment to another Act (Sen. Graham)	97/09/30	97/10/21	Transport and Communications	98/04/02	four	98/05/27	98/06/18	20/98
S-3	An Act to amend the Pension Benefits Standards Act, 1985 and the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions Act (Sen. Graham)	97/09/30	97/10/21	Banking, Trade and Commerce	97/11/05	seven	97/11/20	98/06/11	12/98
S-4	An Act to amend the Canada Shipping Act (maritime liability) (Sen. Graham)	97/10/08	97/10/22	Transport and Communications	97/12/12	three	97/12/16	98/05/12	06/98
S-5	An Act to amend the Canada Evidence Act and the Criminal Code in respect of persons with disabilities, to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act in respect of persons with disabilities and other matters and to make consequential amendments to other Acts (Sen. Graham)	97/10/09	97/10/29	Legal and Constitutional Affairs	97/12/04	one	97/12/11	98/05/12	09/98
S-9	An Act respecting depository bills and depository notes and to amend the Financial Administration Act (Sen. Graham)	97/12/03	97/12/12	Banking, Trade and Commerce	98/02/24	one	98/03/19	98/06/11	13/98
S-16	An Act to implement an agreement between Canada and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, an agreement between Canada and the Republic of Croatia and a convention between Canada and the Republic of Chile, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income	98/05/05	98/05/12	Foreign Affairs	98/05/28	none	98/06/02		

GOVERNMENT BILLS
(HOUSE OF COMMONS)

No.	Title	1st	2nd	Committee	Report	Amend.	3rd	R.A.	Chap.
C-2	An Act to establish the Canada Pension Plan Investment Board and to amend the Canada Pension Plan and the Old Age Security Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts	97/12/04	97/12/16	Committee of the whole 97/12/17	97/12/17	none	97/12/18	97/12/18	40/97
C-3	An Act respecting DNA identification and to make consequential amendments to the Criminal Code and other Acts	98/09/30	98/10/22	Legal and Constitutional Affairs					

C-4	An Act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts	98/02/18	98/02/26	Agriculture and Forestry	98/05/14	five	98/05/14	98/06/11	17/98
C-5	An Act respecting cooperatives	97/12/09	97/12/16	Banking, Trade and Commerce	98/02/24	none	98/02/25	98/03/31	01/98
C-6	An Act to provide for an integrated system of land and water management in the Mackenzie Valley, to establish certain boards for that purpose and to make consequential amendments to other Acts	98/03/18	98/03/26	Aboriginal Peoples	98/06/09	none	98/06/18	98/06/18	25/98
C-7	An Act to establish the Saguenay-St. Lawrence Marine Park and to make a consequential amendment to another Act	97/11/25	97/12/02	Energy, Environment and Natural Resources	97/12/09	none	97/12/10	97/12/10	37/97
C-8	An Act respecting an accord between the Governments of Canada and the Yukon Territory relating to the administration and control of and legislative jurisdiction in respect of oil and gas	98/03/17	98/03/25	Aboriginal Peoples	98/03/31	none	98/04/01	98/05/12	05/98
C-9	An Act for making the system of Canadian ports competitive, efficient and commercially oriented, providing for the establishing of port authorities and the divesting of certain harbours and ports, for the commercialization of the St. Lawrence Seaway and ferry services and other matters related to maritime trade and transport and amending the Pilotage Act and amending and repealing other Acts as a consequence	97/12/09	98/03/26	Transport and Communications	98/05/13	none	98/05/28	98/06/11	10/98
C-10	An Act to implement a convention between Canada and Sweden, a convention between Canada and the Republic of Lithuania, a convention between Canada and the Republic of Kazakhstan, a convention between Canada and the Republic of Iceland and a convention between Canada and the Kingdom of Denmark for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income and to amend the Canada-Netherlands Income Tax Convention Act, 1986 and the Canada-United States Tax Convention Act, 1984	97/12/02	97/12/08	Banking, Trade and Commerce	97/12/09	none	97/12/10	97/12/10	38/97
C-11	An Act respecting the imposition of duties of customs and other charges, to give effect to the International Convention on the Harmonized Commodity Description and Coding System, to provide relief against the imposition of certain duties of customs or other charges, to provide for other related matters and to amend or repeal certain Acts in consequence thereof.	97/11/19	97/11/27	Banking, Trade and Commerce	97/12/04	none	97/12/08	97/12/08	36/97
C-12	An Act to amend the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Superannuation Act	98/04/28	98/04/30	Social Affairs, Science & Technology	98/06/04	none	98/06/08	98/06/11	11/98
C-13	An Act to amend the Parliament of Canada Act	97/10/30	97/11/05	Legal and Constitutional Affairs	97/11/06	none	97/11/18	97/11/27	32/97
C-15	An Act to amend the Canada Shipping Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts	98/05/05	98/06/03	Transport and Communications	98/06/10	none	98/06/11	98/06/11	16/98

C-16	An Act to amend the Criminal Code and the Interpretation Act (powers to arrest and enter dwellings)	97/11/18	97/12/11	Legal and Constitutional Affairs	97/12/16	none	97/12/17	97/12/18	39/97
C-17	An Act to amend the Telecommunications Act and the Teleglobe Canada Reorganization and Divestiture Act	97/12/09	98/02/24	Transport and Communications	98/03/25	none	98/04/29	98/05/12	08/98
C-18	An Act to amend the Customs Act and the Criminal Code	98/02/10	98/02/18	Legal and Constitutional Affairs	98/04/02	none	98/04/28	98/05/12	07/98
C-19	An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code (Part I) and the Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts	98/05/26	98/06/08	Social Affairs, Science & Technology	98/06/18	none	98/06/18	98/06/18	26/98
C-20	An Act to amend the Competition Act and to make consequential and related amendments to other Acts	98/09/24							
C-21	An Act to amend the Small Business Loans Act	98/03/19	98/03/25	Banking, Trade and Commerce	98/03/26	none	98/03/31	98/03/31	04/98
C-22	An Act to Implement the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on their Destruction	97/11/25	97/11/26	Foreign Affairs	97/11/27	none	97/11/27	97/11/27	33/97
C-23	An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of Canada for the financial year ending March 31, 1998	97/11/26	97/12/04	—	—	—	97/12/08	97/12/08	35/97
C-24	An Act to provide for the resumption and continuation of postal services	97/12/02	97/12/03	Committee of the whole	97/12/03	none	97/12/03	97/12/03	34/97
C-25	An Act to amend the National Defence Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts	98/06/11	98/06/18	Legal and Constitutional Affairs					
C-26	An Act to amend the Canada Grain Act and the Agriculture and Agri-Food Administrative Monetary Penalties Act and to repeal the Grain Futures Act	98/06/08	98/06/16	Agriculture and Forestry	98/06/18	none	98/06/18	98/06/18	22/98
C-28	An Act to amend the Income Tax Act, the Income Tax Application Rules, the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, the Canada Pension Plan, the Children's Special Allowances Act, the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, the Cultural Property Export and Import Act, the Customs Act, the Customs Tariff, the Employment Insurance Act, the Excise Tax Act, the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act, the Income Tax Conventions Interpretation Act, the Old Age Security Act, the Tax Court of Canada Act, the Tax Rebate Discounting Act, the Unemployment Insurance Act, the Western Grain Transition Payments Act and certain Acts related to the Income Tax Act	98/04/28	98/05/12	Banking, Trade and Commerce	98/06/04	none	98/06/16	98/06/18	19/98
C-29	An Act to establish the Parks Canada Agency and to amend other Acts as a consequence	98/06/03	98/06/15	Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources	98/10/20	none			
C-30	An Act respecting the powers of the Mi'kmaq of Nova Scotia in relation to education	98/06/11	98/06/16	Aboriginal Peoples	98/06/18	none	98/06/18	98/06/18	24/98

C-31	An Act respecting Canada Lands Surveyors	98/05/07	98/05/26	Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources	98/06/09	none	98/06/10	98/06/11	14/98
C-33	An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of Canada for the financial year ending March 31, 1998	98/03/18	98/03/25	—	—	—	98/03/26	98/03/31	02/98
C-34	An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of Canada for the financial year ending March 31, 1999	98/03/18	98/03/26	—	—	—	98/03/31	98/03/31	03/98
C-36	An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 24, 1998	98/05/28	98/06/08	National Finance	98/06/15	none	98/06/17	98/06/18	21/98
C-37	An Act to amend the Judges Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts	98/06/11	98/09/22	Legal and Constitutional Affairs	98/10/22	eight	98/11/04		
C-38	An Act to amend the National Parks Act (creation of Tukturnogait National Park)	98/06/15	98/06/17	Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources					
C-39	An Act to amend the Nunavut Act and the Constitution Act, 1867	98/06/03	98/06/08	Aboriginal Peoples	98/06/09	none	98/06/10	98/06/11	15/98
C-45	An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of Canada for the financial year ending March 31, 1999	98/06/10	98/06/16	—	—	—	98/06/17	98/06/18	28/98
C-46	An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of Canada for the financial year ending March 31, 1999	98/06/10	98/06/16	—	—	—	98/06/17	98/06/18	29/98
C-47	An Act to amend the Parliament of Canada Act, the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act and the Salaries Act	98/06/11	98/06/16	Banking, Trade and Commerce	98/06/17	none	98/06/18	98/06/18	23/98
C-52	An Act to implement the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty	98/10/20	98/10/28	Foreign Affairs					

COMMONS PUBLIC BILLS

No.	Title	1st	2nd	Committee	Report	Amend.	3rd	R.A.	Chap.
C-220	An Act to amend the Criminal Code and the Copyright Act. (profit from authorship respecting a crime) (Sen. Lewis)	97/10/02	97/10/22	Legal and Constitutional Affairs	98/06/10 adopted	recommend Bill not proceed			
C-410	An Act to change the name of certain electoral districts	98/05/28	98/06/04	Legal and Constitutional Affairs	98/06/08	two	98/06/09	98/06/18	27/98
C-411	An Act to amend the Canada Elections Act	98/05/28	98/06/04	Legal and Constitutional Affairs	98/06/08	none	98/06/09	98/06/11	18/98

SENATE PUBLIC BILLS

No.	Title	1st	2nd	Committee	Report	Amend.	3rd	R.A.	Chap.
S-6	An Act to establish a National Historic Park to commemorate the "Persons Case" (Sen. Kenny)	97/11/05	97/11/25	Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources					
S-7	An Act to amend the Criminal Code to prohibit coercion in medical procedures that offend a person's religion or belief that human life is inviolable (Sen. Haidasz, P.C.)	97/11/19	97/12/02	Legal and Constitutional Affairs					
S-8	An Act to amend the Tobacco Act (content regulation) (Sen. Haidasz, P.C.)	97/11/26	97/12/17	Social Affairs, Science & Technology	98/04/30	two	Dropped from Order Paper pursuant to Rule 27(3) 98/10/01		
S-10	An Act to amend the Excise Tax Act (Sen. Di Nino)	97/12/03	98/03/19	Social Affairs, Science & Technology	98/06/03	none	referred back to Committee 98/09/24		
S-11	An Act to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act in order to add social condition as a prohibited ground of discrimination (Sen. Cohen)	97/12/10	98/03/17	Legal and Constitutional Affairs	98/06/04	one	98/06/09		
S-12	An Act to amend the Criminal Code (abuse of process) (Sen. Cools)	98/02/10	98/05/06	Legal and Constitutional Affairs					
S-13	An Act to incorporate and to establish an industry levy to provide for the Canadian Anti-Smoking Youth Foundation (Sen. Kenny)	98/02/26	98/04/02	Social Affairs, Science & Technology	98/05/14	seven	98/06/10		
S-14	An Act providing for self-government by the first nations of Canada (Sen. Tkachuk)	98/03/25	98/03/31	Aboriginal Peoples					
S-15	An Act respecting the declaration of royal assent by the Governor General in the Queen's name to bills passed by the Houses of Parliament (Sen. Lynch-Staunton)	98/04/02	98/06/09	Legal and Constitutional Affairs	98/06/18	four			
S-17	An Act to amend the Criminal Code respecting criminal harassment and other related matters (Sen. Oliver)	98/05/12	98/06/02	Legal and Constitutional Affairs					
S-19	An Act to give further recognition to the war-time service of Canadian merchant navy veterans and to provide for their fair and equitable treatment (Sen. Forrestall)	98/06/18							

PRIVATE BILLS

S-18	An Act respecting the Alliance of Manufacturers & Exporters Canada (Sen. Kelleher, P.C.)	98/06/17
S-20	An Act to amend the Act of incorporation of the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Mackenzie (Sen. Taylor)	98/09/23 98/10/29
		Social Affairs, Science & Technology

CONTENTS

Thursday, November 5, 1998

	PAGE		PAGE
Remembrance Day		Senator Graham	2151
Tributes to the Late John McCrae, Physician, Poet.			
Senator Graham	2144	Human Resources Development	
Memories of World Wars I and II. Senator Phillips	2144	Appointments to Canada Pension Plan Investment Board—	
World War I Heroes of Pine Street, Winnipeg, Manitoba.		Government Position. Senator Stratton	2151
Senator Carstairs	2146	Senator Graham	2151
Korean War Heroes from Prince Edward Island.		Senator Lynch-Staunton	2152
Senator Johnstone	2146	Appointments to Canada Pension Plan Investment Board—	
Tributes to Veterans—Resurrection of Peace and Security Institute.		Entitlement of Appointee to Receive Two Salaries—	
Senator Prud'homme	2147	Government Position. Senator Andreychuk	2152
		Senator Graham	2152
<hr/>			
SENATORS' STATEMENTS		Agriculture	
		Drop in Market Prices for Produce and Livestock—	
The Senate		Effect on Incomes of Farmers—Government Position.	
Outcome of Libel Action against Reform Party.		Senator Gustafson	2152
Senator Lawson	2147	Senator Graham	2152
National Defence		Delayed Answer to Oral Question	
Tribute to Crews Flying Sea King Helicopters from		Senator Carstairs	2152
CFB Shearwater on Search and Rescue Missions.			
Senator Forrestall	2149		
		United Nations	
<hr/>		International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural	
		Rights—Recent Responses to Questions from Commission—	
ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS		Request for Copy.	
		Question by Senator Kinsella.	
Statute Law Amendment Proposals		Senator Carstairs (Delayed Answer)	2152
Tabled Document Referred to Legal and Constitutional Affairs			
Committee. Senator Carstairs	2149	Social Housing Programs	
		Notice of Motion to Authorize Aboriginal Peoples Committee	
Canada-Europe Parliamentary Association		to Extend Date of Final Report. Senator Watt	2153
Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe—			
Seventh Annual Meeting of Parliamentary Assembly,			
Copenhagen, Denmark—Notice of Inquiry.			
Senator Grafstein	2149		
		<hr/>	
QUESTION PERIOD		ORDERS OF THE DAY	
Solicitor General		Canadian Parks Agency Bill (Bill C-29)	
Commission of Inquiry into Treatment of Protestors at		Third Reading—Motion in Amendment—Debate Continued.	
APEC Conference by RCMP—Provision of Funds for Defence		Senator Murray	2154
of Complainants—Re-examination of Issue—		Motion in Amendment. Senator Murray	2155
Government Position. Senator Kinsella	2150	Senator Hays	2155
Senator Graham	2150		
Treatment of Protestors at APEC Conference by RCMP—		Competition Act (Bill C-20)	
Timely Naming of Inquiry Under Inquiries Act—		Bill to Amend—Second Reading—Order Stands.	
Government Position. Senator Kinsella	2150	Senator Kinsella	2157
Senator Graham	2150		
		Merchant Navy War Service Recognition Bill (Bill S-19)	
Nova Scotia		Second Reading—Order Stands. Senator Forrestall	2157
Timing and Particulars of Transfer of Land at		Senator Carstairs	2157
Base Shearwater to Province by Development Corporation—			
Government Position. Senator Forrestall	2150	Adjournment	
		Senator Carstairs	2157
		Progress of Legislation	i



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