



# Debates of the Senate

---

1st SESSION

•

36th PARLIAMENT

•

VOLUME 137

•

NUMBER 119

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Thursday, March 11, 1999**

—

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, March 11, 1999

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

Prayers.

[Translation]

### SENATORS' STATEMENTS

#### THE WINTER GAMES

**Hon. Fernand Robichaud:** Honourable senators, last Saturday the closing ceremonies of the Winter Games were held in Corner Brook, Newfoundland. More than 3,200 athletes and 600 coaches from all across Canada took part in these games.

The City of Corner Brook showed all of Canada what a warm and hospitable welcome it had reserved for all those attending this great event. Its 7,000 volunteers made a vital contribution to the welcoming atmosphere.

My congratulations to the New Brunswick athletes who so ably represented our province in these games. My congratulations as well for a job well done to the organizers, the volunteers, the athletes and, particularly, the people of Corner Brook, for making these Winter Games the resounding success that they were.

I would also like to take this opportunity to invite the people of Canada to the first Canadian Francophone Games, which will bring together the francophones and the francophiles of Canada. More than 1,000 people will be participating. The Games will be held next summer in Memramcook, New Brunswick, August 19 through 22, just before the Sommet international de la Francophonie. There will be an innovative aspect to these games: an artistic component in addition to the sports. This is a first for Canada. We will be expecting you this summer. Do come down and see us.

[English]

### COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY

#### YEAR 2000 PROBLEM

**Hon. Donald H. Oliver:** Honourable senators, I had intended to present a statement last week on the importance of electronic commerce and the need for a comprehensive study of this subject by the Senate Banking Committee. I am delighted to report that that committee has already undertaken such a major study on e-commerce, taking its cue from last fall's OECD report, which estimates that electronic commerce will increase in value from the present-day \$26 billion U.S. per year to about \$1 trillion worldwide in the next seven years. However, first we must get

through into next year. First we must deal with the Y2K problems of the so-called millennium bug.

It is difficult to pick up a newspaper without reading some commentary on our preparedness, or lack thereof, as we reach the end of the year. Last Saturday's *National Post*, for example, carried a feature article on this subject detailing the government's efforts to assuage the fear of Canadians through the distribution of a pamphlet entitled, "The Millennium Bug Home Check."

The thrust of the federal government's thinking so far on this subject has been to reassure Canadians that all will be well, home appliances will work, cars will start, and the buses and trains will run on time, but it is foolish to believe that there will not be problems. For the most part, they are problems which can be anticipated and, in many cases, resolved through individual action before the end of the year. We do not really know whether, in the middle of next winter, our home and office heating sources will function uninterrupted. We do not know for sure whether the purification plants for drinking water will continue to produce clean water. In spite of the preparedness measures our financial institutions have already undertaken, we are unsure of a steady supply of cash through bank machines.

We do not realize the magnitude of our dependency on computer technology. Take the food production industry, for example. Les MacDougall of Halifax-based CIC Ltd. has stated that food production will be impacted by Y2K in every step of the process, from seed production, growing, transportation, manufacturing, to retailing. All these steps involve governments, power sources and other public utilities such as telecoms, which are dependent on date-sensitive technology.

What should we be doing as senators? Perhaps we should be studying the impact of Y2K in one of our standing committees. Senators should also become involved through our newsletter and other communication tools informing Canadians of simple precautions that could be taken.

Prevention could be useful, such as taking two weeks' salary out of the bank machine in cash, stocking up on two or three weeks' groceries, ensuring that homes have alternative sources of heat which are not Y2K vulnerable, and obtaining enough pure water or a water purifier to ensure clean drinking water for at least two weeks.

There is a role here for senators to play, a role of informing Canadians to take necessary precautions to lessen, to the greatest extent possible, the potential adverse consequences of the failure of time-sensitive computer equipment. We should ensure that Canadians are not lulled into a false state of security but are generally prepared at least to meet predictable service interruptions.

---

## VISITORS IN THE GALLERY

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable senators, I wish to draw your attention to some distinguished visitors in the gallery, Madam Marie-Louise Rossi, Chief Executive of the International Underwriting Association of London, England, and Mr. David Matcham. They are here as guests of our Senate Banking Committee.

I bid you both welcome to the Senate.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### ACCESS TO INFORMATION ACT

BILL TO AMEND—REPORT OF COMMITTEE

**Hon. Lowell Murray,** Chairman of the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology, presented the following report:

Thursday, March 11, 1999

The Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology has the honour to present its

### SEVENTEENTH REPORT

Your committee, to which was referred, Bill C-208, An Act to amend the Access to Information Act, in obedience to the Order of Reference of Thursday, February 11, 1999, has examined the said bill and now reports the same without amendment.

Attached as an appendix to this Report are the observations of your committee on Bill C-208.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWELL MURRAY  
*Chairman*

*(For text of Appendix, see today's Journals of the Senate.)*

**The Hon. the Speaker:** When shall this bill be read the third time?

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

### RECOMBINANT BOVINE GROWTH HORMONE

INTERIM REPORT OF AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY COMMITTEE  
ON STUDY OF EFFECT ON HUMAN AND ANIMAL HEALTH TABLED

**Hon. Leonard J. Gustafson:** Honourable senators, I have the honour to table the eighth report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which is an interim report on the

human and animal health safety aspect of rBST, as referred to the committee on Thursday, May 14, 1998.

Honourable senators, pursuant to rule 97(3), I move that the report be placed on the Orders of the Day for consideration at the next sitting of the Senate.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable senators, is it agreed?

Motion agreed to.

[*Translation*]

## CARRIAGE BY AIR ACT

BILL TO AMEND—REPORT OF COMMITTEE

**Hon. Marie-P. Poulin,** Acting Chair of the Standing Senate Committee on Transport and Communications, presented the following report:

Thursday, March 11, 1999

The Standing Senate Committee on Transport and Communications has the honour to present its

### TENTH REPORT

Your committee, to which was referred Bill S-23, to amend the Carriage by Air Act to give effect to a Protocol to amend the Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules Relating to International Carriage by Air and to give effect to the Convention, Supplementary to the Warsaw Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules Relating to International Carriage by Air Performed by a Person Other than the contracting Carrier, has, in obedience to the Order of Reference of Wednesday, February 3, 1999, examined the said Bill and now reports the same without amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

MARIE-P. POULIN  
*Acting Chair*

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

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

[*English*]

## FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL FISCAL ARRANGEMENTS ACT

BILL TO AMEND—FIRST READING

**The Hon. the Speaker** informed the Senate that a message had been received from the House of Commons with Bill C-65, to amend the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act.

Bill read first time.

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

On motion of Senator Carstairs, bill placed on the Orders of the Day for second reading on Tuesday next, March 16, 1999.

## CANADA-EUROPE PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

ORGANIZATION FOR SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE—  
MEETING OF PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY, VIENNA, AUSTRIA—  
REPORT OF CANADIAN DELEGATION TABLED

**Hon. Jeremiah S. Grafstein:** Honourable senators, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the report of the Canadian delegation of the Canada-Europe Parliamentary Association; OSCE, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe; and the parliamentary assembly, OSCP, standing committee meeting in Vienna, Austria, on January 14 and 15, 1999.

## ENERGY, THE ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

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

**Hon. Nicholas W. Taylor:** Honourable senators, I give notice that on Tuesday, March 16, I shall move:

That notwithstanding the Order of the Senate adopted on October 23, 1997, the Standing Senate Committee on Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources, in accordance with rule 86(1)(p), which was authorized to examine such issues as may arise from time to time relating to energy, the environment and natural resources generally in Canada, be empowered to present its final report no later than March 31, 2000.

## HUMAN RIGHTS IN TIBET

NOTICES OF MOTION TO URGE CHINESE GOVERNMENT  
TO RECOGNIZE SELF-DETERMINATION  
AND HUMAN RIGHTS OF TIBETANS

**Hon. Consiglio Di Nino:** Honourable senators, I give notice that on Tuesday next, March 16, 1999, I will move:

That the Senate urge the Government of Canada to use its good offices to urge the Government of China to respect the right to self-determination and human rights of the people of Tibet and, in particular, to respect the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as well as resolutions of the UN General Assembly 1960, 1961 and 1965 which affirm these rights for the Tibetan people.

## JUSTICE REFORM AND VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

COMMENTS MADE AT CIDA AND UNIFEM CONFERENCE—  
NOTICE OF INQUIRY

**Hon. Anne C. Cools:** Honourable senators, pursuant to rules 56(1), (2) and 57(2) of the *Rules of the Senate*, I give notice that two days hence, I will call the attention of the Senate:

(a) to the speech by Supreme Court of Canada Justice Claire L'Heureux-Dubé at a conference on "justice reform and violence against women," sponsored by UNIFEM and the Canadian International Development Agency, (CIDA), held at the Government Conference Centre in Ottawa, on March 8, 1999, International Women's Day;

(b) to Madame Justice L'Heureux-Dubé's work with an international women's organization, Sakshi, that promotes reform in South Asia, and to her role "explaining equality and our concept of equality";

(c) to the speeches at this same conference by Diane Marleau, Minister for International Cooperation and Minister Responsible for la Francophonie, Jean Augustine, Member of Parliament, Hélène Lagacé, Centre canadien d'études et de coopération internationale, (CECI), and Madonna Larbi, MATCH International Centre;

(d) to the media reports about Madame Justice L'Heureux-Dubé's speech;

(e) to Canada's Superior Court justices' international activities in other countries;

(f) to the Canadian International Development Agency's financing of Canada's Superior Court justices' international activities;

(g) to Parliament's role in Canada's Superior Court justices' actions in other countries.

## QUESTION PERIOD

### NATIONAL FINANCE

LEGISLATIVE CHANGES NEEDED TO MODERNIZE, STREAMLINE  
AND STRENGTHEN FINANCIAL SECTOR—GOVERNMENT POSITION

**Hon. W. David Angus:** Honourable senators, given that we have with us today guests from the financial services sector in the U.K.; given that our friends to the south have recently begun a massive overhaul of legislation to reform their financial services regulation structure; given that the U.K., with its Financial Services Administration Act, has recently undertaken a complete overhaul of its financial services system; given that last fall the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce recommended, unanimously — following a similar

such unanimous recommendation by the finance committee of the other place — that the government move with all due haste to modernize, streamline and, at the same time, strengthen Canada's financial services sector, especially in banking and insurance; and given that yesterday's announcement by the Canada bond rating agency recognized that the Canadian financial system, especially in banking, is weakening and not strengthening, can the Honourable Leader of the Government in the Senate please tell us when the government will introduce badly needed legislative changes to help to modernize, streamline and strengthen Canada's financial services sector?

**Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, given that it was necessary to bring the country's finances under control; given that this government, when it came into office, was faced with a \$42-billion debt; given that this government has brought forward two balanced budgets for the first time in 50 years; and given that this government has promised two more balanced budgets, which will give us four balanced budgets for the first time since Confederation, the government is indeed examining the possibility of bringing forward the legislation alluded to by the Honourable Senator Angus. Over time, this government has put Canada on a sound financial basis from which we can move forward and create more jobs in this country.

**Senator Angus:** Honourable senators, given that the honourable leader has not answered the question and that he does not know the answer thereto; given the Free Trade Agreement and the constant breaches thereof by the government; and given the indiscriminate, unpopular, and ill-conceived refusal to allow mergers of banks in this country, would the Leader of the Government please answer the question?

**Senator Graham:** As honourable senators know, the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce, of which the Honourable Senator Angus is a valuable member, brought forward a report on financial institutions and continues to investigate that sector. In the near future, the government will be releasing a policy statement, the intent of which is to map out our vision of the financial services sector. This will be an important step in assessing any proposed future developments in the banking and financial institutions sector.

[Translation]

## CANADA-FRANCE RELATIONS

### PRESUMED TRANSGRESSION OF INTERNATIONAL RULES OF PROTOCOL—GOVERNMENT POSITION

**Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Acting Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Honourable senators, my question is for the Leader of the Government in the Senate. First, I would like to point out that relations between France and Canada are very important. They are important to Canada as a whole, to the Province of Quebec and to my province of New Brunswick. The Prime Minister yesterday accused France and its Minister of Culture, Catherine Trautmann, of failing to abide by international rules. Which international rules did the French minister break?

[English]

**Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, Canada's reaction was entirely appropriate, given the circumstances. Informal or not, the meeting organized by the French minister of culture and communications brought together sovereign states on, according to the invitation of the minister, the margins of the annual general meeting of the Inter-American Development Bank.

Accordingly, only the Government of Canada may determine the mode of representation for the federation and its constituent parts in its relations with other sovereign states and international institutions such as the bank.

[Translation]

### JURISDICTION OF QUEBEC ON MATTERS RELATING TO FRENCH CULTURE—GOVERNMENT POSITION

**Hon. Pierre Claude Nolin:** Honourable senators, my question is for the Leader of the Government in the Senate. I would like to point out that the informal meeting organized by the French Minister of Culture has nothing to do with what the minister has just told us, but instead concerned municipal development in South America.

Quebec has full jurisdiction over everything that concerns French culture in Quebec. Is your government casting doubt on that?

[English]

**Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government):** No, absolutely not, honourable senators. The declaration on culture signed between the governments of France and Quebec in no way alters the situation. The declaration must be viewed in the context of the direct and privileged relationship between France and Quebec. Given that the meeting of March 10 was not a bilateral meeting, the declaration bears little relevance, in my opinion.

[Translation]

### DEBATE ON CULTURAL PLURALITY AND DIVERSITY— GOVERNMENT POSITION

**Hon. Pierre Claude Nolin:** Honourable senators, on December 19, the Prime Minister of France and the Premier of Quebec issued a press release. I presume it was read by the Government of Canada. The two governments recognized the necessary participation in the debate on cultural plurality and diversity of states and governments which, like Quebec, have authority over these matters. I remind you that this is a document that was jointly released by the Prime Minister of France and the Premier of Quebec. Your government read that statement. Why did Minister Copps not react at that time?

[English]

**Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, Canada's decision does not question the very special relationship between France and Quebec which we all recognize has developed with the approval of the Government

of Canada. The relationship cannot, however, be extended to any international setting without the Canadian government's explicit consent.

**Senator Nolin:** Is it true that Minister Copps was not invited to that meeting, that she decided to invite herself, and that it was at that moment that the French minister decided to invite the Quebec minister?

**Senator Graham:** Honourable senators, I am not aware of the specific details on that particular point.

[Translation]

**Hon. Jean-Claude Rivest:** Honourable senators, the government spokesperson should realize that, as regards relations between Quebec and France, Lester B. Pearson — who was then Canada's Prime Minister and who had a much more enlightened vision of Canada than that of the current government — and Jean Lesage signed an agreement confirming the direct and privileged relationship of Quebec and France, within the Canadian federation. As for the multilateral aspect of relations in the area of francophonie, Brian Mulroney and Robert Bourassa established foundations that were fully compatible with the federal system in the context of the Sommet de la francophonie, where Quebec speaks for itself, as does Canada. This has been done in total harmony for years.

Instead of getting all worked up and of politicizing the issue uselessly, why did the Government of Canada not simply — as is done within the Agency for Cultural and Technical Co-operation in French-speaking countries, and also regarding the activities relating to the Sommet de la francophonie — endorse Quebec's direct participation in that conference? The federal government could have invited, on behalf of the Canadian francophonie, the Government of Ontario and the Government of New Brunswick. The latter could have spoken with authority about culture and Acadians in Canada.

Instead of displaying this adversarial attitude toward the Government of Quebec — which is precisely what Lucien Bouchard wants — and in light of the precedents that exist since the Pearson days and that were expanded on in a remarkable fashion by the Mulroney government, would it not have been wiser for the Canadian government to take its cue from such people, who had a much more sound vision of Quebec and Canada than does the current government, with this kind of sterile confrontation, which is very bad for the unity of the country?

[English]

**Senator Graham:** Honourable senators, we are talking here about process. Senator Nolin, on the one hand, has raised the point of why the Government of Canada did not object at the time of the signing of the cultural agreement. Senator Rivest, in particular, is asking why we do not allow the joint participation of the Government of Quebec and the Government of Canada.

Again, you must draw the line sometime, somewhere. You must bring this matter to the attention of those who are most concerned. The decision as to the presence and means of representation of the Canadian federation and its constituent

parts, if you will, in its dealings with other sovereign states lies exclusively with the Government of Canada. France's decision to invite the Government of Quebec to participate in a ministerial meeting, coinciding with the general meeting of the Inter-American Development Bank, is incompatible with the Canadian government's constitutional jurisdiction over international relations.

[Translation]

**Senator Rivest:** Honourable senators, if it was incompatible with the uniqueness of Canada's foreign policy, why then did Mr. Pearson's government recognize the direct and privileged relationship, without the official presence of Canada, between Quebec and France?

Why is Canada preparing to host a meeting of all francophone nations in New Brunswick at which Quebec and New Brunswick will play a direct and equal role similar to that of the Canadian government? Incompatibility does not enter into it. What we have here is the Prime Minister of Canada's unfortunate short-sightedness when it comes to the problems of Quebec.

[English]

**Senator Graham:** This is a decision that was made by the Government of Canada. For example, it would be tantamount to inviting Corsica to come to Canada for a consultation or a conference without notifying the Government of France.

[Translation]

**Hon. Pierre De Bané:** Honourable senators, our colleague Senator Rivest has enjoyed reminding the Leader of the Government in this chamber that the words "direct and privileged relationship" were used by the Pearson government. Is it not true that the Pearson government recognized the direct and privileged relationship between France and Quebec? Is it not true that the Trudeau government used the same terms? And were they not also used by the Mulroney, Turner and Chrétien governments? Each of Ottawa's governments, including that of Mr. Chrétien, has recognized direct and privileged relationship. All governments have used these words, contrary to what Senator Rivest would have us believe. He implied that only two prime ministers used them.

Is it not true that no government has recognized that one of Canada's provinces could participate in an international meeting without the consent of the federal government? Quebec is a member of the Agency for Cultural and Technical Co-operation because the federal government has given its approval.

[English]

**Senator Graham:** I thank the Honourable Senator De Bané for reminding us of those important historic facts.

[Translation]

**Hon. Marcel Prud'homme:** Honourable senators, regardless of what certain personages in Ottawa may say or think, if Canada is to exist, none wish it more than Senators De Bané, Gauthier, Nolin, Rivest, Grimard, Bacon, Pépin, Mercier and Prud'homme.

One thing cannot be changed. The relationship between France and Quebec will evermore be privileged. That in no way changes the privileged relationship Canada and France have had in historical terms.

Right now, as the relationship between Canada and France, between the Right Honourable Jean Chrétien, my friend the Prime Minister, and Mr. Jospin, between Ms Copps, a friend, and Madam Trautmann, seemed to be excellent, why did Ottawa once again get in a state? The only conclusion I can draw is that it can only be to the detriment of what I have called the other points. This is a country that recognizes a striking difference. It will be increasingly noticed and noticeable.

Mr. Minister, you are a member of cabinet. Would you tell them there to ask their advisors to calm down? We can only worsen the situation with the Government of Quebec, despaired of not achieving its goal of breaking up Canada and doing everything to uncover every little upset in our relationship with France. I have always said I am not a Quebecer, I am a French Canadian from Quebec.

[English]

•(1440)

**Senator Graham:** Honourable senators, I thank the Honourable Senators Prud'homme, Nolin, Rivest, De Bané and Kinsella for their interventions. I maintain that Canada's reaction was entirely appropriate given the circumstances. The decision does not put into question the important relationship that has developed between France and Quebec, with the approval of the Government of Canada.

I should point out that Canada's ambassador to France, Jacques Roy, made representations on several occasions to the highest levels of the French government to convey Canada's deep concern with respect to the invitation. What is more, the Prime Minister also wrote a letter to the Prime Minister of France on March 9.

Given the representations, and important observations expressed in this chamber, I am duty bound and pleased to bring them to the attention of my colleagues, in particular the Prime Minister.

[Translation]

**Senator Nolin:** Honourable senators, in a reply a few minutes ago, the Leader of the Government made reference to the Corsican problem. I assume the author of the notes you were reading is in the know. Did that person explain the situation in Corsica to you? It cannot be compared to the present situation in Quebec. Premier Bouchard has been duly elected by a majority of Quebecers. Like it or not, his is a democratic government. In Corsica, there are revolutionaries, people operating outside the law. It might be acceptable to compare them to the FLQ.

Such a comparison, reported in the Quebec press, only stirs up an animosity that is not appropriate. My colleague Senator Rivest referred to this a few minutes ago. I trust that you will not use that comparison again.

[English]

**Senator Graham:** Honourable senators, I take full responsibility for my reference to Corsica. That reference did not come from any briefing notes or any other such source. If I am wrong or if I have been given the wrong impression, I beg the indulgence of my honourable colleagues.

**Senator Prud'homme:** Honourable senators, would the minister undertake to recommend something to his colleagues with regard to the word "approve" which has different connotations?

[Translation]

In the province of Quebec, the most francophone of provinces, the word "approve" is used.

[English]

It reminds me of the stamp we see on pieces of meat, "Canada Approved." It is a little like saying that Quebec is a little baby who needs approval. The word "approve" is one which should be disposed of in these relationships.

[Translation]

**The Hon. the Speaker:** I would like to point out that Question Period is for questions, not debate.

[English]

## NATIONAL DEFENCE

### CLOSING OF CFB CORNWALLIS—REMOVAL OF MEMORIAL WINDOWS FROM ST. GEORGE'S CHAPEL—REQUEST FOR RESPONSE

**Hon. Gerald J. Comeau:** Honourable senators, yesterday, I asked the Leader of the Government in the Senate a question regarding the status of the stained glass windows in St. George's Chapel in Cornwallis, Nova Scotia. He indicated that he would respond to my question today.

Does the minister have a response as to the status of those windows?

**Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, a decision was taken by the Chaplain General of the Armed Forces to leave the stained glass windows where they are. When I questioned the status of this particular problem, it was determined that the decision was taken on the basis that they should be left in a consecrated chapel and that it would not be appropriate for them to be returned to premises which are regarded merely as a museum.

**Senator Comeau:** Honourable senators, the minister may want to go back to the Chaplain General and advise him that the chapel at Cornwallis is to be consecrated in May to coincide with the anniversary of the Battle of the Atlantic. As well, the Royal Canadian Naval Association is returning to their former recruit training base for a reunion this summer.



The chapel at Shannon Park is closed six days per week. Therefore, the stained glass windows will be viewed by fewer people, and face a greater danger that they will be damaged. The chapel at Cornwallis is open seven days per week. As well, Shannon Park has a very small congregation, whereas the congregation at Cornwallis is as large if not larger.

All of the arguments used by the Chaplain General do not stand up. It is about time that we did the right thing and moved the stained glass windows back to where they belong in their historical and rightful home. I should like the minister from Nova Scotia to support us on this project.

**Senator Graham:** Honourable senators, I most certainly will bring those representations to the attention of the Minister of National Defence who, in turn, will discuss them with the Chaplain General.

My understanding is that, currently, the stained glass windows are in what would be termed an active naval chapel in Halifax at the largest naval base in the country. They serve as a reminder to the members of the Canadian Forces and their families who worship there of the sacrifices and traditions that they follow so proudly.

I was not aware that the chapel in Shannon Park is only open one day per week. Senator Comeau suggests that the chapel at Cornwallis is open seven days per week. My understanding is that it is now a museum. However, he suggests that it will be returned to its original status as a consecrated chapel.

The Chaplain General's position is that the memorials are living gifts that belong in a consecrated chapel, as I suggested earlier, and not relics to be put away in a so-called museum. The decision to keep the windows in Halifax was made by the Chaplain General. The Minister of National Defence supported the decision. I would be happy to bring these new revelations to the attention of my colleague.

## AGRICULTURE

### ECONOMIC CRISIS IN PRAIRIE PROVINCES—URGENT NEED FOR FARM RELIEF PROGRAM—GOVERNMENT POSITION

**Hon. Leonard J. Gustafson:** Honourable senators, I was asked at a farm rally in Regina, attended by 1,500 people, to ask the question I am about to ask of the Leader of the Government in the Senate. Farmers there voted to send a message to Ottawa stating that they are very upset that neither minister attended the rally to which they were invited. In fact, they went as far as asking them to resign.

The basis of this problem is the very serious agriculture situation facing the Prairies. It is more serious than the drought years. Income levels have fallen by some 70 per cent.

•(1450)

We heard horror stories from farmers who will not be able to survive. They are upset with the program and the way in which it

will be administered. They asked if I would take a request to the Senate, requesting that the government make an acreage payment in order to put some money into the pockets of farmers before seeding time.

I ask the Leader of the Government in the Senate if he would take my representation to cabinet. I am sure this is not the last time he will hear about this situation, but it is indeed serious.

**Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, I thank the Honourable Senator Gustafson for bringing this matter to our attention. We discussed this issue often and at great length during sittings in the Senate while the Minister of Agriculture was working very assiduously to set up the farm relief program that he had announced before the Christmas break. I wish to assure the honourable senator that both Minister Vancilief and Minister Goodale, who has certain responsibilities in this respect, both speak to their cabinet colleagues on a regular basis on this matter.

This matter is of concern to all Canadian citizens. We recognize that, in so many respects, the area of the country to which Senator Gustafson has referred is often called the breadbasket of the nation. We feel for our fellow Canadians, just as Canadians across the country feel for the plight of the coal miners in Cape Breton.

In any event, I assure my honourable friend that I shall bring those representations to the attention of my colleagues.

[Translation]

## ROYAL ASSENT

### NOTICE

**The Hon. the Speaker** informed the Senate that the following communication had been received:

### RIDEAU HALL

March 11, 1999

Mr. Speaker,

I have the honour to inform you that the Honourable J.E. Michel Bastarache, Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, in his capacity as Deputy Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber today, the 11th day of March, 1999, at 4:30 p.m., for the purpose of giving Royal Assent to certain bills.

Yours sincerely,

Judith A. Larocque  
*Secretary to the Governor General*

The Honourable  
The Speaker of the Senate  
Ottawa

[English]

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### PRIVILEGES, STANDING RULES AND ORDERS

#### CONSIDERATION OF NINTH REPORT OF COMMITTEE— DEBATE ADJOURNED

The Senate proceeded to consideration of the ninth report of the Standing Committee on Privileges, Standing Rules and Orders (independent Senators) presented in the Senate on March 10, 1999.—(*Honourable Senator Maheu*).

**The Hon. Shirley Maheu** moved the adoption of the report.

She said: Honourable senators, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to present the ninth report of the Standing Committee on Privileges, Standing Rules and Orders concerning independent senators.

[Translation]

This report is very important, since it will enable independent senators to become full-fledged members of Senate committees.

I am particularly pleased and proud to see this project finally come to fruition. Indeed, it is high time that independent senators reclaim their rights and resume active participation in the work of our committees. You must realize, honourable senators, that the road leading to that report was long and full of obstacles. Nevertheless, our firm resolve to see independent senators regain the place that is rightfully theirs helped us overcome these obstacles, which were often of a procedural nature, to finally produce this report.

[English]

The other reason I am so pleased with this report is that everyone in our chamber will benefit from the presence and the full participation of independent senators on our committees.

On the one hand, the independent senators will be much more interested in taking part in the work of the committees since their voices will be heard and they will have the right to vote. I am sure that they will be very enthusiastic and take an active part in the work of our committees. I am also sure that they will become dedicated members of the committees.

I strongly believe that we will all benefit from their presence. Their knowledge and wisdom will be of great help to all of us and should make our committees even more effective.

[Translation]

Honourable senators, I also want to take a few more minutes to answer the questions raised on March 9 by Senators Kinsella and Robertson, regarding the meeting times of the Standing Senate Committee on Privileges, Standing Rules and Orders.

Let me first remind you that Senator Kinsella's question concerned the regular meeting times of our committee. I emphasize the word "regular." I replied that the committee meets every Tuesday, after the Senate rises, which is true.

However, my reply seems to have generated a great deal of confusion among senators opposite. They seem to not understand that the March 9, 1999 meeting, and this is rather exceptional, was to be held after the adjournment of the Senate, but not before six o'clock. What is so hard to understand about this?

Nevertheless, in order to avoid confusion in the future, let me give a very concrete example: Had the Senate adjourned at 5:30 p.m., the meeting would have begun at six o'clock. However, if the Senate had adjourned at six o'clock, the meeting would have begun immediately after, while taking into account the time necessary to get from one location to the other.

I would remind Senator Kinsella that, had his question been clearer and had he asked me at what time the committee would be sitting on March 9, all this pointless debate could have been avoided.

I believe Senator Robertson's memory is failing her. She seems to have forgotten that the Standing Committee on Privileges, Standing Rules and Orders has already been boycotted by opposition members. That is why I will remind her that neither she nor her colleagues opposite were at the March 19, 1998 meeting. The absence of opposition members was therefore recorded in the meeting's minutes.

Furthermore, I have considerable difficulty understanding Senator Robertson's reaction. The senator is complaining that she received notice at around 3:45 p.m. that the meeting would be held when the Senate rose, but not before six o'clock, and that this left her little time. My question is: "Little time for what?"

The meeting had been planned for some time and the delay resulting from this slight change of schedule could therefore not have been more than a few minutes. How has this harmed her?

However, Senator Robertson had perhaps once again forgotten that a meeting of the Standing Committee on Privileges, Standing Rules and Orders was scheduled for March 9. In that case, I can understand her dismay on being reminded of the meeting.

It was perhaps that faulty memory of hers to blame again when she arrived over one hour late at the meeting of the Standing Committee on Privileges, Standing Rules and Orders on February 2, 1999.

I will conclude by mentioning that there was an astonishing comment from one senator during this debate. Instead of suggesting a constructive solution to the problem, he proposed that the meeting be cancelled outright. Talk about the path of least resistance!

Honourable senators, such behaviour could be detrimental to the Senate's reputation. It should no longer pass without comment, nor should it be tolerated.

[English]

• (1500)

Honourable senators, the committee has five points it wishes to bring to your attention in regard to independent senators being appointed full members on committees.

[Translation]

That independent senators present a request to the selection committee;

That the selection committee be authorized to appoint an independent senator to a committee, in which case it will appoint another non-independent senator to the committee, increasing the membership of the committee by two extra members;

That an independent senator cannot sit on more than two committees;

That only one independent senator be allowed on any given committee; and

That should he be unable to attend, the independent senator cannot have a substitute.

[English]

**Hon. Brenda M. Robertson:** Honourable senators, after those superfluous remarks, I move the adjournment of the debate.

**Hon. A. Raynell Andreychuk:** Honourable senators, for my clarification, as I deliberate on this resolution and the recommendations, could my honourable friend define the words “independent senator”?

**Senator Maheu:** Independent senators are senators appointed neither as Conservatives or members of the government side of the chamber.

**Senator Andreychuk:** I understand that under the Constitution we are all appointed as senators. I wondered, therefore, where and how the term “independent” was being used. Are these to be only senators who declare themselves to be independent after the fact, or are they independent in their thoughts, actions and behaviours?

**Senator Maheu:** It refers to senators appointed as independent senators. They accept the nomination and sit neither in the Conservative caucus nor in the Liberal caucus. They choose to remain designated as independent or named as independent senators.

**Hon. Marcel Prud'homme:** Honourable senators, my comment is directly addressed to the Honourable Senator Robertson through the Honourable Senator Maheu. I hope that we will not sink the aspirations of independent senators in a long and lengthy debate.

**Senator Maheu:** I do not anticipate anything happening to the aspirations of independent senators. I am quite sure both sides are anxious to see this situation resolved.

On motion of Senator Robertson, debate adjourned.

## THE BUDGET 1999

STATEMENT OF MINISTER OF FINANCE—INQUIRY—  
DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the inquiry of the Honourable Senator Lynch-Staunton calling the attention of the Senate to the Budget presented by the Minister of Finance in the House of Commons on February 16, 1999.—(*Honourable Senator Graham, P.C.*)

**Hon. Norman K. Atkins:** Honourable senators, as I rise today to take part in the budget debate, it will not surprise anyone in this chamber to find that some of my remarks are critical of the recent budget. However, it would not be responsible for me just to criticize. I believe that as an opposition, especially an opposition in Parliament dedicated to maintaining a united Canada and representing Canadians from coast to coast, we must be constructive in our criticism. We must offer alternatives in addition to demonstrating where the government has gone wrong.

This afternoon, I will deal in general terms with the state of the Canadian economy, the economic problems as I see them, and then specifically with health care, education and Canada's armed forces, three areas which I believe were sadly neglected in this budget.

In his budget speech of February 16, the Minister of Finance made one statement which exemplifies to me what budgets are all about. He said:

It is an inescapable fact of life that a budget always brings its own special vocabulary. We talk in the language of rates and ratios, of percentages and decimals, of accounting methods and measures.

What all of this obscures is what budgets should be about. It is to make the lives of Canadian better. It is to improve their standard of living.

Above all, it is to put Canada on a sound financial footing.

On this later point, I find agreement with the minister. Budgets should be about providing the economic means for Canadians to improve their standard of living, while managing the country's fiscal responsibilities properly. Unfortunately, this budget does not accomplish the noble goal set by the Minister of Finance. In fact, few Canadians are better off today than they were before budget day.

However, that is a problem with a budget developed by a government which has no economic plan; a government which shows no leadership on the economy, or anywhere else for that matter; a government which we, here in this Senate, know only too well has no legislative agenda; a government which has passed on to the provinces many financial burdens, and they have in turn passed on the additional burdens to the municipalities; a government that is, up to now, devoid of vision as we enter the next century; a government whose only answer to the economic crisis of a collapsing dollar and collapsing stock market last summer was to proclaim they had the fundamentals right, and to go on to say that a falling dollar and low export prices were really good for the economy.

Well, if that is correct, as Scott Brison, Nova Scotia's Progressive Conservative member for Kings—Hants, exclaimed:

...the logical corollary of this argument would be that if we reduce the dollar to zero by high taxes and productivity, inhibiting prices ultimately, we would become the greatest exporting nation in the world.

Honourable senators, we cannot devalue our way to prosperity. We also cannot reach prosperity by indiscriminate spending cuts coupled with steadily increasing taxes.

The federal transfers to the provinces have been reduced by over \$6 billion since 1995. In 1993, federal tax revenues were \$114 billion; now they total \$151 billion. These increased taxes have not been directed to new or better programs or services. Instead, services have been reduced or eliminated or made subject to user fees.

•(1510)

Canadians at all wage levels have been paying more and getting less. Let me take a few moments to relate the problems of our economy and how they affect the social policies which are so necessary in Canada. We cannot forget that economic activity is not an end in itself. It is a means to an end. It provides the means of ensuring opportunity for Canadians to help create and expand the country's wealth and to share in that wealth. It is through economic generation that we can achieve the other goals we set for our society.

Senator Lynch-Staunton, in his speech on Tuesday, listed the differences between the situation inherited by the Mulroney government in 1984 and that inherited by the present government in 1993. Of course, because it was not public at the time when he spoke, he did not mention the downgrading of the big banks' credit rating announced by the Dominion Bond Rating Service on March 9, 1999. Why did this occur? Because of another political decision made by this government similar to its political decisions to cancel the Pearson airport contracts and the purchase of helicopters, decisions made for short-term political expediency without any thought to the long-term effect on the people of Canada.

Despite some growth in economic activity, and particularly employment growth among full-time workers in the

manufacturing industries, the unemployment rate still hovers over 8 per cent and, in many parts of Canada, well over 10 per cent. While there has been strong growth in exports, domestic demand has been sluggish. A close examination of our export growth reveals that it has largely occurred because of currency devaluation and relatively low growth in wages.

We are failing to attract foreign investment into our economy. In 1985, Canada's share of foreign direct investment was 8.9 per cent of the world total. By 1995, this share had declined to 4.4 per cent. A \$1-billion increase in foreign direct investment is estimated to create approximately 45,000 new full-time job opportunities and generate approximately \$4.5 billion in gross domestic product in a five-year period. The main flaw in our economic situation today, though, is the very lacklustre performance of our productivity in absolute and relative terms.

Since 1973, productivity growth in Canada has averaged a mere 0.3 per cent per year. At this rate, our standard of living will take 231 years to double. Compare this with productivity growth from 1960 to 1973 of some 2 per cent per year, allowing Canadians' standard of living to double in only 35 years.

The Organization of Economic Co-operation and Development, the OECD, in its recent economic survey of Canada, puts it another way:

Compared with the major and fast growing, smaller OECD countries, —

— such countries as France, Australia, Ireland and Norway —

— Canada has not kept pace on several accounts over the 1990s: total factor productivity has not been increased and instead has declined, an experience which is shared with virtually no other OECD country that we should compare ourselves with.

This lack of productivity advancement, if ongoing — so says the OECD — could lead to a substantial decline in Canada's per capita income relative to the OECD average. We cannot allow this to occur. Decreasing productivity means decreasing standard of living and means that the issues Canadians care about most — financial security, health care, education, and the future of our social programs — will be placed in jeopardy.

To tackle this serious problem facing our economy, the government must establish targets for national productivity improvement in the context of a growing economy.

How can we become more productive? The OECD has suggested the adoption of policies and incentives which promote capital accumulation, technical innovation and adoption and higher levels of research and development, all of which are less apparent here than in better performing economies.

Canada has a large number of small and medium-sized enterprises which are less internationally oriented, less innovative and, as a result, less productive than their counterparts in other countries. Policies must be directed at these problems.

Canadian business must embrace the use of up-to-date technology, including computers in the factories and in the offices. We must take the advice of the OECD and invest more in research and development and ensure that the products resulting from research and development are used in Canada. We must also become more innovative in how we think and problem-solve so that we create new products which help Canada compete in a global economy.

Government can encourage this through the use of the income tax system and the creative use of tax credits to aid businesses to adapt to new technologies. The same can be done to encourage research and development, but it would have to be research and development leading to products and processes which can be used in Canada, targeted to stimulate productivity.

Encouragement for the introduction and application of the new technologies by Canadian small and medium-sized businesses through tax credits is particularly important for those businesses with export potential. This will help them add value to products before they leave Canada, which means more manufacturing jobs for Canadians and increased productivity. Canadians must be encouraged to invest in Canada and, therefore, in their own future. The rate of domestic investment has fallen well below that of other industrial economies. Canada must also recoup its position as a desirable destination for foreign investors.

Fiscal responsibility also must address the national debt. We must set and follow a comprehensive program for debt reduction with clear and achievable targets. These targets must be worked out with care. Perhaps it would not be unreasonable to aim for a debt-to-GDP ratio that was equal to the average of the economic summit nations, the G-8, over a period of, say, five years and not two years as suggested by the government in this budget.

Within that context, we must lighten the tax burden on Canadians. The surplus in the Employment Insurance Fund should be returned to the employers and employees in the form of reduced contributions. I agree with the actuary of the fund that a premium rate of \$2 per \$100 of insurable earnings is appropriate. The tax income bracket should be fully indexed. It is ridiculous for a person with income of \$7,000 to be paying income tax. The basic personal exemption should be increased, in my view, to \$10,000. Both of these measures would help low-income Canadians.

The measures presented in this budget are an insult both to Canadians living on welfare and to that growing group of Canadians, the working poor. To attempt to take credit for mentioning the problem of homelessness in the budget while doing nothing about it is disingenuous at best on the part of the government. To announce increases to a home renovation program as a remedy to homelessness illustrates how much this government has lost touch with the people of Canada. These people are homeless because they do not have homes. They do not have homes to renovate.

As Senator Cohen pointed out yesterday, poverty and homelessness have become real and urgent problems in Canada

which must be addressed now. That is why the leader of my party has announced the creation of a task force on poverty. One of the co-chairs is Senator Erminie Cohen, along with Diane St-Jacques, MP for the Quebec riding of Shefford. The other Senate member who will be on this task force is Senator Lavoie-Roux.

•(1520)

We all look forward to the work of this task force as it travels throughout Canada, meeting Canadians and working with Canadians to find out what the problems are so that we can arrive at solutions to these vitally important social issues, and recognizing that these issues are both a provincial as well as a federal problem.

I have outlined principles for increasing productivity, debt repayment and tax incentives, as well as tax relief, which should go a long way to reviving confidence in the long-term future of Canada's economy. These are measures that, if they had been addressed in the budget, would set us on a course whereby we could deal with the problems which beset us in both the health and education fields.

Let us look at health care for a moment. This was to be the health care budget. Yes, the government is putting money into health care. In reality, however, it is restoring only enough to bring health and education transfer payments back to 1996 funding levels, but only by the year 2004.

Again, the government does not seem to understand the issue that it is attempting to deal with and has resorted to the old Liberal maxim, "Problems can best be solved by throwing money at them." While this funding increase is obviously welcomed in the health care field, the government is ignoring the tough issues that must be faced and the tough decisions that must be made in relation to health care. A true sign of leadership is the ability to make tough decisions about important matters. This government continues to fail in the areas of leadership and vision.

Our present health care system started as a universal program to provide health care to all Canadians without reference to their ability to pay. It is now time for us, under the leadership of the federal government, to look again at health care and define what are required health care services under the Canada Health Act. What are those services to which the five principles of the Canada Health Act — that is, portability, universality, accessibility, public administration, comprehensiveness — should continue to apply?

While many contend that there is not enough money in the system, I believe we should look carefully at where the money is being spent. There are few, if any, spending controls, little accountability, and medical fees are based on procedures and recurring patient visits which only increase the cost of the system. A new covenant should be forged that redefines health care but guarantees its future accessibility for all Canadians.

In the examination of health care, those involved in its provision should look at how there can be a coordinated delivery of health care. For example, it is not enough to talk about increasing a commitment to home care on its own. It must be coordinated with the doctor, the hospital and the home care providers. Health care sources must be integrated. We must integrate federal-provincial resources, integrate provincial resources with community resources, and integrate our facilities at the local level. Our resources must not be working in isolation, one from the other.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable Senator Atkins, I regret to have to interrupt you, but your allotted time has elapsed. Are you requesting leave to continue?

**Senator Atkins:** Yes, Your Honour.

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

**Hon. Senators:** Agreed.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Please continue.

**Senator Atkins:** This budget presents a shot-gun approach to the health care problems without looking at health care as a whole. The system must be fixed as a whole, and not piecemeal as suggested by this budget.

This budget ignores the problems which have developed in the last few years in the area of education in Canada. There are three problems before us:

First, there are the high dropout rates. A 1991 study on school leavers has the total as high as 30 per cent of students who enter high school dropping out before completion. More recent figures put the average at 20 per cent. While this is still intolerably high, the dropout rate in our aboriginal community, or with other disadvantaged groups, is around 35 to 40 per cent.

Second, those students who remain in the system are not being adequately prepared for the workplace of the next century.

Third, because of the high cost of delivery of post-secondary education, the crisis of the accessibility to post high school education, which we thought we had resolved years ago, is back with us.

I should like to spend a few moments now addressing the problem of accessibility. With the introduction of Canada's Student Loans Program in the 1960s, we prided ourselves in having solved the accessibility problem for those wishing to attend universities. In many ways I believe we were deluding ourselves even then. The school experience of low income families, children with disabilities, and those from minority groups, even with the Canada Student Loans Act, differs from the experience of children from middle and high income families.

The issue of cost and high debt loads on students must be addressed, but addressed in the context of affordability for all students. Gone are the days of annual tuition of \$500 or less, as it was when I was in university. Summer jobs were more plentiful, and if you were lucky, you could cover tuition on your second

month's summer wages. Tuition is now over \$4,000 per year and there are books and living costs to be added. Some students are graduating with crippling debt loads. I admit there is no simple answer to this problem, but I do have one suggestion. Solving it will require imagination and, perhaps, a review of history.

At the end of the Second World War, Parliament enacted the Veterans Rehabilitation Act, 1945, under which funds were provided for veterans wishing to attend university under the University Training Program. Those veterans who indicated a desire to attend university had their tuition paid directly to the university by the Department of Veterans Affairs and were given a living allowance on a monthly basis. This continued as long as "satisfactory" progress was made in the university.

This was a massive investment by the government in the future of this country. But because of its success, Canada had a well-educated, taxpaying population contributing positively to society just a few years after the end of World War II. Veterans graduated with an education, or trade, virtually debt free. Such an investment in the future of Canada may be possible now as we turn the corner into an era of budgetary surpluses. I hope so, because we must make post-secondary education accessible to all who are academically qualified.

Again, these are the types of problems which require vision and imagination to deal with. What has this government done? It announced in last year's budget a millennium scholarship fund. This fund has yet to help one student, and when it does finally come into being, it will help only approximately 4 per cent of post-secondary students.

Finally, honourable senators, I want to deal with the shameful treatment of Canada's military in this budget. In 1994, the white paper on Canada's defence set forth a program for capital acquisitions, increases in military personnel and increases in Canada's reserve force. In the succeeding years, the government has completely ignored its own white paper. In this budget, only \$175 million is been given to our military to increase the quality of life of our armed forces personnel. Honourable senators, this is a cruel joke being played on the military by this government.

An all-party committee in the other place, after thoroughly studying the living conditions of our military, including their pay scales, determined that an additional \$700 million was necessary this year to implement its quality-of-life recommendations. We will again be faced with troop cuts — cuts which we can ill afford as we commit our military to missions throughout the world. What about developing a program for reserve units that really works?

•(1530)

There is also no mention of equipment in this budget. Our Sea King helicopters, as well as our Labradors, are experiencing more and more engine problems and structural fatigue as they age. There will be no replacements in the Sea King fleet in the next three years. Eventually, realistically, all our helicopters will be grounded. This will end our capability to do search and rescue and our ability to protect our coastal waters from the illegal intrusion of foreign vessels.

It is time we had a real debate in this country about the future of our military, a debate which would hold the government to account for lives lost and for equipment failures because of politically expedient promises made during the election campaign in 1993.

Honourable senators, I hope that in the debate which follows at least one senator will address the issue of the environment. This area is completely ignored in the budget. There are no incentives for business to move to adopt environmentally sound practices. Just as the government did no planning going into the Kyoto meetings last year, there is no sign of implementation of the Kyoto agreement by tax incentives in this budget. I hope that one of my colleagues, perhaps Senator Spivak, will take up the argument as we go further into the debate.

Honourable senators, as I said at the outset, I, not surprisingly, do not support this budget. It lacks vision and imagination. It shows no leadership in the economy or elsewhere. However, I believe I have set out some alternative ideas which the government may wish to consider should it decide to show true leadership on tough issues.

This is a government devoid of ideas and coherent policy for the future of this country. It is just not good enough to continue to govern on a modified agenda inherited from the previous government, even though Canadians seem to be willing to accept, for the moment, the status quo. Governments have an obligation, regardless of a lack of public pressure, to do the right thing for the country.

On motion of Senator Graham, debate adjourned.

### SOLICITOR GENERAL

#### COMMISSION OF INQUIRY INTO TREATMENT OF PROTESTORS AT APEC CONFERENCE BY RCMP—PROVISION OF FUNDS FOR DEFENCE OF STUDENTS—MOTION ADOPTED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Carney, P.C., seconded by the Honourable Senator Bolduc:

That the Senate supports the granting of funding for legal counsel to complainants at the APEC hearing in Vancouver before the RCMP Public Complaints Commission.—  
(Honourable Senator Pénin)

**Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, the government has announced that it will provide funding for legal counsel for the complainants at the APEC hearing. I should like to set out for you the government's decision and exactly what the funding arrangement provides.

On February 3 of this year, Commissioner Hughes of the RCMP Public Complaints Commission wrote to the Solicitor General recommending that the state fund legal counsel for the complainants at the hearing into events at the 1997 APEC Summit. Commissioner Hughes' recommendation was based on

fairness, the public interest, and the quality and efficiency of the hearing process. The government has carefully considered Mr. Hughes' recommendation.

On February 15, 1999, the government announced that it would provide funding for legal counsel to those complainants who were directly involved in confrontations with RCMP officers at the 1997 APEC Summit. In reaching the decision to provide funding, the government took into consideration the unique nature of the APEC hearing and Commissioner Hughes' view that legal representation for the complainants was essential to the conduct of a full and fair hearing.

I want to emphasize that the decision to fund the complainants was made in a fiscally responsible manner.

On February 23, 1999, the government announced the criteria for the funding arrangement. Those criteria are as follows: First, the government will provide funding for one team of up to three lawyers, including at least one junior lawyer, to represent all complainants who wish to be represented and who were directly involved in confrontations with the RCMP. Second, it is up to the complainants to select the team of lawyers.

Third, counsel representing the complainants will be paid in accordance with the Department of Justice fee scale for civil litigation, which ranges from \$60 to \$200 per hour for a maximum of 10 hours per day.

Fourth, funding to complainants' counsel will be limited to reasonable preparatory and hearing time spent to represent the complainants before Mr. Hughes.

Fifth, the government will pay for reasonable disbursements.

Sixth, fees and disbursements will be paid as of December 21, 1998, the date of Mr. Hughes' appointment.

Seventh, all bills will be taxed on behalf of the government by a third party, Mr. J.J. Camp, Q.C., of the law firm Camp, Church and Associates, and who is a former president of the Canadian Bar Association.

Commissioner Hughes endorsed this arrangement. On March 5 of this year when he provided rulings on a number of issues, including the issue of funding. He found that the government has substantially complied with his recommendation to the Solicitor General and he was not prepared to interfere with the decision made by the government.

Mr. Hughes made one further comment on the funding issue. It relates to the complainants' application to Federal Court. By this application, the complainants seek to challenge the government's claim of privilege over certain documents on the basis of national security and international relations. The complainants want state funding to bring this application in the Federal Court. Mr. Hughes suggested that complainants' counsel ask Mr. Camp, the third party responsible for administering the funding arrangement, whether the costs of the Federal Court application fall within the funding criteria. I understand that Mr. Camp has been approached for a decision and that the matter is currently under review.

I think we can all agree that the funding arrangement provided by the government is fair and reasonable. It allows the commission to conduct a fair and full hearing as it works toward a resolution of the issues before it. It is expected that the commission will ensure that both Canadians coming before it with complaints about the RCMP and members of the RCMP are given every opportunity to publicly set forth their positions and concerns.

In the 12 years since its creation, the Public Complaints Commission has distinguished itself by treating individuals appearing before it with respect and fairness, and we are confident that it will continue to do so.

Therefore, honourable senators, I have no hesitancy in supporting this motion because it accurately describes what the government has announced it will do.

**Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Acting Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Honourable senators, having spoken on the motion, I am not eligible to speak again, but perhaps the minister would accept a question for explication of his remarks.

**Senator Graham:** Certainly.

**Senator Kinsella:** Honourable senators, although in this town things are not totally subject to Aristotelian categories of reality, might honourable senators on both sides of this chamber reach, with some degree of confidence, the conclusion, or at least an inference, that our raising of questions on this matter helped in that determination?

•(1540)

**Senator Di Nino:** Absolutely.

**Senator Graham:** Absolutely.

**Senator Kinsella:** Honourable senators, as a student of these kinds of matters, one wishes to understand the principles upon which such decisions are taken. Would the honourable minister be able to explicate the specific difference between the request for such funding that was made by the chairman of the first panel, Mr. Morin, and the request that was made by Mr. Justice Hughes?

**Senator Graham:** When the Solicitor General responded to this question he referred to the correspondence that had been sent to him by Mr. Justice Hughes and he used the word, as I recall, "essential," that it was essential to the hearings, essential to the proceedings. I am quoting Justice Hughes and I do have copies of the correspondence for my honourable friend Senator Kinsella. With permission, I could table the correspondence between Mr. Hughes and the Solicitor General for the edification of all honourable senators.

**Senator Kinsella:** Thank you.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Is it agreeable, honourable senators, that this correspondence be tabled?

**Hon. Senators:** Agreed.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** If there are no other honourable senators who wish to speak, I will proceed with the motion.

It was moved by Senator Carney, seconded by Senator Bolduc:

That the Senate supports the granting of funding for legal counsel to complainants at the APEC hearing in Vancouver before the RCMP Public Complaints Commission.

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

**Hon. Senators:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

## MULTILATERAL AGREEMENT ON INVESTMENT

### INQUIRY—DEBATE CONCLUDED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the inquiry of the Honourable Senator Spivak calling the attention of the Senate to the differences between the proposed Multilateral Agreement on Investment and the NAFTA.—(*Honourable Senator Eytton*)

**Hon. J. Trevor Eytton:** Honourable senators, I rise today to continue debate on the motion of inquiry brought forth by my colleague Senator Spivak, concerning the Multilateral Agreement on Investment, commonly called the MAI. Senator Spivak raised a number of interesting points in her remarks. Her main concern was to the effect that the MAI is being sold as more or less a similar version of the NAFTA albeit on a larger scale, while in fact, as she points out, there are substantial differences.

On this occasion, I should like to try to put the entire MAI question into better perspective. It is important that we have a clear understanding of what the MAI is and what it is designed to accomplish. Much of what we have read in the newspapers, and hear elsewhere, is either biased or simply wrong. For that reason, it is often difficult to separate the wheat from the chaff, and some of the chaff is just silly. I read a news clipping recently, for example, that quoted a teacher from P.E.I. opining that the MAI spelled the doom of public education in Canada. Someone else called it another nail in the coffin of Confederation.

For the record, MAI negotiations began in the spring of 1995 and continued until just recently, when talks were suspended due to a lack of consensus over issues ranging from sovereignty in culture to the protection of labour rights and the environment. The negotiations had been limited to the 29 members of the OECD because it was felt that the 132-member World Trade Organization would be simply too large a forum in which to achieve any kind of consensus. It was decided a meeting of minds would be easier to attain among nations already highly committed to trade liberalization and protecting investments. In



any case, OECD countries are the source of more than 60 per cent of the total foreign direct investment, therefore, it was natural to begin with them. Logical thinking perhaps, however, it appears this particular process is not likely to succeed and, by default, the WTO shall be seized with the matter.

I shall now give a little background. At present there are some 1,600 bilateral agreements linking OECD nations. This includes Canada, which has agreements with 24 countries. The MAI would do away with all of this paper and replace it with one overarching agreement that would take into account the many different concerns that have arisen from the globalization of production. The MAI was designed to do for investment what the Uruguay Round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade did for goods and services — that is, to offer a comprehensive mechanism for dealing with a wide variety of interrelated issues.

Put another way, the MAI is an attempt to establish global rules for the movement of investment capital by creating a stable and fair international investment climate that will benefit all who take part, including particularly small and medium-sized businesses which lack the power to influence governments that otherwise may change their foreign investment rules or discriminate against foreign companies.

To this end, the MAI reflects three central elements. First, it lowers barriers to foreign investment. Second, it protects investors against discrimination and expropriation through two mechanisms; guaranteeing national treatment and guaranteeing the principle that countries agree to treat foreign investors no less favourably than they treat their own investors. The principle is that once a country has accorded a given treatment to a foreign investor or an investment, it cannot grant less favourable treatment to any other investor or investment. Lastly, it provides a binding dispute settlement process for settling problems.

From the beginning, the MAI was the target of ferocious opposition from a small band of economic nationalists and those opposed to free trade, who refuse and apparently always will refuse to admit free trade has been a boon to Canada in spite of overwhelming evidence to the contrary. These people claim the MAI will, amongst other things, make Canada unable to legislate in some areas, prevent us from setting our own standards, bring on increased unemployment, and result in the disappearance of our cultural sector. Clearly this is not so.

The MAI will not result in the sky falling in any more than NAFTA did. I am not saying there are no improvements or changes that can be made; however, we are a long way from the scenarios of apocalypse being painted by Maude Barlow and people of her ilk. Ms Barlow and her fellow travellers have tapped into a rich seam of anxiety, of fear of the unknown. They have made globalization a bad word here in Canada, despite the jobs it has created and the many measurable benefits it has had on the country and Canadian consumers.

Admittedly, the pace of change, including globalization, has been rapid over the past decade. The electronic and communications revolutions have changed completely the way we do business and how we see the world. Old ways and practices have fallen by the wayside. People are uncertain where it is all leading. They feel insecure and resistant to even more

change. Yet, this is just the point: The MAI will not result in major changes either here or elsewhere. That is because most of the rules in the agreement are already present in the myriad of bilateral agreements I referred to earlier.

As for Canada, in effect, we already have an MAI with our major trading partner, the United States, in the form of NAFTA. Therefore, there is no question of a major economic upheaval of the type forecast by critics. Contrary to what these people say, the MAI is not some sort of charter of rights for big business, nor is it a Trojan horse for foreign domination, nor does it imply a relaxation of corporate responsibility, and it will not undermine the ability of nations like Canada to regulate their domestic economies so long as they do not in the process discriminate against foreign investment.

The MAI is about protecting business people from indiscriminate government actions and it is about establishing an internationally recognized standard of market access and legal security for investors. Obviously, the MAI is not perfect. There are bound to be differences in the ways in which language is interpreted. However, I believe it is a good effort in the right direction that can, if ultimately enacted, be of great benefit for Canada in the long run. Globalization and trade liberalization are the trends of today and tomorrow. We must position ourselves to take advantage of these trends and avail ourselves of instruments such as the MAI, which will enhance our ability to compete in the new world.

This means we must invest. For example, last year Canadians invested over \$190 billion abroad. We need to encourage others to invest here. Foreign investment is crucial to our national well-being. It improves services, enhances competition and generates growth. It creates jobs. In fact, it creates one-tenth of all the jobs in this country.

•(1550)

Honourable senators, by all means, let us be part of a new and satisfactory MAI. In getting there, let us make constructive improvements to its terms that will benefit all Canadians, and not let it be said some particular group is seeking a particular advantage at the cost of a vast majority of Canadians.

**Hon. John B. Stewart:** Honourable senators, I have two or three questions I should like to address to Senator Eyton. Perhaps I should ask them seriatim.

The first question relates to foreign investment coming into Canada. Earlier this afternoon, Senator Atkins mentioned that foreign investment in Canada is not nearly as high as it ought to be. The report of the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs on Canada and Asia Pacific discovered some of the reasons why this is so, but I do not wish to attempt to remember the paragraphs in our report.

Given the present situation and given the low value of the Canadian dollar, what would the agreement which Senator Eyton supports do specifically to attract new investment in Canada? From what countries with which we do not now have national treatment agreements would those new investments come under the MAI?

**Senator Eyton:** Thank you for the question. I did say in my remarks that Canada already has agreements covering the general subject with 24 countries. Particularly, we have NAFTA which deals with those arrangements vis-à-vis the United States and Mexico. In terms of real impact here in Canada, it might be fairly small because so much trade and investment is now governed by the existing agreements. The MAI, however, amounted to a worldwide attempt to have consistent rules with which we could all live, which would be well understood by business, international business in particular, and which would give greater confidence in investing here.

I cannot give you the quantum in terms of the advantage. I am sure there is some, but perhaps it is quite minimal.

**Senator Stewart:** That, honourable senators, is the answer I had expected, and I thank the honourable senator for that answer.

My next question is perhaps under the heading of a rich seam of anxiety. Down in the part of Canada from which I come, I am not aware of the MAI having attracted any support in the fishing industry. Right now, the Department of Fisheries has a policy which allows individual transferable quotas. A fishing person or a company gets a quota. The danger that the fishers see is that if these are transferable, they will be accumulated by major companies such as National Sea Products or whatever its new name now is.

We then go on to a second concern, and this is where the MAI comes in, that those Canadian companies which have taken over from the small entrepreneurs in turn are, under the MAI, taken over by foreign investors, with the result that the people who now fish on relatively small boats become spectators. They are not even crew members on the boats. This is a real concern, not just a hypothetical one that I am conjuring up.

Has the senator had an opportunity to look at that specific problem?

**Senator Eyton:** Honourable senators, the easy answer to that is "no." It is hypothetical.

**Senator Stewart:** The future is always hypothetical.

**Senator Eyton:** The MAI does not say you cannot do it. You can do anything you want, as long as the rule is standard and applies to both your domestic Canadian business and to international business. For example, you could quantify it in terms of the size of fleet or the size of the boat or the kind of individuals that qualify for those kinds of licences. You can do it all, but you are simply not allowed to discriminate.

I think the honourable senator's concerns could be answered, but it is probably a little far out for me to try to respond. I am certainly not an expert in that area.

**Hon. Nicholas W. Taylor:** Perhaps the honourable senator would entertain another question. I am thinking particularly of the so-called banana war where the U.S., which does not produce bananas, is fighting with Europe, which also does not produce bananas, about where they should buy their bananas. Obviously the war is set in motion by U.S. capital heavily invested in

banana companies, not fisheries, in Central America. What happens if an investing country sabotages a particular banana market to protect its investment in another banana market? Would the MAI not open the doors for that to continue? Will we have little banana wars going on all over?

**Senator Eyton:** Honourable senators, all of us have weaknesses and examples where we are not perfectly fair in our dealings. I took some comfort from thinking that, at least here in Canada, we have no bananas today. It is not especially our concern. The fact is that the plea by the EU and the U.S. relative to bananas is that the WTO should rule. In fact, the U.S. has gone outside that body. They have ignored that process or procedure, and they are threatening to retaliate in other ways.

A country the size of Canada needs an international organization such as the WTO that can try to impose consistent rules internationally. That is not to say it will always work vis-à-vis our major trading partner, the U.S., or that they will always play by the rules, but then again, there are examples where we have not played by the rules either. I think it is an improvement. I do not say it is a perfect world, but it is an improvement.

**Senator Taylor:** Is the honourable senator recommending then that the MAI, although it appears to be the order of things to come, should follow better and stronger regulations set up by the WTO? In other words, would the MAI without a good WTO be dangerous?

**Senator Eyton:** Absolutely. I think an organization of that kind with solid rules is beneficial to Canada, and we should support it. The difficulty, and we encountered it ourselves in settling NAFTA, is the concern about impairing our ability to manage our own affairs. It is almost a constitutional concern. That is particularly felt by the U.S. Congress. There is a reluctance to be entirely bound, and there are exceptions where people can escape. In our case, we have the cultural exemption in NAFTA. We insisted on that because of the politics and the sense in Canada that that area should be exempted. However, the drive should be towards a WTO and towards dispute settlement mechanisms that work, and clear rules.

•(1600)

**The Hon. the Speaker:** If no other honourable senator wishes to speak, this inquiry shall be considered debated.

## ELECTION OF CANADA TO UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL

### INQUIRY—ORDER STANDS

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the inquiry of the Honourable Senator Roche calling the attention of the Senate to the election of Canada to the United Nations' Security Council for 1999-2000, and Canada's role in contributing to peace, global security and human rights in the world on the eve of the new millennium.—(*Honourable Senator Graham, P.C.*)

**Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, this is an important inquiry raised by the Honourable Senator Roche. I am not prepared to speak on it today as I wish to speak on another matter.

Given that Royal Assent is scheduled for 4:30 p.m. today, with the understanding that the bells will ring at 4:15 p.m., I should like to stand the inquiry and assure honourable senators that I will speak at the first opportunity.

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

**Hon. Senators:** Agreed.

Order stands.

## SECURITY IN EUROPE

INQUIRY—DEBATE ADJOURNED

**Hon. Jerahmiel S. Grafstein** rose pursuant to notice of March 9, 1999:

That he will draw the attention of the Senate to the Canada-Europe Parliamentary Association (OSCE) Delegation to the Standing Committee Meeting of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE PA), held in Vienna, Austria, from January 14 to 15, 1999 and the situation in Kosovo.

He said: Honourable senators, deep in the heart of old imperial Vienna sits the Hofburg Palace, former residence of the Habsburg Emperors. From this majestic edifice, Hitler, in 1938, celebrated the Anschluss between Germany and Austria with the citizens of Vienna. It was in a wing of this same palace that the OSCE convened the quarterly meeting of its standing committee on January 14 and 15, 1999. I was invited to attend in my capacity as a member of the extended bureau and as Vice-Chairman of the Economic Committee.

The report of that meeting, tabled earlier today, details the reports and the menu digested in Vienna. Vienna, once the eastern frontier of Europe, bestrides the fabled Danube River that is more than twice as long as any great river in Europe — over 1,700 miles — which flows through seven countries from the Black Forest of Germany deep in the centre of Europe, through Austria, then on to the Balkans and beyond to the Black Sea. Kosovo, that hotbed of current unrest, lies nearby and not too far south below the fabled Danube.

Reports at our meeting came from the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities and the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights describing 19 missions planned for 1999 in Eastern Europe, in 14 Eastern European states. The OSCE representative on Freedom of Media outlined problems confronting journalists in 40 European states. A report was heard from the Co-ordinator of Economic Environmental Activities, as well as from the Gender Advisor

respecting human rights violations against trafficking in women and children; along with one concerning women's electoral rights.

We then heard from the President of the Austrian Parliament and the Austrian Chancellor, who brought greetings. As well, the report on the Seminar on Conflict Resolution held in the Caucasus in Tbilisi, Georgia, on October 5 and 6, which I attended as one of the guest speakers, and which I reported to the Senate, was also tabled. Finally, preparations for a separate regional conference, the sub-regional Economic Co-operation Conference in Nantes, France, in October 1999, was received.

All in all, it was a busy and congested menu, highlighting dozens of OSCE initiatives, all with one central purpose — the development of civil, democratic structures in Europe. If there is one lesson we could learn in this century, it is that democracy is not a wild flower. A civil society does not grow without constant cross-pollination and constant nurturing care. A civil society works best when it works daily at every level of society.

However, honourable senators, while the scope of the activities of the OSCE committees on democratic development is widening, deepening and improving in sophistication and impact, at the core of the meeting was the smouldering resolution dealing with Kosovo. The debate centred on the use of force as a mechanism to bring that conflict to at least a peaceful stalemate in order to resolve much deeper problems.

The resolution, soft in contours, was settled mainly between the U.S. and Russian interlocutors. However, the news media skips lightly over a most significant development, a very dangerous experiment; that is, the transfer of democratic technology. Perhaps the news media prefers not to deal with complexity and, thus, cannot structure itself to do so except to broadcast history as vignettes and episodes in retrospect.

There is something about which the Canadian public should be aware. It is that there is something very different and very dangerous being tested in Kosovo. Over 2,000 citizen volunteers from North America and Europe, including parliamentarians, experts with a military or police background, lawyers specializing in human rights, many with experience in the field of election supervision, expertise in civil society, refugee and resettlement issues, and others, have been seconded by the OSCE participating states to the Kosovo Verification Mission, commonly referred to as the KVM.

Let me repeat, honourable senators, over 2,000 unarmed citizen volunteers, including parliamentarians, are in Kosovo or are preparing to go there.

The Kosovo Verification Mission is the largest, most complex and challenging non-military mission that the OSCE, or indeed any other international organization, has undertaken since the aftermath of World War II. The OSCE structure is light. Let us hope that its reach does not exceed its grasp. This challenge will test the OSCE as no other action. The KVM will verify the effectiveness of the former Republic of Yugoslavia's compliance with United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1260 and

1199. It will verify ceasefires, movement of troops, assistance for the return of refugees and displaced persons, supervise elections, assist in forming elected bodies of self-administration and democratizing police forces, thereby promoting human rights and democracy building. All of this is much easier said than done.

Another new task has been assigned today to the KVM. I quote from the press today, which states:

Madam Justice Louise Arbour of the Ontario Court of Appeal, Chief Prosecutor for the United Nations War Crimes Tribunal, said yesterday that she has asked international observers to help her piece together grisly events in Kosovo, including the alleged roundup of 100 ethnic Albanians recently by Serb police.

"We are looking to OSCE Verifiers to provide us with an account of their observations on all matters that may fall within our jurisdiction, historical or ongoing," Judge Arbour said in The Hague.

To go back to the context, the OSCE Permanent Council decided on October 15 last to deploy citizens from OSCE states toward this verification mission to measure factual compliance by all parties in Kosovo. The OSCE mission was endorsed by the UN Security Council on October 24 and was established by the OSCE Permanent Council by Decision 263 on October 25.

The UN resolution called for the creation of a mission numbering about 2,000 unarmed expert verifiers from OSCE participating states. Their prime mandate, as I outlined, is simple, yet complex. It is to verify compliance of all parties in Kosovo with UN Security Council resolutions. These resolutions call for ceasefire, withdrawal of security units, restrictions against civilian repression, safe return of refugees and displaced persons, the commencement of meaningful dialogue about political solutions and the current crisis, and ultimately, to supervise elections in Kosovo to ensure their openness and fairness in accordance with regulations and procedures, all the while assisting in the establishment of democratic institutions and appropriately trained police forces.

Wins and losses, progress, as well as non-compliance, are to be reported regularly to the OSCE Permanent Council, the UN Security Council and other international organizations. The mandate is for one year only, with extensions upon request of the chairman. This is different in scope and magnitude than any similar unarmed non-military peace mission undertaken in recent times. By comparison, the Bosnia mission consisted of only 250 members when a structured settlement was in place.

Honourable senators, read the papers. For Kosovo, as of today, no such settlement is in sight.

Deployment of people began late in October 1998. Of concern, obviously, was the safety and security of these OSCE appointed, unarmed personnel. After much pressure, an agreement was signed with the former Republic of Yugoslavia's authorities and

the OSCE states that the former Republic of Yugoslavia would guarantee the safety and security of the KVM and all its members. The agreement states that it is up to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to guarantee the safety of these members. In the event of an emergency, extraction action may be needed to ensure the safety of KVM volunteers, including Canadians. To that end, NATO established a 1,600-man extraction force, based on the borders of Kosovo in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. The dangers are real, present and apparent. As I said, the mandate of the verification mission is detailed, ranging from travel arrangements to transportation and communications, transborder issues and resettlement problems.

Unfortunately, in January, several verifiers were wounded by sporadic gunfire, yet the mission continues unabated. Last week, reports were received that other verifiers were beaten and expelled from one area. Yet, as of February 5, 1999, 1,125 verifiers have been identified and have been deployed or are in the process of being deployed in Kosovo. The mission continues to expand, until it reaches its goal of about 2,000 people. Of the 1,125 assigned, Canada has contributed 131 experts. It is my understanding that this could be expanded to include an additional 45. Included in the Canadian personnel are police, communications and legal specialists.

•(1610)

Honourable senators, this is a highly dangerous experiment, yet a significant step in fulfilling the gap between resolutions in the air at the UN and observation on the ground of flagrant human rights and breaches of international standards. I have a nagging concern that Canadian citizens, non-military and unarmed personnel, have been sent without a clear political settlement, an umbrella of security or a careful parliamentary review of these issues. It is interesting to note that today, in the American Congress, they intend to have a debate and a vote as to whether to endorse U.S. military peacekeepers in Kosovo.

Meanwhile, the struggle in Kosovo, from a political standpoint, remains a hot and explosive issue. Contesting representatives met outside of Paris, at Rambouillet, to craft an agreement, led by a ministerial contact group including six countries in all. Today we are told that Ambassador Holbrooke's, the American special envoy, efforts have been fruitless in bringing the Serbs and various Albanian factions back to the table. The OSCE states, led by the United States and Britain, have deployed NATO forces with a view to providing maximum pressure, particularly on Serbian authorities to redress issues in Kosovo. As honourable senators know, Kosovo is 10 per cent Serbian descent, 90 per cent Albanian descent. Kosovo, however, is the mythic heartland of so-called "Greater Serbia." The basic issue remains the relationship between the Albanian majority and the Serbian minority within the boundaries of Kosovo and the role of Kosovo as a part of the Serb-dominated Yugoslav federation or as an independent state. Meanwhile, amidst the hiatus of political discussions in France, reports are received that Serb-led forces continue to ethnically cleanse small Albanian villages one at a time.

This verification mission is little known and little understood. The media has focussed on the military threats by NATO, led by the U.S. and Britain, to evoke Serbian compliance to a peaceful and equitable settlement. In reading the press or watching the media, as I said, little or no attention is given to this massive, non-military, unarmed, international intervention that deals in part with the root problems provoked by the civil war in the former Republic of Yugoslavia.

Honourable senators, the Balkans question erupted in 1903 with the regicide of King Alexander of Serbia, in Belgrade. The word "Balkans" comes from the Turkish word for mountains. More over, the word "Balkans" has become a miserable metaphor for the 20th Century. To Balkanize means to boil away problems to their sizzling, volatile and simple essence. The smaller the groups, the tinier the geography, the higher the intensity of dispute. It is interesting to note that this century of state-supported terrorism started in Italy with state-supported camps to train terrorists destined to undermine governments in the Balkans for regional dominance. Therefore, we end this century with the same root problems unresolved, and if anything, worse.

At the conclusion of this inquiry, I hope to delineate the root causes of the obscene acts of ethnic cleansing which have so transfigured peace in this hotbed region in the south-eastern, neglected corner of Europe. Since the collapse of the Soviet Empire, the Balkan question has re-emerged as a central, unresolved and political murky morass. Honourable senators will not be surprised to discover that actions external to the former Republic of Yugoslavia, inaction by western democratic states, knowing or at least negligent, collaborationists, in this final debacle in the last decade of this century shall forever be known as the killing century.

I welcome other senators who wish to participate in this inquiry. This is the second opportunity the Senate has had to debate Kosovo. I note the thoughtful speech by Senator Forrestall, who focussed on the danger to Canadian troops to be deployed in Kosovo. I agree this is a volatile and dangerous situation. However, honourable senators, Canadian verifiers are also in harm's way and could become pawns in any fast outbreak of violence evoked by imminent NATO action.

The unravelling of the former Federal Republic of Yugoslavia that led to both Croatian and Serbian genocide in Bosnia and the equally horrendous acts of inhumanity by citizens of Serbian and Albanian extraction in Kosovo is a sad tale looking for a lesson.

The fault lies in part with the popular fiction that the people of the Balkans can never reach the standards of a civil society, that they can never achieve any peaceful pluralism. Honourable senators are likely aware that the warring factions in the former Yugoslavia come from the same Slavic ethnic groups. They speak the same language, they share similar names with perhaps one minor exception, with some religious differences.

As a result of acts of omission and commission instigated by exaggerated claims of history, zealous churchmen and avaricious and ambitious politicians all abetted by those states who held similar ambitions for mean, low political goals beyond the borders of the former Yugoslavia have contributed to present violent impasse.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable Senator Grafstein, I regret to interrupt you, however, the 15-minute speaking period has expired.

**Senator Grafstein:** Your Honour, I seek leave to continue.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable senators, is leave granted?

**Hon. Senators:** Agreed.

**Senator Grafstein:** Honourable senators, let me conclude with this note: All parties have drawn from the toolbox of frantic nationalism. Let me list a decalogue of these miserable tools that uncovers the pathology of nationalist extremism. These tools are always the same: first, false, mythic origins and exaggerated history; second, a transference to others as an excuse for all ills; third, economic deprivation and paralysis invoked by either inflated military budgets or sovereignty policies; fourth, distorted claims of humiliation always caused by others; fifth, worship of minor differences; sixth, fomenting false fears and feelings of insecurity against others; seventh, marginalization of moderates; eighth, a one-eyed media; ninth, bloated claims of sovereignty; tenth, preaching notions of religious superiority that define others as inferior or, worse, polluters of the pure faith and pure life.

Without an autopsy of this entrenched Balkan mindset, we cannot arrive at good questions, let alone answers.

I hope other senators will participate in this inquiry and Senator Forrestall's inquiry so that, together, the Senate can address this growing wound in the side of the democratic idea.

**Hon. Eymard G. Corbin:** Honourable senators, I wonder if Senator Grafstein would entertain a question. I do not believe he told us how many Canadians are participating in the KVM. Could he tell us if they are indeed participating of their own free will or were they seconded from other duties?

•(1620)

**Senator Grafstein:** Honourable senators, it is my understanding that there are 131 Canadians presently deployed or in the process of being deployed in Kosovo. An additional 45 have been promised. It is my understanding that all of these are volunteers. They have full knowledge of the danger and are going to Kosovo as citizen volunteers. Many of them are military police personnel, lawyers, social workers and others. All of them are volunteers.

On motion of Senator Roche, debate adjourned.

## FOREIGN AFFAIRS

REFORMS TO INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND—COMMITTEE  
AUTHORIZED TO STUDY—NOTICE OF MOTION AMENDED

On the Order:

That the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs be authorized to examine and report on possible reforms to the International Monetary fund, especially in its economic and financial surveillance activity and its lending practices, and on other international financial and trade developments;

That the committee have power to engage the services of such counsel and technical, clerical and other personnel as may be necessary for the purpose of its examination and consideration of the said order of reference;

That the committee have power to adjourn from place to place inside and outside Canada; and

That the committee submit its final report no later than March 31, 2000 and that the committee retain all powers necessary to publicize the findings of the committee contained in the final report until April 22, 2000.

**Hon. John B. Stewart:** Honourable senators, I am told that this motion must be amended by the deletion of paragraphs two and three. I understand that the Speaker has authority from the Senate to make that correction in the draft motion. With the deletion of those two paragraphs, I move the motion standing in my name.

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

That the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs be authorized to examine and report on possible reforms to the International Monetary Fund, especially in its economic and financial surveillance activity and its lending practices, and on other international financial and trade developments; and

That the committee submit its final report no later than March 31, 2000 and that the committee retain all powers necessary to publicize the findings of the committee contained in the final report until April 22, 2000.

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

**Hon. Senators:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

## CANADA AND THE NUCLEAR CHALLENGE

MOTION TO ENDORSE REPORT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS  
AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMITTEE—  
POINT OF ORDER—DEBATE SUSPENDED

**Hon. Douglas Roche,** pursuant to notice of March 3, 1999, moved:

That, whereas the proliferation of nuclear weapons poses a real and ongoing threat to global security, and recognizing the strong conclusions of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade in their study, "Canada and the Nuclear Challenge," the Senate of Canada fully supports the disarmament and non-proliferation objectives of the Report, and urges the Government of Canada to carefully consider its recommendations when preparing its response.

## POINT OF ORDER

**Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Acting Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Honourable senators, I rise on a point of order. While not opposing the principle contained in this motion, it may be helpful for honourable senators to receive some clarification and direction from His Honour. As I read the motion, it seems to rest on a report of the other place. To my knowledge, no message has been received by the Senate from the other place. That is my first concern.

Honourable senators, the theme that runs through the rules of this place is to maintain a very clear distinction in our bicameral Parliament between the other place and this place. For example, in the Senate, senators may not read speeches from the Hansard of the other place. That seems to be the principle. I am not sure whether that principle applies also to reports. They may be very good reports, but that is not the point. The point is that we are a separate house. I think we need some clarification on this matter.

Odgers' *Australian Senate Practice*, which speaks to the practice of their bicameral system, points out that:

In a bicameral system the conduct of relations between the two houses of the legislature are of considerable significance...

I do not raise this point of order because I have any difficulty with the principle underlying the motion. However, I do raise, as a serious question, the importance of the separation of the two houses. As Odgers says, it is, indeed, of considerable significance.

If the essence of this motion speaks to a report from the other place, we must determine whether that report finds its way here by way of a message. Is there a special transmission, or do we merely go to the library? It is not that it is a report of the other place. It is like another piece of literature. If that is the case, then I have no procedural difficulty.

In Erskine May's *Parliamentary Practice*, twenty-second edition, page 610, under the section entitled "Communications Between the Lords and the Commons," the author draws our attention again to the fact that:

The two Houses of Parliament have frequent occasion to communicate with each other, not only in regard to bills which require the assent of both Houses, but with reference to other matters connected with the proceedings of Parliament.

Clearly, a report such as a report that the honourable senator is building his motion upon is a proceeding of that other place, but how does it get from there to here? The models of communication traditionally are by message. We have all had some experience with joint committees, but in a joint committee report, we are party to that report. I am not clear on how the opposite house deals with such a report and its findings. I would invite other honourable senators who might have thought of this to perhaps comment. If the matter is deemed by honourable senators not to be of significance — although the literature suggests it is — I have no difficulty with the motion. However, I do wish some thought and reflection be given to that point.

**Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Deputy Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, we are dealing with two issues in this particular motion by Senator Roche. One is the concept, as Senator Kinsella has placed before us, of whether this chamber should be dealing with a report of the other place that we have not studied. The Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, which would normally be the producer of such a report, has not taken under advisement the study of this issue. Then we have the issue of the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the threat to global strategy that has been raised by Senator Roche.

Obviously His Honour must rule as to whether this particular motion is in order. Perhaps if we could hear from Senator Roche, he may be prepared to come back to the chamber the next time we sit with an amended motion removing the references to the House. Then we could deal with it. That, of course, would be up to Senator Roche.

**Hon. Douglas Roche:** Honourable senators, I wish to thank Senator Kinsella and Senator Carstairs for their comments. It goes without saying that my first desire is to follow the *Rules of the Senate* to the letter. In perhaps innocence, I gave notice of the motion a week ago and noted that I had drawn the attention —

•(1630)

**The Hon. the Speaker:** I regret that I must interrupt the honourable senator. It is now 4:30 p.m. I am prepared to say now that I will take the matter under advisement and check further if that is satisfactory.

**Hon. Eymard G. Corbin:** I wish to contribute to the point of order at some point.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** I am sorry but the Speaker has the right to decide when he has heard enough on a point of order. For the expedition of our work, unless Senator Corbin insists, I would prefer to proceed and report back.

**Senator Corbin:** Are you suspending the sitting?

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Yes.

**Senator Corbin:** That is fine with me but we can continue with this afterwards.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** The Senate will now adjourn during pleasure to await the arrival of His Excellency.

The Senate adjourned during pleasure.

[Translation]

## ROYAL ASSENT

The Honourable J.E. Michel Bastarache, Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, in his capacity as Deputy Governor General, having come and being seated at the foot of the Throne, and the House of Commons having been summoned, and being come with their Deputy Speaker, the Right Honourable the Deputy Governor General was pleased to give the Royal Assent to the following bills:

An Act to amend the Insurance Companies Act  
(*Bill C-59, Chapter 1, 1999*)

An Act to amend the Competition Act and to make consequential and related amendments to other Acts  
(*Bill C-20, Chapter 2, 1999*)

An Act to amend the Nunavut Act with respect to the Nunavut Court of Justice and to amend other Acts in consequence (*Bill C-57, Chapter 3, 1999*)

An Act to amend the Royal Canadian Mint Act and the Currency Act (*Bill C-41, Chapter 4, 1999*)

An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act and the Corrections and Conditional Release Act (*Bill C-51, Chapter 5, 1999*)

An Act to change the name of the electoral district of Argenteuil—Papineau (*Bill C-465, Chapter 6, 1999*)

An Act to change the name of the electoral district of Stormont—Dundas (*Bill C-445, Chapter 7, 1999*)

An Act to change the name of the electoral district of Sackville—Eastern Shore (*Bill C-464, Chapter 8, 1999*)

The House of Commons withdrew.

The Right Honourable the Deputy Governor General was pleased to retire.

[English]

•(1650)

The sitting of the Senate was resumed.

## CANADA AND THE NUCLEAR CHALLENGE

MOTION TO ENDORSE REPORT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS  
AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMITTEE—POINT OF ORDER—  
SPEAKER'S RULING RESERVED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Douglas Roche, seconded by the Honourable Senator Keon: That, whereas the proliferation of nuclear weapons poses a real and ongoing threat to global security, and recognizing the strong conclusions of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade in their study, "Canada and the Nuclear Challenge," the Senate of Canada fully supports the disarmament and non-proliferation objectives of the Report, and urges the Government of Canada to carefully consider its recommendations when preparing its response.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable senators, when we rose we were on the point of order raised by the Honourable Senator Kinsella and Honourable Senator Corbin had the floor.

**Hon. Eymard G. Corbin:** Honourable senators, I want to say at the outset that I certainly have no quarrel with the objective of Senator Roche. That is not the problem. I find myself in some considerable agreement with my New Brunswick colleague Senator Kinsella on this one.

The fact is that a committee of this house has not had the opportunity to examine in detail the preliminaries which led a committee of the House of Commons to attain certain conclusions. It is true that, earlier this week, in our own Foreign Affairs Committee, chaired by Senator Stewart, we did have a cursory and general briefing by a researcher of the other place on what took place in that committee prior to our meeting yesterday with the delegation from the United States of America. However, I personally am far from satisfied that we have had a reasonable and ample opportunity to go into the depth of this matter.

Honourable senators, it may be superfluous to say that no one is against fatherhood or motherhood and everyone is against nuclear arms in this country. I am quite sure that is so, except for maybe some oddball. That is not really the question at hand. The question is the relationship between the two Houses. There are ways of doing things.

The House of Commons decided not to invite the Senate to join with them on a joint committee for this exercise, as they have in the past on matters of joint national and international interest. I have yet to understand why, in this instance, we were not invited. Perhaps informally there was an invitation. I am not

aware of it. Nevertheless, this is a matter of such grave consequence that this house and its members are entitled to do their own work, their own research.

We exist for a reason. It is not for nothing that we often amend legislation which comes from the other place. An analogy can be made of the matter Senator Roche has brought before the house. I have a problem with the wording of his motion. He should have indicated that the report of the committee in question was a report of a committee of the House of Commons. I told him that privately and I think the motion ought to be amended in that respect so that everyone knows the source of the information. Then again I recognize his absolute right to bring before this house a matter by way of inquiry, formal motion or otherwise. This is a place of discussion, a place of debate.

Leaving that aside for one moment, the motion deals with a matter which occurred in the other place. There are means of dealing with matters or invitations coming out of the other place. In light of what is happening these days, in light of the beating the Senate is getting from members of the other place, in the media, and in public opinion, we ought to do everything to prevent the erosion of our independence in this house. If we are to do something, we ought to do it in an orderly, traditional way of proceeding.

Again, I insist this takes nothing away from Senator Roche's initiative. Perhaps I may suggest a way out. Rather than requesting that the Senate come to a conclusion at this time, I suggest that Senator Roche amend his motion to refer the subject-matter to the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs. That committee could then report to the house their opinion as to whether that committee should launch its own in-depth examination of the question. We could then take a very informed and intelligent position and make a rational decision on the proposal put before us by Senator Roche. That is the only point I wanted to make today.

**Hon. John B. Stewart:** Honourable senators, we have been talking procedure, on the one hand, and we have been talking about substance, on the other hand. It seems to me that the point of order relates to procedure. I do not know any rule or precedent which says that the Senate cannot take cognizance of any public document, even a document coming from the other place. What debars us from so doing? Perhaps there are precedents, but I do not remember them.

•(1700)

This is not a bill for which there is a legislative process. Let us say it was an article in a newspaper. We could take cognizance of that and proceed to do work on that basis. I do not see why we cannot do the same with a report from the House of Commons.

Going beyond that, if the Senate were to decide to allow Senator Roche's motion, then we could make all sorts of comments about the members of the Senate being very busy now, particularly the Foreign Affairs Committee. If you look at the preceding two motions from the Foreign Affairs Committee, they anticipate a busy time for that committee. That is a substantive point.



The procedural point is whether we can take cognizance of this report of the other place. To my knowledge, there is no good reason why we cannot.

**Hon. Douglas Roche:** Honourable senators, I am encouraged by the comments of Senators Kinsella, Carstairs, Corbin and Stewart. I repeat that I am most willing — and, that should go without saying — to follow the *Rules of the Senate*.

I gave notice of this motion a week ago, in good faith — and, as I said before, perhaps in innocence — that it would be in order. Since then, I have not received any communication from anyone that would indicate otherwise.

I am concerned that we are now getting into a procedural debate about the efficacy of our dealing with a House report. I am much less concerned about that than I am in respectfully drawing to the attention of the Senate the principles underlying the motion and having the Senate express its views. If I receive advice on this matter — that is, if that is the judgment that is offered to me — I would be happy to amend this motion and to remove the reference to the House. I will take it right off the Order Paper.

With respect to Senator Stewart's comment following Senator Corbin, I, too, feel that the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs has a heavy plate. As Senator Stewart has just reminded us, it is proceeding with two new mandates. I would be reluctant to impose on the Senate's Foreign Affairs Committee a whole study on this subject. I thought that the information that is in the House of Commons study was of such quality — after all, it took them two years to do it — that honourable senators could draw from it to inform themselves. That is why, when I gave notice of the motion a week ago, I drew the attention of the Senate to the existence of that report on December 10, 1998, the day the House report was tabled. I did that under Senators' Statements in this chamber. The three months that has elapsed since that time would have provided honourable senators sufficient time to decide whether they agreed or did not agree with it.

I do not want to impose my views on anyone. I just hope that we can have the Senate come to a determination on the matter at hand, namely, the essential recommendation that was made dealing with the NATO review. There is some urgency in my mind, and I am not disposed to ask the Senate to go down a long road because the NATO summit on April 15, a well-publicized summit, will deal with the request that there be a review of NATO's nuclear weapons policies.

The Government of Canada is seized of this issue. In a few days, cabinet will receive a submission that will give it an opportunity to make a formal government policy, based on the information that was contained in the House report that is summarized in 15 recommendations. Thus, "for the Senate to be effective," in the words of Senator Corbin — and, I certainly agree with what he said about the need to establish the effectiveness of the Senate — I thought it would be helpful if, in the cabinet's deliberations on what they will say in a formal

statement on Canada's policies on nuclear weapons, they could take into consideration the views of the Senate of Canada, as expressed by this motion.

Honourable senators, I am in a dilemma, which I will express this way. I will instantly follow your ruling. If you rule that my motion is in order, I will get up and speak on it. If you indicate that it will give you a problem, then, if you will allow me, I will offer an amendment. However, I do not have the wording of that amendment written down. I should like to negotiate that amendment with the leaders on both sides of the aisle. If you so indicate, I will return with an amended motion that will then stand a reasonable chance of passage in the Senate. I should like to take that action at the earliest opportunity that would be reasonable for everyone concerned.

**Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Acting Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Honourable senators, this is the first occasion to raise in this chamber any concerns that we have with the motion that is before us, namely, when the motion is brought forward for acceptance and discussion in this chamber.

I concur with Senator Corbin that it speaks to a serious issue of our bicameral system. The words used in the motion do not suggest that we simply take cognizance because the motion reads, in part, "recognizing the strong conclusions of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs," which we all understand is the House of Commons standing committee. In the next paragraph, the active verb is that we "support" this report. If adopted, it would be a motion of the Senate that we support fully the objectives of the report. These are the words contained in the motion.

There is a third action that is contained within the motion, namely, that, by a decision of the Senate, we would urge the government to consider the recommendations of that report.

The particular report is germane to the motion here, and it is quite close to a bill coming by way of a message to this house. It is not like another piece of literature in the library that we simply take cognizance of by the words that are in the motion before us. I wish to underscore that.

**Hon. Jeremiah S. Grafstein:** Honourable senators, I read briefly and quickly the report of the other standing committee. I did that as a result of a briefing session that Senator Roche convoked with the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs to brief us for the meeting with former U.S. defence secretary Robert McNamara, former general Lee Butler, Ambassador Graham and others yesterday. I think we met the day before. That was the first time that I was seized of it and read it at the chairman's urgings. The chairman said, "We should take a look at this," so I reviewed it cursorily.

• (1710)

**Senator Stewart:** You were urged to read it, but now we are being told that we should not have taken cognizance of the report.

**Senator Grafstein:** I have taken both cognizance of it and have read it cursorily. I think that Senator Roche does put us in a bit of a dilemma, and I will explain my personal dilemma with this matter.

The last time we took, in effect, cognizance of a committee report of the foreign affairs committee of the other place, it dealt with, as I recall, NATO expansion. The Senate, after some deliberation, took a very opposite view, both of the recommendations of that committee and the policy of the government. I believe that I was the only parliamentarian to make a speech against NATO expansion. The reason I was the only one is that it was at the very end of a session and I insisted upon standing up and making that comment. I stand to be corrected. There may have been others, but to my recollection I was the only one.

**Hon. Marcel Prud'homme:** I opposed it with you.

**Senator Grafstein:** Senator Prud'homme adds his name in support.

My point is that we were told at the meeting yesterday, in examination of the witnesses who were supporting those recommendations, which we are now asked to support, that that committee was wrong because it was counter-productive, as I put it, to support expansion and then look to nuclear reduction. It was an inconsistent policy; first, instigating expansion of nuclear weapons and, second, in effect reduction.

Having said that, I am sceptical of decisions taken for immediate purposes in the other place, particularly with regard to recent foreign policy issues. I have detected off-the-cuff reactions to popular public issues with little in-depth study.

However, I was quite impressed by these distinguished visitors who were very enamoured by the report. I would like to be enamoured by the report. It is flattering to have great American experts supporting a report of Parliament, but, I am not convinced.

**Senator Corbin:** It was not unanimous.

**Senator Grafstein:** I remain unconvinced by the hour-long review yesterday, which did not deal in-depth with strategic questions, the question of de-alerting, or the problems in Russia, that we should accept, wholesale, the recommendations. I might come to that conclusion after more careful study. We have been put in a time bind. We have a dilemma. If we want to have a role in important foreign policy deliberations, we have to take a sober look in conjunction with the other place. However, at this moment I remain unconvinced about these recommendations.

I am prepared to do the work and study on my own, and to participate in the debate, but both the visitors yesterday and the recommendations raise some very complex strategic issues. I, as one lone amateur, am not satisfied with the proposition they put on the table, which is essentially to move away from first strike capability based on a moral proposition. We do not live in a moral world, and that was the basis of it.

Based on the evidence I heard yesterday, I am not convinced. Based on my cursory reading of the report, I remain unconvinced. I am prepared, as I am sure are other senators, to deal with this issue in due process, but we are tied by the agenda of the Foreign Affairs Committee, which has no time.

I do not know where we go from here.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable senators, we are getting into the substance of the question. The point before us, the point of order, is whether the matter is in order, not the substance of it. Unless any other honourable senator wishes to speak, I am prepared to take the matter under advisement.

**Senator Stewart:** Honourable senators, I suggest that Senator Roche seek leave to withdraw this motion and that, if he wishes, he bring forth a motion making no reference to the House of Commons at all but repeating the words in recommendation 15, which are the words which say that NATO should review the whole question. We would not be deciding one way or the other; we would simply be asking NATO to consider it.

That would obviate the procedural problem and avoid involving the Senate in a long discussion and investigation of the validity of the basic argument.

**Hon. Nicholas W. Taylor:** Honourable senators, Beauchesne, sixth edition, at pages 244 and 245, talks about debating reports. I think that as long as a report is filed, its source does not matter.

**Senator Corbin:** It does matter.

**Senator Taylor:** The honourable senator might want to file the report and it could then be debated. I do not think there is anything to stop the filing of a report in this house, be it from the other place, from Russia, or anywhere else. When a report is filed, it can be debated. I see nothing in Beauchesne which indicates that the origin of the report governs whether it can be filed.

**Senator Corbin:** I rise on a matter of clarification, but one which I consider fundamental. The report mentioned in Senator Roche's motion is not before this house. It is a report of the other place. It has never arrived before us in a proper way for our consideration. That is the fundamental argument being made here this afternoon. We all wish it were before us formally.

Senator Stewart has said that this is not a bill. Communications between the houses are not limited to bills. Reports, invitations and messages of various kinds are communicated. Surely, when a report asks for our endorsement and begs the government to take it under careful consideration, we are entitled to be given sufficient opportunity to arrive at rational conclusions. Indeed, if the matter were properly before the Senate or one of its committees, some of us may want to propose amendments to the report. Nothing prevents us from doing that. However, I am not prepared today, on the basis of the wording of this motion, to give it my support, even though I am in favour of banning nuclear weapons.

[Translation]

**Senator Prud'homme:** Honourable senators, we could debate this issue *ad nauseam*. I disagree with Senator Corbin, and I agree with Senator Taylor that we can review all the reports we want.

Senator Kinsella raised a point of order. I will sum up my thinking on the matter. I would dearly love to have this debate.

[English]

The distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee has made a very wise suggestion.

•(1720)

I am aware of Senator Roche's motivation. I would think that the Speaker and Senator Kinsella should allow Senator Roche to adopt the suggestion of our wise chairman of the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs and amend his proposal accordingly. That should be satisfactory to Senator Corbin, who has some good points. After all, I am certain Senator Roche will agree with that. Before you accept a report with 15 recommendations, one would wish to read them all, and may disagree or agree. On this point I agree with Senator Corbin. I do agree with Senator Taylor that nothing prevents us from studying whatever report we want. We must address the question of Senator Kinsella.

In a nutshell, I believe Senator Stewart has made a very concrete proposal and now we are in the hands of Senator Roche to see if he wishes to add, accept, reject, or amend. Personally, knowing him and his real motivation, it would seem that the proposal of Senator Stewart would be satisfactory.

**Senator Roche:** I am anxious to avoid giving you, Your Honour, a problem, let alone the Senate itself. I wish to first express my gratitude to Senator Stewart. I concur with the use of the word "wise" which Senator Prud'homme applied to Senator Stewart. What he has offered us is a sound way out.

Second, for the purposes of this discussion, I am willing now to take right off the table the House report. Let us forget about that. I am willing to do that, period. I would then seek to amend my motion with the concurrence of the Senate so that it would read:

That the Senate recommend that the Government of Canada urge NATO to review its nuclear weapons policies at the summit meeting of NATO in April, 1999.

If Your Honour rules that the amendment which I am willing to make is in order, and if the Senate would be willing to allow me to give a five-minute speech on this, I would be most happy to see such a motion passed at this sitting in order that it would have an effect on the Government of Canada.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable senators, you have all heard what Honourable Senator Roche has said he would do. However, the question which I have to deal with at the moment is a point of order raised by Honourable Senator Kinsella on the motion before us. I would first need the agreement of Honourable Senator Kinsella to withdraw his point of order.

**Senator Kinsella:** Honourable senators, I do not wish to be an obstacle in the way of progress in the Senate. However, there are two difficulties. One difficulty is that if we have brought before us this afternoon a new motion, all members of the Senate will not have had notice of that new motion, and therefore, we will be dealing with something that other honourable senators will not know about. That is my first point.

My second point is: If we appear from time to time to be endeavouring to follow the rules strictly, or at least pay very careful attention to the rules of procedure, it is because we, in our system, who constitute the minority, have nothing with which to defend ourselves but the rules. My colleagues opposite, and some of their former colleagues, taught me that lesson when I first arrived here. Some of the distinguished senators who used to sit in these seats, to whom I would listen very carefully when any one of them would speak, taught me a great deal. I recall on several occasions that our system is based on that. The minority is protected by the rules. I raise these questions often because, if we do not have the rules, then it will be might that will determine right.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Do I understand, Honourable Senator Kinsella, that you are not withdrawing your point of order?

**Senator Kinsella:** I should like to have a determination by the Speaker. The matter is sufficiently important. Based upon what I have understood from my colleagues opposite, several concur with this stance.

**Senator Prud'homme:** Honourable senators, Senator Kinsella has raised a very good point. When I was in the House of Commons, surprise motions came in after many people had left the chamber. I always — very reluctantly, and violently at times — opposed any surprise motion of which the majority was not made aware.

I call on my honourable friend and colleague to accept. At least the first part of what Senator Kinsella has said goes without saying, that it is reasonable. Senators who are not here do not know about a new motion, and it could be easily passed. Therefore, if Senator Roche would accept the wise recommendation of Senator Kinsella, to go ahead with what he is proposing, number one, and number two, to say that it should be taken at the next sitting of the Senate, then you will not need to rule. I do not know if Senator Kinsella would be happy with that.

Before you rule, Your Honour, I should like to know if Senator Kinsella would accept what would make sense to all of us: that no one be taken by surprise by something that they did not have under consideration when they left the chamber earlier.

**Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Deputy Leader of the Government):** Your Honour, I must say that I fully agree with Senator Kinsella on this point. He has raised a point of order, and you need to rule on it. That will provide clarity, not just for this incident but for future incidents.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** If no other honourable senator wishes to speak, then I will take the point of order under consideration and report at the earliest possible opportunity.

[*Translation*]

#### ADJOURNMENT

Leave having been given to revert to Notices of

Government Motions:

**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 next, March 16, 1999, at 2:00 p.m.

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

**Hon. Senators:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

The Senate adjourned until Tuesday, March 16, 1999, at 2 p.m.

---

**THE SENATE OF CANADA**  
**PROGRESS OF LEGISLATION**  
**(1st Session, 36th Parliament)**  
**Thursday, March 11, 1999**

**GOVERNMENT BILLS**  
**(SENATE)**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>1st</b>	<b>2nd</b>	<b>Committee</b>	<b>Report</b>	<b>Amend.</b>	<b>3rd</b>	<b>R.A.</b>	<b>Chap.</b>
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 Senate agreed to Commons amendments 98/05/06	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	98/12/03	33/98
S-21	An Act respecting the corruption of foreign public officials and the implementation of the Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions, and to make related amendments to other Acts	98/12/01	98/12/03	Whole	98/12/03	one at 3rd	98/12/03	98/12/10	34/98
S-22	An Act authorizing the United States to preclear travellers and goods in Canada for entry into the United States for the purposes of customs, immigration, public health, food inspection and plant and animal health	98/12/01	99/02/11	Foreign Affairs					

S-23	An Act to amend the Carriage by Air Act to give effect to a Protocol to amend the Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules Relating to International Carriage by Air and to give effect to the Convention, Supplementary to the Warsaw Convention, for the Unification of Certain Rules Relating to International Carriage by Air Performed by a Person Other than the Contracting Carrier	98/12/10	99/02/03	Transport and Communications	99/03/11	none	
------	---	----------	----------	------------------------------	----------	------	--

**GOVERNMENT BILLS  
(HOUSE OF COMMONS)**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>1st</b>	<b>2nd</b>	<b>Committee</b>	<b>Report</b>	<b>Amend.</b>	<b>3rd</b>	<b>R.A.</b>	<b>Chap.</b>
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	98/12/08	none	98/12/09	98/12/10	37/98
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 repealing and re-enacting 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	98/11/17	Banking, Trade and Commerce	98/12/03	none + two at 3rd concur in Commons amendments	98/12/10 Commons amendments referred to Committee 99/02/11	99/03/11	02/99

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	98/11/24	one	98/12/01	98/12/10	35/98
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	98/11/19	98/12/03	31/98
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-35	An Act to amend the Special Import Measures Act and the Canadian International Trade Tribunal Act	98/12/07	99/02/17	Foreign Affairs					
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	98/11/18	30/98
C-38	An Act to amend the National Parks Act (creation of Tuk Tukut Nogait National Park)	98/06/15	98/06/17	Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources	98/12/01	none	98/12/10	98/12/10	39/98
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-40	An Act respecting extradition, to amend the Canada Evidence Act, the Criminal Code, the Immigration Act and the Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Act and to amend and repeal other Acts in consequence	98/12/02	98/12/10	Legal and Constitutional Affairs					
C-41	An Act to amend the Royal Canadian Mint Act and the Currency Act	98/12/02	98/12/09	National Finance	99/02/18	none	99/03/02	99/03/11	04/99
C-42	An Act to amend the Tobacco Act	98/12/02	98/12/08	Legal and Constitutional Affairs	98/12/10	none	98/12/10	98/12/10	38/98
C-43	An Act to establish the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency and to amend and repeal other Acts as a consequence	98/12/08	99/02/10	National Finance					
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-49	An Act providing for the ratification and the bringing into effect of the Framework Agreement on First Nation Land Management	99/03/09							
C-51	An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act and the Corrections and Conditional Release Act	98/11/18	98/12/03	Legal and Constitutional Affairs	99/03/04	none	99/03/09	99/03/11	05/99
C-52	An Act to implement the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty	98/10/20	98/10/28	Foreign Affairs	98/11/18	one	98/11/24	98/12/03	32/98
C-53	An Act to increase the availability of financing for the establishment, expansion, modernization and improvement of small businesses	98/11/25	98/12/02	Banking, Trade and Commerce	98/12/08	none	98/12/09	98/12/10	36/98

C-57	An Act to amend the Nunavut Act with respect to the Nunavut Court of Justice and to amend other Acts in consequence	98/12/07	98/12/10	Legal and Constitutional Affairs	99/02/18	none	99/03/02	99/03/11	03/99
C-58	An Act to amend the Railway Safety Act and to make a consequential amendment to another Act	99/02/02	99/02/11	Transport and Communications					
C-59	An Act to amend the Insurance Companies Act	98/12/10	99/02/04	Banking, Trade and Commerce	99/02/16	none	99/02/18	99/03/11	01/99
C-60	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	98/12/02	98/12/08	—	—	—	98/12/09	98/12/10	40/98
C-65	An Act to amend the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act	99/03/11							

### COMMONS PUBLIC BILLS

No.	Title	1st	2nd	Committee	Report	Amend.	3rd	R.A.	Chap.
C-208	An Act to amend the Access to Information Act	98/11/17	99/02/11	Social Affairs, Science & Technology	99/03/11	none			
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
C-445	An Act to change the name of the electoral district of Stormont-Dundas	98/12/07	98/12/09	Legal and Constitutional Affairs	99/02/04	none	99/02/11	99/03/11	07/99
C-464	An Act to change the name of the electoral district of Sackville—Eastern Shore	98/12/07	98/12/09	Legal and Constitutional Affairs	99/02/04	none	99/02/11	99/03/11	08/99
C-465	An Act to change the name of the electoral district of Argenteuil—Papineau	98/12/07	98/12/09	Legal and Constitutional Affairs	99/02/04	none	99/02/09	99/03/11	06/99

## 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 98/12/09	none one	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 + two at 3rd	98/06/10	<i>Bill withdrawn pursuant to Commons Speaker's Ruling</i> 98/12/02	
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 report withdrawn 98/12/08	four		<i>Bill withdrawn</i> 98/12/08	
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							
S-24	An Act to provide for judicial preauthorization of requests to be made to a foreign or international authority or organization for a search or seizure outside Canada (Sen. Beaudoin)	99/03/03							

S-26	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)	99/03/10
------	---	----------

PRIVATE BILLS

S-18	An Act respecting the Alliance of Manufacturers & Exporters Canada (Sen. Kelleher, P.C.)	98/06/17	Dropped from Order Paper pursuant to Rule 27(3) 98/11/17		
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	98/12/09
S-25	An Act respecting the Certified General Accountants Association of Canada (Sen. Kirby)	99/03/04			

# CONTENTS

Thursday, March 11, 1999

PAGE

PAGE

## SENATORS' STATEMENTS

### The Winter Games

Senator Robichaud ..... 2754

### Computer Technology

Year 2000 Problem. Senator Oliver ..... 2754

### Visitors in the Gallery

The Hon. the Speaker ..... 2755

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### Access to Information Act (Bill C-208)

Bill to Amend—Report of Committee. Senator Murray ..... 2755

### Recombinant Bovine Growth Hormone

Interim Report of Agriculture and Forestry Committee on  
Study of Effect on Human and Animal Health Tabled.  
Senator Gustafson ..... 2755

### Carriage by Air Act (Bill S-23)

Bill to Amend—Report of Committee. Senator Poulin ..... 2755

### Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act (Bill C-65)

Bill to Amend—First Reading. .... 2755

### Canada-Europe Parliamentary Association

Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe—Meeting  
of Parliamentary Assembly, Vienna, Austria—Report of  
Canadian Delegation Tabled. Senator Grafstein ..... 2756

### Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources

Notice of Motion to Authorize Committee to Extend Date  
of Final Report. Senator Taylor ..... 2756

### Human Rights in Tibet

Notices of Motion to Urge Chinese Government to Recognize  
Self-Determination and Human Rights of Tibetans.  
Senator Di Nino ..... 2756

### Justice Reform and Violence Against Women

Comments Made at CIDA and UNIFEM Conference—  
Notice of Inquiry. Senator Cools ..... 2756

## QUESTION PERIOD

### National Finance

Legislative Changes Needed to Modernize, Streamline and  
Strengthen Financial Sector—Government Position.  
Senator Angus ..... 2756  
Senator Graham ..... 2757

### Canada-France Relations

Presumed Transgression of International Rules of Protocol—  
Government Position. Senator Kinsella ..... 2757  
Senator Graham ..... 2757  
Jurisdiction of Quebec on Matters Relating to French Culture—  
Government Position. Senator Nolin ..... 2757  
Senator Graham ..... 2757  
Debate on Cultural Plurality and Diversity—Government Position.  
Senator Nolin ..... 2757  
Senator Graham ..... 2757  
Senator Rivest ..... 2758  
Senator De Bané ..... 2758  
Senator Prud'homme ..... 2758

### National Defence

Closing of CFB Cornwallis—Removal of Memorial Windows  
from St. George's Chapel—Request for Response.  
Senator Comeau ..... 2759  
Senator Graham ..... 2759

### Agriculture

Economic Crisis in Prairie Provinces—Urgent Need for Farm  
Relief Program—Government Position. Senator Gustafson ... 2760  
Senator Graham ..... 2760

### Royal Assent

Notice. .... 2760

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### Privileges, Standing Rules and Orders

Consideration of Ninth Report of Committee—Debate Adjourned.  
Senator Maheu ..... 2761  
Senator Robertson ..... 2762  
Senator Andreychuk ..... 2762  
Senator Prud'homme ..... 2762

### The Budget 1999

Statement of Minister of Finance—Inquiry—Debate Continued.  
Senator Atkins ..... 2762

### Solicitor General

Commission of Inquiry into Treatment of Protestors at  
APEC Conference by RCMP—Provision of Funds for Defence  
of Students—Motion Adopted. Senator Graham ..... 2766  
Senator Kinsella ..... 2767

### Multilateral Agreement on Investment

Inquiry—Debate Concluded. Senator Eyton ..... 2767  
Senator Stewart ..... 2768  
Senator Taylor ..... 2769

### Election of Canada to United Nations Security Council

Inquiry—Order Stands. Senator Graham ..... 2770

**Security in Europe**

Inquiry—Debate Adjourned. Senator Grafstein .....	2770
Senator Corbin .....	2772

**Foreign Affairs**

Reforms to International Monetary Fund—Committee Authorized to Study—Notice of Motion Amended.	
Senator Stewart .....	2773

**Canada and the Nuclear Challenge**

Motion to Endorse Report of Foreign Affairs and International Trade Committee—Point of Order—Debate Suspended.	
Senator Roche .....	2773
Point of Order. Senator Kinsella .....	2773
Senator Carstairs .....	2774
Senator Roche .....	2774
Senator Corbin .....	2774

<b>Royal Assent</b> .....	2774
---------------------------	------

**Canada and the Nuclear Challenge**

Motion to Endorse Report of Foreign Affairs and International Trade Committee—Point of Order— Speaker's Ruling Reserved. Senator Corbin .....	2775
Senator Stewart .....	2775
Senator Roche .....	2776
Senator Kinsella .....	2776
Senator Grafstein .....	2776
Senator Prud'homme .....	2777
Senator Taylor .....	2777
Senator Carstairs .....	2779

**Adjournment**

Senator Carstairs .....	2779
-------------------------	------

<b>Progress of Legislation</b> .....	i
--------------------------------------	---



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