



Debates of the Senate

1st SESSION

•

36th PARLIAMENT

•

VOLUME 137

•

NUMBER 122

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Thursday, March 18, 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 18 1999

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

Prayers.

[*Translation*]

SENATORS' STATEMENTS

INTERNATIONAL FRANCOPHONIE DAY

Hon. Marie-P. Poulin: Honourable senators, on the occasion of this International Francophonie Day, Senator Comeau and myself would ask permission to make a joint statement.

Today, the Honourable G eral-A. Beaudoin was made Chevalier of the Ordre de la Pl iade. He continues to contribute to the development of the Francophonie in Canada, through his actions, his commitment and his devotion.

Today is also the opening day of the Year of the Francophonie in Canada. To mark the event, twelve French-speaking federal parliamentarians — two senators, three ministers, and seven MPs — went to the Quebec National Assembly last evening. Our purpose was to mark the ties of brotherhood linking all French-speaking parliamentarians from one end of this country to the other. The visit was greatly appreciated on all sides. At a dinner following the reception at the National Assembly, the various parliamentarians made each others' acquaintance. They made a number of comments to us. We would like to pass some of them on to you now.

Hon. Gerald J. Comeau: Honourable senators, first of all, the place we can be of most use as parliamentarians committed to national unity is here in Ottawa. We would do well, however, to listen carefully to what the Quebec members of the National Assembly have to say, to read their debates, and to act accordingly, as responsible federal parliamentarians.

Second, last evening one of the federal parliamentarians made reference to the great concern triggered by the last Quebec referendum, and the reaction of one of the National Assembly members was to say "We have concerns here daily when we hear some of the messages that contribute to the division of the country."

Third, all parliamentarians noted the importance of the institutions in all of Canada's provinces and territories serving minorities in communications, education, health or other areas.

Fourth, the parliamentarians were last night themselves living proof that all Canadians recognize the credibility of francophones living in the Atlantic provinces, Quebec, Ontario

and the west. The Governor General of Canada is a French Canadian from New Brunswick, the Speaker of the Senate is a French Canadian from Manitoba, the Speaker of the House of Commons is a French Canadian from Ontario and the Prime Minister of Canada is a French Canadian from Quebec.

Fifth, the federal government has the tools and human resources to continue actively nurturing French Canadian culture.

Let us stop saying "French Canada" and "English Canada." That is a myth. There are proud francophones right across the country. Honourable senators, happy Year of the Francophonie in Canada.

[*English*]

HUMAN RIGHTS

INTERNATIONAL DAY FOR THE ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Hon. Donald H. Oliver: Honourable senators, it is with a sense of deep pride and honour that I rise today as the first of a series of Progressive Conservative senators to speak about the importance of March 21, a day set aside to celebrate the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

The Progressive Conservative Party of Canada has long been a world leader in taking steps to quash racism and promote equality. I feel proud that, following me, Progressive Conservative senators from all regions of Canada will rise, one by one, to speak eloquently about this important convention.

•(1410)

You will recall that the United Nations convention was born as a result of the vicious massacre in Sharpeville, South Africa on March 21, 1960, which focused the world's attention on the oppression that was ravaging blacks in that land as the minority white inhabitants prospered under apartheid.

In my two remaining minutes, let me briefly sketch for you the considerations which influenced the nations of the world to adopt this important convention.

Underlying the convention is the fundamental principle, enshrined in the UN Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration of the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, of "the dignity and equality inherent in all human beings." Implicit in this belief in human equality and dignity is the firm conviction that any doctrine of racial superiority is "scientifically false, morally condemnable,

socially unjust and dangerous,” that there is no justification for racial discrimination in theory or practice anywhere, and that all human beings must be equal before the law. This in turn leads, by necessity, to the principle that everyone is entitled to fundamental rights and freedoms without distinction of any kind, in particular as to race, colour or national origin.

Rooted in these core principles, the framers of the convention went on to note the dangers of inaction. International peace and security, they believed, could be compromised by ongoing discrimination on the grounds of race, colour and ethnic origin, discrimination that could be “an obstacle to friendly and peaceful relations among nations” and which might disturb the harmony of persons living side by side within one and the same state.

Thus, the convention is not merely a set of noble ideas but a call to action. Member states signing the convention reiterated their commitment to take joint and separate action, in cooperation with the United Nations, to promote and encourage respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without discriminatory distinctions. The signatories placed special emphasis on the need for the “earliest adoption of practical measures” aimed at reducing racial discrimination.

They renewed the condemnation of colonialism and the associated practices of segregation and discrimination contained in the 1960 Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and they promised to move without delay to eliminate racial discrimination in all its forms, prevent and combat racial doctrines, and build an international community free from all forms of racial segregation and discrimination.

In conclusion, four decades later, the philosophy and insights behind the convention continue to resonate. On this March 21 anniversary date, it is still our duty to recognize — indeed proclaim — the principles of human equality and dignity, the dangers of passivity, and the need for practical action.

Hon. Mary Alice Butts: Honourable senators, Sunday, March 21 is the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. The United Nations proclaimed this day in commemoration of the 1960 massacre of 69 peaceful anti-apartheid demonstrators in South Africa. For over a decade, Canada has recognized this day by engaging Canada’s youth in the struggle against racism.

In the latest poll, 85 per cent of Canadians believe that eliminating racism should be part of federal government policy. Honourable senators, we must listen to Canadians.

This year also marks the third annual National Stop Racism Video Competition. Over 320 youth teams have entered this competition. They must create a one-minute video which expresses their feelings about racism. The 10 winners will be spotlighted this Sunday, the International Day for the Elimination of Racism, on MuchMusic and MusiquePlus.

Ending racism is a priority for this government, and we believe that the best way to do it is by giving our youth the tools they need to build an inclusive, respectful society.

Hon. Consiglio Di Nino: Honourable senators, I, too, wish to make some comments on this very important day. I shall start by giving you a little background on this issue.

During the years following the Second World War, the shadow cast by the horrors of the concentration camps were long and dark. Haunted by knowledge of genocide perpetrated in the heart of Europe, the newly formed United Nations Organization moved quickly to prepare a Universal Declaration on Human Rights in 1948 and, 15 years later, a companion Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. The declaration in turn became the basis for an international convention adopted by the General Assembly on December 21, 1965 and signed by Canada the following year. The declaration came into force on October 24, 1970.

Canada’s support for the new convention came as no surprise. As a society constructed by European settlers of diverse ethnic origins, surrounded by indigenous peoples, the matter of the relationship between racial and ethnic groups had long been high on Canada’s agenda. As one of the staunchest supporters of United Nations, and home to the drafter of its Universal Declaration on Human Rights, Mr. John Humphrey, Canada was committed to the principle of multilateral efforts to guarantee basic rights.

As one of the architects of the new Commonwealth of Nations, Canada was sensitive to the emerging forces of decolonization, the racial overtones of international politics, and the internal racial and ethnic strife bedeviling many UN member states.

As a middle power seeking to maximize its influence in a changing world, Canada wanted to maintain friendly relations with nations emerging from the yoke of colonialism and the humiliation of subjugation. Despite the Cold War and a dark cloud of apartheid, there was in the air a feeling of interdependence of nations and a growing internationalism, and Canada was eager to play a role.

Finally, as a country with demographics that were rapidly changing, and a history that had already known difficult moments of discrimination, including the internment of Japanese-Canadians and Canadians of other backgrounds during World War II, Canada had a clear interest in all initiatives that promised to enhance the odds of interracial harmony.

The changing demographics had much to do with the shifting patterns of immigration. In 1962, the Diefenbaker government decided to remove race-based immigration policies. Canadian immigrants were already arriving from other European — that is, non-British, non-French — sources after the world war, and I am one of those. By 1971, they comprised 29 per cent of the population. To this were added the non-European immigrants whose numbers rose almost five-fold to about 200,000 between 1951 and 1971. They joined more than a quarter of a million First Nations people in Canada.

Prime Minister Diefenbaker's belief in basic rights and non-discrimination had deep roots. As early as 1947, he called for a Bill of Rights, and in 1960 saw that dream become a reality. Speaking on the Bill of Rights, Mr. Diefenbaker said:

I am a Canadian, a free Canadian, free to speak without fear, free to worship God in my own way, free to stand for what I think right, free to oppose what I believe wrong, free to choose those who shall govern my country. This heritage of freedom I pledge to you for myself and all mankind.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable Senator Di Nino, I regret to interrupt you, but your three-minute speaking time has expired.

Senator Di Nino: May I finish?

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Senator Di Nino: Thank you kindly, honourable senators.

He regarded the Bill of Rights as fundamental to his philosophy of social justice and national development.

The Right Honourable John Diefenbaker thundered, with quavering jowls:

One Canada stood for prejudice towards none and freedom for all. There were to be no second-class citizens, no distinction based on race, creed, or economic station in the Canada of my dreams.

Given its heritage, demographics and leadership, it is hardly surprising that Canada played an active role in formulating and implementing the UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

•(1420)

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I regret to inform you that the 15-minute period for Senators' Statements has expired. However, I will recognize one more honourable senator.

[*Translation*]

INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF OLDER PERSONS

Hon. Marisa Ferretti Barth: Honourable senators, I rise to speak to you today of one of my main concerns in this the International Year of the Older Person. I refer to the specific needs of seniors in Canada's cultural communities.

My personal experience with them has taught me that their needs are not always heard, since they are rarely consulted by this country's decision-makers. However, the cause of seniors in our cultural communities warrants particular attention, because these people represent the difficulties associated with aging and the difficulties inherent in their status as immigrants.

[Senator Di Nino]

So that the voice of the seniors in the various cultural communities may be heard, I am organizing, in cooperation with the Regional Council of Italian-Canadian Seniors, a day of dialogue on aging to be held tomorrow in Montreal.

On that day, representatives from several cultural communities will come to talk about the problems faced by the elderly in their community. We also invited representatives from community organizations and from the Régie nationale of Quebec's Department of Social Services, so that they are aware of these problems.

Later on, we intend to submit a report on the results of that dialogue to the departments and organizations of all the levels of government concerned.

In this International Year of Older Persons, I invite all senators to remain receptive to the problems related to aging, and to be open to the particular issues confronting the elderly in the various cultural communities.

[*English*]

Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Acting Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, I would request leave for one more statement.

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

An Hon. Senator: No.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

CANADA CUSTOMS AND REVENUE AGENCY BILL

REPORT OF COMMITTEE

Hon. Terry Stratton, Chairman of the Standing Senate Committee on National Finance, presented the following report:

THURSDAY, March 18, 1999

The Standing Senate Committee on National Finance has the honour to present its

TWELFTH REPORT

Your committee, to which was referred Bill C-43, An Act to establish the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency and to amend and repeal other Acts as a consequence, has, in obedience to the Order of Reference of Wednesday, March 10, 1999, examined the said bill and now reports the same without amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

TERRY STRATTON
Chairman

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

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

[Translation]

ADJOURNMENT

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

That when the Senate adjourns today, it do stand adjourned until Tuesday next, March 23, 1999, at 2 p.m.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

[English]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE TO STUDY CHANGING MANDATE OF NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

Hon. John Lynch-Staunton (Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, I give notice that on Tuesday, March 23, 1999, I will move, seconded by the Honourable Senator John Stewart:

That the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs be authorized to examine and report upon the ramifications to Canada:

1. of the changed mandate of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and Canada's role in NATO since the demise of the Warsaw Pact, the end of the Cold War and the recent addition to membership in NATO of Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic; and
2. of peacekeeping, with particular reference to Canada's ability to participate in it under the auspices of any international body at which Canada is a member.

That the committee hear, amongst others, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Minister of National Defence and the Chief of Defence Staff;

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

That the committee have the power to permit coverage by electronic media of its public proceedings; and

That the committee submit its final report no later than October 29, 1999.

[Translation]

AFRICA

STATE VISIT OF GOVERNOR GENERAL TO IVORY COAST, TANZANIA, MALI AND MOROCCO—NOTICE OF INQUIRY

Hon. Eymard G. Corbin: Honourable senators, I give notice that on Tuesday, May 4, 1999, I will call the attention of the Senate to my observations and thoughts arising from 16 days spent in Africa with Their Excellencies the Governor General of Canada, the Right Honourable Roméo LeBlanc and his wife, Diana Fowler LeBlanc, who were carrying out the first Canadian state visit to the Ivory Coast, Tanzania, Mali and Morocco.

[English]

ROLE OF CANADIAN JUDICIAL COUNCIL

MEDIA COMMENTS—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 letter to the editor in the *National Post*, March 13, 1999 entitled "Fair Hearing," written by British Columbia Chief Justice Allan McEachern, the Chairperson of the Canadian Judicial Council's Judicial Conduct Committee, responding to the March 10, 1999, *National Post* editorial "Hardly Impartial" about Mr. Justice John Wesley McClung, Madame Justice Claire L'Heureux-Dubé, and the Canadian Judicial Council;

b) to the continuing public controversy about Alberta Court of Appeal Justice John Wesley McClung, and Supreme Court of Canada Justice Claire L'Heureux-Dubé, and the media reports of same;

c) to the interview and the comments of Chief Justice Allan McEachern as reported in the *Lawyers Weekly* February 26, 1999 article "Judges Must be Cyber-Warriors";

d) to the matter of justices' public statements in the media; and

e) to the concept and principles of judicial independence and to Parliament's rights in these matters.

INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL TRIBUNAL FOR FORMER YUGOSLAVIA AND RWANDA

STANCE OF MADAME JUSTICE LOUISE ARBOUR—
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 a February 28, 1999, *Calgary Herald* article by David Paddon entitled “Troops needed to assist tribunal, says Arbour,” and to Madame Justice Louise Arbour’s demands for international troops to assist her as the United Nations Chief Prosecutor of the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda, in her prosecutions in Kosovo;

b) to the fact of a Canadian justice’s wish to exercise force and coercion, and to commandeer military troops, and the military instruments of state, and the relationship of a Canadian justice’s use of military armed forces and the role of justices as per the Judges Act;

c) to Bill C-42, 1996, and Parliament’s sole exemption from its Judges Act to permit Madame Justice Louise Arbour to act as the United Nations Chief Prosecutor of the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda;

d) to a March 16, 1999, *Globe and Mail* article by Kirk Makin entitled “Louise Arbour’s Supreme Decision: The Celebrity judge would be a superstar candidate for the top court, but is the time right for her?”, and media reports about Madame Justice Louise Arbour’s alleged wishes, and possibilities for appointment to the Supreme Court of Canada upon the retirement of Mr. Justice Peter Cory; and

e) to justices’ comments in the media about public policy issues, and to Canadian justices international activities, and to the concept of judicial independence of Canadian justices.

•(1430)

INTERNATIONAL POSITION IN COMMUNICATIONS

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AUTHORIZE TRANSPORT AND
COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE TO EXTEND DATE
OF FINAL REPORT ON STUDY

Leave having been given to revert to Notices of Motion:

Hon. J. Michael Forrestall: Honourable senators, I give notice that on Tuesday, March 23, 1999, I will move:

That notwithstanding the Order of the Senate adopted on December 1, 1998, the Standing Senate Committee on Transport and Communications, which was authorized to examine and report upon Canada’s international competitive position in communications generally, including a review of

the economic, social and cultural importance of communications for Canada; be empowered to table its final report no later than May 30, 1999, and

That the committee be permitted, notwithstanding usual practices, to deposit its report with the Clerk of the Senate, if the Senate is not then sitting; and that the report be deemed to have been tabled in the Chamber.

QUESTION PERIOD

NATIONAL FINANCE

CANADA CUSTOMS AND REVENUE AGENCY BILL—
COST OF SPEECH-WRITING IN SUPPORT OF LEGISLATION—
APPLICATION OF GOODS AND SERVICES TAX—
POSITION OF CHAIRMAN

Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Acting Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, I have a question for the Leader of the Government in the Senate. Can the honourable leader either confirm or deny that a contract for \$23,000 was let by Revenue Canada for the writing of two speeches on Bill C-43, and can he advise whether GST was applied to that amount?

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I would obviously need to seek an answer to that question. I am sorry I do not have a response.

If GST was applicable, it certainly would have been applied.

Senator Kinsella: On a supplementary question to the Chairman of the Standing Senate Committee on National Finance, does the chairman of that committee, which has been examining Bill C-43, have any information on the same matter? Does he know whether either of those two speeches, costing \$23,000, is the one on the Revenue Canada Internet site purporting to be the speech delivered by our honourable friend the Deputy Leader of the Government — which is not, however, the speech printed in Hansard?

Hon. Terry Stratton: Thank you for the question. I can only respond that the information given to me clearly states that there were two speeches on Bill C-43 prepared by Revenue Canada, and that the total contract amount was \$23,200 plus GST.

As to whether or not the speeches were used on the Internet, I am still trying to confirm that. Since two speeches were prepared, it would appear that Senator Carstairs delivered one in the chamber, while Revenue Canada showed another on the Internet.

Hon. Lowell Murray: Honourable senators, on a supplementary question to the Leader of the Government in the Senate, if the government is paying such rates for speech-writing, would he be interested in joining me in a new partnership in which we could both go back to our old trade?

Senator Graham: Honourable senators, I would be very pleased to do so. As a matter of fact, the thought crossed my mind immediately. As soon as the question was raised by Senator Kinsella and responded to by Senator Stratton, I immediately turned and asked the Deputy Leader if she paid the GST. However, obviously she had nothing to do with it.

There is obviously a ghost-writer out there somewhere. Certainly, the rates are better than those we were paid at the Antigonish *Casket*.

Hon. Consiglio Di Nino: Honourable senators, there is no doubt a bit of levity around this issue, but if I were Senator Carstairs, I would be a little upset rather than thinking that it was funny.

When I hear Senator Murray and Senator Graham talk about this matter, I am struck by the injustice of the situation. The Senate, to do its job, spends a certain amount of money, and we are criticized nearly around the world for it. Perhaps some of the criticism is justified and perhaps it is not. Now we hear that the government is spending this kind of indecent sum to have a speech written.

Would the Leader of the Government in the Senate please tell us whether this is a normal occurrence that is taking place, and if he does not have the answer, could he find out for us?

Senator Graham: I agree with Senator Di Nino's description and use of the word "indecent."

I do not know whether this is standard practice, but certainly, if there is any truth in these assertions, we should inquire, and bring them not only to the attention of the Senate but to the attention of the public.

I agree with Senator Di Nino that there is an element of unfairness in this situation, because so much of the valuable work that is done in this chamber goes unrecognized. That work is done not only by individual senators but also by their researchers and by the committees that work in the public interest on behalf of the Senate.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

ACCUMULATION OF UNPAID BILLS—SHORTFALL IN ARMY BUDGET DUE TO EXPENDITURES FOR DISASTER RELIEF— GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. J. Michael Forrestall: Honourable senators, my question is directed to the Leader of the Government in the Senate as well.

It was revealed in questioning in the other place the other day that the Defence budget has an additional \$600 million in funds, according to the 1999-2000 Estimates. In response to questions about why it did not announce the additional spending, the government claimed that the new moneys were for disaster relief, and that the army got only an additional \$184 million in funding.

Is the additional \$184 million to cover the army's operating budget shortfall, and is that why National Defence could not pay its bills on time — because it had no money and was broke?

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government): My understanding is that within the Department of National Defence there was a backlog of unpaid bills. This is from my recollection of reading files at an earlier date, but my understanding is that the matter has been rectified.

There was a previous mention of \$377 million, and that indeed was the sum that went towards disaster relief in various parts of the country.

With respect to the \$184 million, I would need to do further investigation in order to identify that number.

CANADIAN FORCES BUDGET SHORTFALLS— REQUEST FOR ANSWERS TO ORDER PAPER QUESTIONS

Hon. J. Michael Forrestall: Honourable senators, I have had questions on the Order Paper since October 21, 1997. One is Question No. 57 on army budget shortfalls. Another is with regard to the Canadian Forces shortfall, Question No. 129, since June 15 of 1998. When my staff asked Parliamentary Affairs in DND about these questions, they were told that the answer to Question No. 57 had undergone a number of revisions.

Is the government too embarrassed to answer my questions about army budget shortfall? Why all of the revisions? How long must one wait to get an answer to a very simple question?

•(1440)

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, the government is not embarrassed at all. I regret very much that the questions put forward by the Honourable Senator Forrestall have still not been answered. I shall certainly pursue the matter immediately upon the adjournment of the Senate today.

HUMAN RIGHTS

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION—POSSIBILITY OF INTERVENTION ON BEHALF OF DISSIDENTS IN CUBA—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. A. Raynell Andreychuk: Honourable senators, I regret that a certain senator did not permit me to make my statement today because it precluded me from giving the government a commendation on the excellent steps that they had taken pursuant to Article 5 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. Canada and this government has taken an excellent step toward complying with that convention with this government's undertaking that they will work towards elimination of all forms of discrimination and human rights violations within the multilateral forum.

Will the government consider initiating a process to have a special rapporteur to look into the situation in Cuba?

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I would be very happy to bring that matter to the attention of my colleague the Minister of Foreign Affairs. As the honourable senator knows, our relations with Cuba are under review as a result of the recent trial, conviction and imprisonment of four Cuban nationals. Canada is taking very seriously the whole question of our relations with Cuba. We believe that continued engagement is the best course of action.

While this matter is under review, the planned visits to Cuba of two ministers, I believe Ministers Marleau and Marchi, have been temporarily postponed. This has already sent a strong message to Cuba with respect to the seriousness with which we regard such incidents.

Senator Andreychuk: Honourable senators, Canada has entered into a constructive dialogue with Cuba. We have taken their statements at face value to this point. The Human Rights Commission is imminently sitting, dealing with the issues. It seems to me that a rapporteur could demand consent from Cuba to enter into this dialogue with Cuba. It would be an excellent opportunity for Canada to give a signal to Cuba and to the world that we are serious about working within the international covenants.

Senator Graham: I agree with Senator Andreychuk, and I shall bring that point to the attention of my colleagues.

IMPROVEMENT OF SITUATION OF DEMOCRACY
IN EAST TIMOR—ROLE OF GOVERNMENT

Hon. Consiglio Di Nino: Honourable senators, I wish to continue along the same line, particularly considering this special day and the special year in which we are celebrating efforts against racial discrimination, for human rights and rights in general.

The winds of democratic change that seem to be coming out of Indonesia, particularly dealing with East Timor, are very welcome. I hope my question will reflect on what I think is some good work done by Canada.

What role did Canada play in encouraging these wonderful winds of democratic change in that part of the world? Perhaps it is a harbinger for good things to come in Asia.

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, Canada played a prominent role. I know the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Axworthy, discussed that matter on a number of occasions with his colleagues.

Senator Di Nino's question reminds me that several international organizations — the Socialist International, the Liberal International, the Conservative organization, the Christian Democrats, and several others — have raised this matter at their international meetings. They have made very

strong representations with respect to the situation in East Timor. I know from first-hand knowledge that the Minister of Foreign Affairs has played a very active role in that particular situation.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN TIBET UNDER
CHINESE OCCUPATION—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Consiglio Di Nino: Honourable senators, I want to congratulate the government — I do not do that very often on issues of this nature — both on the Cuba issue and on East Timor.

As a supplementary question, would the minister be able to inform us, or at least undertake to find the answer, as to whether the same pressure or the same approach was taken vis-à-vis China and, in particular, Tibet?

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, my honourable friend would know from earlier discussions that Canada is very concerned about the human rights situation in China, including Tibet. Our policy regarding Tibet is to press for greater respect for human rights in China in general and in Tibet in particular. Respect for human rights and religious freedom is an important objective of Canada's bilateral and multilateral agendas.

Canada will continue to use the joint Canada-China Human Rights Committee to push the Chinese government to respect the religious freedom of all China's ethnic minorities. We are urging China to ratify the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

Senator Di Nino: Honourable senators, I understand that bilateral discussions are being held between Canada and China on these issues. Would the minister undertake to at least inquire of the external affairs minister or the Prime Minister's Office as to whether some representation from this body — perhaps one member from either side of the chamber — could attend those meetings either as participants or as observers?

Senator Graham: Honourable senators, I shall certainly take that question under advisement. I should point out that the Canadian ambassador visited Tibet last spring. He raised Canadian concerns in all meetings with government authorities and his report contained his impressions of the situation in Tibet. If the Honourable Senator Di Nino is interested, I shall attempt to get a copy of that report.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

COMPENSATION PACKAGE FOR
MERCHANT MARINE VETERANS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Mabel M. DeWare: Honourable senators, as a senator representing the province of New Brunswick, I should like to ask the Leader of the Government if he knows if the minister responsible has taken into consideration the long-time request by our merchant marines for a compensation package?

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I presume the honourable senator is referring to the Minister of Veterans Affairs. Legislation is now before us, and there will be an excellent opportunity to put that question directly to the minister if he is the person who comes before the appropriate committee.

Senator DeWare: Honourable senators, I appreciate the minister's recommendation because I notice that that piece of legislation does not contain the compensation package that is being requested.

INDUSTRY

REMARKS OF MINISTER ON PROBLEMS WITH PRODUCTIVITY— GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Donald H. Oliver: Honourable senators, my question is for the Leader of the Government in the Senate and it deals with productivity. Last month, the Minister of Industry, Mr. Manley, said that Canada has the lowest productivity growth in the G-7. This was confirmed by the Prime Minister's pollsters but today the Minister of Finance is saying that that is not the case.

Could the minister shed some light on Canadian government policy on whether productivity is a problem?

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, productivity is always a problem, but I should emphasize, as I have done on other occasions, that since 1993, the government's central purpose has been to create a better standard of living for Canadians.

We inherited massive unemployment and a runaway deficit. We took the necessary action to address those problems and to improve the future for Canadians. We turned a \$42-billion deficit into a surplus. We have started reducing taxes. We have invested more money in research, development and education. We have invested more money in health care. We have improved the lot of Canada's children through the Child Tax Benefit.

•(1450)

According to Statistics Canada for the year 1997, productivity in Canada rose by 2.9 per cent. That is a substantial figure.

Though Senator Oliver comes from Nova Scotia, I shall cite an example of productivity for the edification of other honourable senators who be may be doubting Thomases from other parts of the country.

Three weeks ago, I had the privilege of participating in the opening of an extension to a Magna International plant in North Sydney, Cape Breton, Nova Scotia, along with the company's president.

There are 157 Cape Breton employees at that particular plant. When the President of Magna came to the plant, I met with him before the announcement and asked him how he would rate the productivity of the labour force in Cape Breton. He told me that

Magna has something in the order of 150 subsidiaries around the world, and he said that he would rate the productivity of the Cape Breton labour force as being as good if not better than any plant in the world.

Senator Oliver: Honourable senators, what does the minister say about Minister Manley's comments about our sagging to the depths of an economy like Mississippi? What does he say about Minister Manley's comment that Canada has the lowest productivity growth of the G-7 countries? Could he address those questions directly?

Senator Graham: In this chamber and in this country, we should be of one mind in our determination to build on the recent improvements which I have just cited and that we have seen in productivity around the country. The aim of the government is to build a stronger economy where incomes grow, employment continues to rise, and the standard of living and the quality of life are raised for all Canadians.

DELAYED ANSWER TO ORAL QUESTION

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I have a response to a question raised in the Senate on March 3, 1999, by the Honourable Senator Kinsella regarding the report of United States State Department and the record of various countries in the treatment of aboriginals.

HUMAN RIGHTS

REPORT OF U.S. STATE DEPARTMENT ON RECORD OF VARIOUS COUNTRIES—MENTION OF INCIDENTS OF ARRESTS IN VANCOUVER AND TREATMENT OF ABORIGINALS— GOVERNMENT POSITION

(Response to question raised by Hon. Noël A. Kinsella on March 3, 1999)

This American annual report comments on a broad range of human rights issues in dozens of countries. In 1998, the report had mostly positive things to say about the state of human rights in Canada. However, it did mention a few complaints, notably discrimination against aboriginal peoples, the disabled and women.

In each of the incidents cited, the report noted either that Canadian governments are taking steps to address the concern, or that Canadian law and an independent judiciary provide such avenues.

The federal government is addressing three quarters (335) of the recommendations, either through existing programs and policies or initiatives under *Gathering Strength — Canada's Aboriginal Action Plan* that was announced in January 1998. It is noteworthy that only one quarter of the recommendations were directed exclusively at the federal government.

Gathering Strength, the federal government's response to RCAP, sets out commitments under four themes: renewing the partnerships; strengthening aboriginal governance; developing a new fiscal relationship; and, building stronger communities, people and economies. The foundations for achieving lasting change under these four themes have been laid over the past year. The challenge ahead is to build on this foundation, working in partnership with other governments, aboriginal people, the private sector and individual Canadians to make a tangible difference in the individual lives of Métis, First Nations and Inuit all across Canada. Members of the federal government team most active in implementing *Gathering Strength* include the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Canadian Heritage, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Health Canada, Human Resources and Development Canada, Industry Canada, Department of Justice, Natural Resources Canada, Solicitor General and Statistics Canada.

ANSWERS TO ORDER PAPER QUESTIONS TABLED

PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE AND PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE—
NUMBER OF OFFICIALS WHO RECEIVED
PUBLIC SERVICE BONUSES

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Deputy Leader of the Government) tabled the answer to Question No. 68 on the Order Paper—by Senator Phillips.

TREASURY BOARD—SCOPE OF PUBLIC SERVICE
BONUSES PAID TO PUBLIC SERVANTS

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Deputy Leader of the Government) tabled the answer to Question No. 69 on the Order Paper—by Senator Phillips.

NATIONAL FINANCE—CANADIAN FORCES SUPERANNUATION
ACCOUNT—REASONS FOR APPROPRIATION—
GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Deputy Leader of the Government) tabled the answer to Question No. 139 on the Order Paper—by Senator Forrestall.

TREASURY BOARD—SCOPE AND MAGNITUDE OF
PUBLIC SERVICE PERFORMANCE PAY AND
BILINGUAL BONUSES PAID FOR 1995-96 AND 1996-97

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Deputy Leader of the Government) tabled the answer to Question No. 109 on the Order Paper—by Senator Phillips.

VISITORS IN THE GALLERY

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, before we proceed to Orders of the Day, I should like to draw your attention to the presence in our gallery of a group from the Merchant Seamen's Association of Canada led by Mr. Ossie MacLean. On

behalf of all honourable senators, I bid you welcome to the Senate of Canada.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

RAILWAY SAFETY ACT

BILL TO AMEND—THIRD READING

Hon. Marie-P. Poulin moved the third reading of Bill C-58, to amend the Railway Safety Act and to make a consequential amendment to another Act.

She said: Honourable senators, I rise in support of Bill C-58 on third reading. First, it is essential to acknowledge the vital role that has been played by members of the Senate and the House of Commons standing committees who have thoroughly examined the proposed legislation to ensure that it benefits all Canadians.

[*Translation*]

In 1994 and 1997 respectively, independent safety experts and officials from the Ministry of Transport conducted two in-depth reviews of the Railway Safety Act. These reviews confirmed the validity of the legislation's underlying principles. In both reviews, the excellent record of the Canadian rail industry was recognized.

In addition, throughout preparation of Bill C-58, Department of Transport representatives met with the rail industry, the rail workers' unions, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, the Canada Safety Council, Transport 2000, provincial officials, and the list goes on. They all played an important role in the development of this improved bill.

Consultation meetings with stakeholders provided an opportunity to reach a consensus on the purpose of proposed amendments to the Railway Safety Act. These amendments correspond to the best practices of the safety systems of other modes of transportation.

[*English*]

Honourable senators, throughout the legislative process, many witnesses voiced their support of what they felt to be a good piece of legislation. Stakeholders commended the process by which this legislation has been developed. In particular, they appreciated the opportunity to fully voice their concerns.

The benefits of full consultation were amply demonstrated by the involvement of stakeholders who ensured that these concerns were integrated into the improved legislative package. For example, the members of the Standing Senate Committee on Transport and Communications met with the Railway Association of Canada to obtain the industry's points of view with respect to Bill C-58. Again, a high level of comfort with the bill was expressed during the hearings.

Moreover, the Transportation Safety Board noted in the fall of 1997 that Canada enjoys a commendable record of passenger rail safety. A railway safety act review committee was established to review the new safety regime. They concluded in their final report that railways in Canada are safe in comparison with competing modes of transportation and railways in other nations.

To continue improving this record, departmental rail safety inspectors will continue to monitor railway company safety performance across Canada. The Department of Transport will also continue to take action to attend to any safety deficiencies that may arise in order to ensure that the safety of the Canadian transportation system is not endangered.

Honourable senators, I am happy to note that my colleagues on the Standing Senate Committee on Transport and Communications approved Bill C-58, as is, after a thorough examination.

[Translation]

In conclusion, honourable senators, I repeat what has already been said many times. Transport Canada's priority is the safety of the Canadian transportation system. As in the past, the department will continue to work closely with the industry and all other stakeholders to ensure that safety is not compromised.

With the passage of these amendments to the Railway Safety Act, Canadians will enjoy a stronger regulatory framework for the safety of this essential mode of transportation. In addition, this framework will provide the department with the means of ensuring that Canadian railways continue to improve their safety performance as we head into the 21st century.

[English]

I am pleased to see the progress of this bill and lend my support to its success. Therefore, I urge honourable colleagues to support this bill so that it may receive Royal Assent as soon as possible.

The Hon. the Speaker: If no other honourable senator wishes to speak, I will proceed with the motion.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to and bill read third time and passed.

[Translation]

**WAR VETERANS ALLOWANCE ACT
PENSION ACT
MERCHANT NAVY VETERAN AND CIVILIAN
WAR-RELATED BENEFITS ACT
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS ACT
VETERANS REVIEW AND APPEAL BOARD ACT
HALIFAX RELIEF COMMISSION PENSION
CONTINUATION ACT**

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING

Hon. Aurélien Gill moved the second reading of Bill C-61, to amend the War Veterans Allowance Act, the Pension Act, the Merchant Navy Veteran and Civilian War-related Benefits Act, the Department of Veterans Affairs Act, the Veterans Review and Appeal Board Act and the Halifax Relief Commission Pension Continuation Act and to amend other Acts in consequence thereof.

He said: Honourable senators, I am really delighted to speak in the Senate for the first time and to have, moreover, the privilege of addressing a matter that concerns primarily citizens who have done honour to their country: veterans and their dependents. I obviously want to speak on the topic of Bill C-61, which I consider an excellent legislative measure.

We rarely have the opportunity to discuss a bill we have no opposition to, regardless of our political stripe. Our colleagues in the House of Commons were well satisfied of the importance of its passage, because they gave it rapid consideration at all stages.

I would hope that we, too, could pay tribute to our veterans in the same way by acting equally diligently.

[English]

The history of our country is marked by the sacrifice of the young men and women who fought for peace and freedom throughout this century. It is marked by the blood they shed on foreign soil around the world. It calls out to those who visit any of the countless Commonwealth cemeteries the world over where headstones plain and simple mark the resting places of Canadian veterans who gave their youth so that others might live free. It is honoured by countless nations in the monuments they have erected as testimony to our citizens who fell in defence of their homes, their land and their families.

[Translation]

Many of them died in their prime: 66,000 during World War I, 45,000 during World War II, and over 500 during the Korean conflict. Many others died during the peacekeeping operations that have been associated with the Canadian military personnel in the second half of this century. Thousands more were also injured, both physically and psychologically.

At what cost? A youth forever lost, families that never existed, mothers and fathers who lost their daughters and sons, wives who lost their husbands, children who lost their parents, and a nation that put its next generation at risk. Such is the price of war, but also of freedom.

[English]

Thus, we made a pact with these veterans that when they came home, we would help them make up for lost time, we would bind up their wounds and we would help them start over. By and large, Canadians and their successive governments have done a pretty good job in keeping that promise. Over the years, veterans' benefits in Canada have become known as among the best in the world.

[Translation]

For example, if a veteran or a military on duty is injured or becomes sick as a result of his service, he is eligible for a disability pension. Wartime veterans who, as they get older, see their income go down, are entitled to a veteran's allowance. Many others can get help and remain in their homes as long as possible, thanks to the benefits provided under the Veterans Independence Program. Many more receive medical benefits that supplement the benefits provided under provincial programs, and they also have access to beds in extended care facilities when they can no longer continue to live at home.

These are just of a few of the basic programs that have been in effect for many years, and that continue to provide essential services to very special Canadians.

On the eve a new century, it is with sadness and resignation that we watch more and more war veterans leave us for a better world. The average age of those still alive will soon be 80. Their needs are changing. This is partly why Bill C-61 must be passed quickly. Through its provisions, the bill recognizes the passage of time and its consequences on the veterans and on those who survive them.

I would now like to look at certain specific features of the bill. Veterans' widows who might be eligible for increases in their survivor's pension will be among the principal beneficiaries of this bill. Once the bill is passed, the Pensions Act will be amended so as to allow survivors to apply for an increase in their pension if they feel that their spouse's disability, at the time of his death, should have received a higher rating. This provision might make it possible for thousands of widows to spend their old age in greater comfort. This is only a small token of our interest in their well-being. In fact, the Royal Canadian Legion strongly urged us to make this amendment, and we are happy to comply.

Passage of this bill will also benefit former prisoners of war. As they grow older and their health deteriorates, former prisoners of war can now receive an allowance to help them with personal care. In addition, veterans in this category who meet the criteria will be eligible for an exceptional incapacity allowance if they become extremely disabled with the passage of time and the onset of debilitating diseases. The amount of such allowances will be based on the degree of incapacity and the impact on their quality of life. Previously, these allowances were given only to veterans already receiving a disability pension. We are pleased to provide these benefits to former prisoners of war. This measure is a response to a priority request from the National Council of Veteran Associations.

[Senator Gill]

Once Bill C-61 is passed, merchant navy veterans will be covered by the legislation applying to Armed Forces veterans. We are thus responding to the request of these very special citizens who wished to be recognized in name and in law as the equals of their brothers and sisters in other branches of the forces.

There are other changes with less impact, or with an impact on fewer veterans than the ones I have referred to. The changes are not minor, however, to those directly affected by them. The bill includes provisions for allied veterans living abroad, improvements to the administration of the Veterans Appeal Board — the appeal and review process, which would be more efficiently run — changes to the funeral and burial program, and continuation of the assistance to some survivors of the 1917 Halifax Explosion.

[English]

•(1510)

It is a sad fact of life that we send our very young off to war — wars not of their choosing or making. Nonetheless, throughout this century, off they went with high hearts and hopes for a speedy victory and a return to life and their beloved homeland.

[Translation]

For many of them, this was not to be the case. We must continue to honour their sacrifice and to remember them by keeping the promise made with them so long ago, the promise to look after those who served our country so valiantly, those who risked their lives that subsequent generations of Canadians might live free and in peace.

This is why I have said right from the start that it is only fair for the bill to be passed promptly, for it maintains our tradition of doing our best for our heroic veterans. I would therefore encourage all honourable senators to examine Bill C-61 with the utmost care. The sooner the bill is passed, the sooner the benefits it covers can be provided to the veterans and their survivors.

This is the least we can do, and it is what we must do.

[English]

Hon. Orville H. Phillips: Honourable senators, I should like to thank Senator Gill for his introduction and congratulate him on the excellent job he did in his first speech in this place. A very commendable effort, sir!

In participating in the debate today, I should like to point out to you that this is the last time that I will be dealing with a piece of veterans legislation in this chamber. That, in itself, is a very important milestone for me.

It is also, honourable senators, a continuation of the leap of faith that the Parliament of Canada took in 1994, when the government of the day asked Parliament to revise and reconstitute the method of applying for disability pensions. There was a long lineup requiring a considerable length of time to complete the process. The new process was adopted and the

number of cases waiting adjudication has been almost eliminated. I think our leap of faith was justified. I agree that the new legislation is the way to go and that we have done a very good job in that regard.

However, about this time last week I was commenting on the subcommittee on Veterans Affairs report entitled "Raising the Bar." We urged the department to ensure that, in streamlining their effort to meet a time line, they deal with such cases carefully and with compassion.

The new legislation is an omnibus bill. It brings forward a number of changes. The first change is the full recognition of the seamen of the Merchant Navy as veterans and their subsequent integration into all veterans legislation.

Another change allows surviving spouses and dependent children to have veterans' pensions amended after the death of the veteran if an additional entitlement should have been made or was in the process of being made. Previously, the award had to be in the amount of 48 per cent before this could be done. Now, it can be done at any level of award.

The Veterans Review and Appeal Board is allowing its chair to delegate persons who can decide whether or not a final appeal should be heard. I will have more to say on that later.

Changes are also being made, as Senator Gill mentioned, to allow former prisoners of war to receive extra allowances covering the cost of health care.

Another amendment is that the veterans who are resident outside of Canada will be allowed to continue drawing War Veterans Allowance. The act of 1996 was supposed to have terminated that benefit but the government has allowed it to continue. I will have certain questions about that matter at committee stage.

In the legislation, the Minister of Veterans Affairs assumes the right to make the regulations regarding grave markers, cost of burial and last sickness. When I read that clause, I wondered what relationship exists between it and the Last Post Fund. There, again, we will probably get the answer to that question in committee.

While most of these changes are positive, I have a number of issues that I should like to raise in the subcommittee — that is, provided the bill is referred to the subcommittee, and I anticipate that it will be. I am happy, as are most veterans and the public in general, to see that the seamen of the Merchant Navy have been given finally the status of full veterans. They have had the service, title and recognition for more than 50 years, as they endured equal or greater exposure to danger as many of the personnel who served in other branches of the Armed Forces.

Honourable senators are familiar with the hunger strike and the demand for compensation from two merchant seamen due to the fact that they were excluded from benefits granted at the end of the war. It is rather interesting to realize that this was almost a deliberate exclusion, because at that time the government of the

day and the Minister of Transport felt that if they could keep these merchant seamen in their trade, we would be able to maintain a Merchant Navy. They say this was the reason for the exclusion. That plan was ill conceived and did not succeed, and the seamen of the Merchant Navy have been asking for compensation ever since.

The various veterans groups support this legislation, and there is an understanding among the veterans groups that negotiations to arrive at a scheme for compensation will continue between the government and the merchant seamen's organization.

•(1520)

I should like to make two suggestions, honourable senators. The first would be an annuity paid to the surviving merchant seamen. I am not an actuary, nor am I very familiar with formulating annuities. However, I have phoned people who are qualified in this regard and I would like to make a suggestion, the one that was most commonly made in answer to my inquiries. My suggestion is that the government take \$100 million, set it aside and invest it in a fund. If the return on the investment were 6 per cent, that would provide a return of \$6 million annually. Since there are about 3,000 surviving merchant seamen, this would provide them with an annuity of \$2,000 per year.

That figure of \$6 million may seem high to some, but I will point out, as Senator Gill has mentioned, the average veteran is now 80 years of age, so their numbers will soon start declining rapidly and the annual bill of \$6 million a year will not stay at that level for very long. When there is no further need for the annuities, the \$100 million that has been set aside is still there and intact. I am not suggesting, honourable senators, that \$2,000 per annum would be the correct amount. I merely use it as a suggestion and an attempt to explain the idea of the annuity.

My other suggestion is that all the surviving merchant seamen receive a small pension to make them eligible for VIP treatment. As honourable senators will recall, in our report entitled "Raising the Bar," we suggested that the 160,000 Canadians who served overseas and received no disability pension be made eligible for VIP-like treatment. This would put those two groups on an equal footing.

Before leaving the question of compensation, it is my hope that both parties can enter into negotiations on the compensation to be made to Merchant Navy seamen in good faith and arrive at an early and satisfactory solution to the problem.

The other amendments, such as the changes for survivors' pensions and the provision of pensions to civilians, such as salt-water fishers in World War II and the war-blinded from the Halifax explosion, are sensible amendments and need no great comment.

When the previous amendment was made in 1994, I asked the government of the day to ensure that no one would receive less under the new system than they did under the old. Since this bill provides for certain civilian payments to be transferred into the veterans' fund, I ask the same thing, that no one suffer as a result of that transfer.

I do have some concerns about the bill, honourable senators, that I would like to discuss briefly. The first is the partial exclusion of individuals who served in the ferry command. These were mostly civilians who flew the bombers from Canada to Europe. They are included on the same basis as the Merchant Navy seamen were formerly included; that is, their injuries had to be as a result of enemy action or responding to enemy action.

Honourable senators, navigation was rather crude in the first part of the war and it was necessary to maintain radio silence. Quite often the aircraft would arrive over England, run into cloud or smog, and a navigator could say, "Well, we are over England but you have to find a place to land." Often it was a wheels-up belly landing, and I do not think that could be attributed to enemy action. I hope that they will not have to wait and fight for 50 years as the merchant mariners have done.

The bill also calls for changes to the operation of the Veterans Review and Appeal Board. Last week, I commented on that board. I will not repeat my comments at this time. The VRAB is asking for three changes. The first is a power to schedule hearings at the convenience of the applicant and the board; formerly it was at the convenience of the applicant. Discretion will have to be used there.

The Veterans Review and Appeal Board does not have a deputy chair. Bill C-61 will allow the chair of the board to designate any one member of the board to make decisions concerning whether or not an appeal will be allowed. I would point out that, in its brief to the Standing Committee on National Defence and Veterans Affairs in the House of Commons last fall, the Royal Canadian Legion stated that this refusal has occurred at least 800 to 900 times at the decision of the chairman of the board.

The amendment allows him, as chairman, to designate any one member to make such decisions. It probably will not occur, but under this legislation, it is quite possible for the individual who sat at the review process to be the one who will now say, "We are not going to hear the final stage because there is not a reasonable chance of passing and receiving an award."

These are what I would call bureaucratic amendments. That is, I feel they are more for the benefit of the bureaucrats than for the veterans. When I see that type of amendment, I am always suspicious, and therefore, recommend that you follow that proposal closely.

•(1530)

Clause 23 introduces a provision for a Merchant Navy veteran to make a sworn statement that he was injured or disabled in some way when making a pension application, provided he can show that the ship was in the area in which he says it was. In effect, this recognizes the benefit of the doubt. However, I should like to see other veterans have that same right to make a sworn statement and have it accepted as evidence. In many cases, it is almost impossible to say that they were knocked down by an

exploding shell in Northeast Europe or blown out of a jeep in Italy, or that they contacted a disease in the Far East. Again, I emphasize that medical records were not that accurate in World War II, and the medical officers were too busy to keep accurate records.

Honourable senators, I hope that you will continue an interest in this subject, and I hope that we will have an opportunity to examine the bill. In Senator Graham's answer to a question today concerning the progress of the negotiations, he said that the committee would be a good place to bring up such a question. I ask him to have whoever appears as the government witness present an update report on the standing of those negotiations.

With that, honourable senators, I look forward to the bill being referred to the subcommittee, where we can receive replies to many of these questions.

The Hon. the Speaker: If no other honourable senator wishes to speak, is it your pleasure, honourable senators, to adopt the motion?

Motion agreed to and bill read second time.

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

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

Hon. Lowell Murray: Honourable senators, I think the disposition of the members of the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology would be to refer the bill to our excellent and highly respected Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs, chaired by Senator Phillips. We will be meeting at ten o'clock on Tuesday morning, and our first order of business will be to take up a motion to that effect?

On motion of Senator Carstairs, bill referred to the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology.

FOREIGN PUBLISHERS ADVERTISING SERVICES BILL

SECOND READING—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government) moved the second reading of Bill C-55, respecting advertising services supplied by foreign periodical publishers.

He said: Honourable senators, I wish to begin my remarks by recalling a little bit of history. The first magazine to be published in Canada appeared, I am proud to say, in Nova Scotia. It was called the *Nova Scotia Magazine*, and I happen to have a copy of Volume 3 of that publication going back to 1790. Thanks to my staff and the Library of Parliament, they were able to turn up a copy of this magazine. It was entitled, *Nova Scotia Magazine and Comprehensive Review of Literature, Politics and News*,

being a collection of the most valuable articles which appeared in the periodical publications of Great Britain, Ireland and America, with various pieces in verse and prose never before published. This is Volume 3 for July, August, September, October, November and December 1790. It was printed by John Howe, the father of the great and famous Joseph Howe. John Howe's printing shop was located at the corner of Barrington and Sackville Streets in Halifax.

Honourable senators, this magazine was read by some 200 subscribers. Sadly, it was forced to fold after just three years. The reasons: high publishing costs, a small domestic audience and the marketing power of far more established publications imported from abroad.

Honourable senators, as you can see, the difficulties faced by the magazine industry in Canada today are not new, but the importance of this industry to Canada today is as great, if not greater, than ever before. Indeed, for many decades Canadian governments of different political stripes have worked hard to establish policies that will help our magazine industry to thrive. Members of this chamber have been particularly engaged in the challenge of trying to ensure a continued vital magazine industry in our country.

Honourable senators, I should like to read a passage from a Senate committee report that captures the value of this industry to Canadians:

Magazines are special. Magazines constitute the only national press we possess in Canada. Magazines add a journalistic dimension which no other medium can provide — depth and wholeness and texture, plus the visual impact of graphic design. Magazines, because of their freedom from daily deadlines, can aspire to a level of excellence that is seldom attainable in other media. Magazines, in a different way from any other medium, can help foster in Canadians a sense of themselves. In terms of cultural survival, magazines could potentially be as important as railroads, airlines, national broadcasting networks, and national hockey leagues. But Canadian magazines are in trouble. The industry may not be dying, but it is certainly not growing. There are very few Canadian-owned consumer magazines that can claim, with any degree of certainty, that their survival is assured. And, if a number of long-established magazines are staring extinction in the face, it is becoming increasingly unlikely that new ones can be launched to replace them.

Honourable senators, those words were written in December 1970, almost 30 years ago, in the report of the Special Senate Committee on Mass Media, chaired by our former colleague the Honourable Keith Davey.

•(1540)

Ten years before that, in 1961, the O'Leary Royal Commission on Publications, chaired by another former colleague in this chamber, Senator Gratton O'Leary, described communications like magazines as:

...the thread which binds together the fibres of our nation. They can protect a nation's values and encourage their practice. They can make democratic government possible and better government probable. They can soften sectional asperities and bring honourable compromises. They can inform and educate in the arts, the sciences and commerce. They can help market a nation's products and promote its material wealth. In these functions it may be claimed — claimed without much challenge — that the communications of a nation are as vital to its life as its defences, and should receive at least as great a measure of national protection.

Honourable senators, our magazines today fulfil our high expectations. They challenge Canadians to think critically about who we are and where we are going as a nation. They tell us the big stories. They tell us the small stories.

Our new territory, Nunavut, is featured in the current issue of *Canadian Living*, a magazine with a circulation of 0.5 million. The same issue takes readers on a cross-Canada railway trip, and it tells Canadians, whether they live in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick or Quebec, about Mary Krupa in Kelowna, British Columbia, who mobilized hundreds of volunteers last summer to help bring peregrine falcons back to British Columbia's Okanagan valley.

Our magazines nurture and develop our writers and our editors. Some of our more distinguished writers honed their skills writing for Canadian magazines. Our writers and editors are among the most highly regarded in the world.

Honourable senators, we have a vibrant, if fragile, magazine industry in this country today. In 1956, there were 661 periodicals published in Canada. Less than 25 per cent of all magazines circulating in Canada at that time were Canadian. Today, over 1,500 Canadian magazines are produced by more than 1,000 publishers. Over 65 per cent of all magazines circulating in Canada today are Canadian.

Unfortunately, having satisfied readers does not guarantee success in the magazine industry. Survival depends on the sale of advertising services, not the sale of the magazines. Canadian publishers depend on advertising revenue for anywhere from 65 to 100 per cent of their income. It is this advertising revenue, the lifeblood of our magazine industry, that is now at risk. It is this threat that Bill C-55 would address.

Let me emphasize that we have the most open cultural market in the world. The bill before us would not change that state of affairs. More than 80 per cent of the magazines on our newsstands are foreign, and 95 per cent of those are American. The sale of American magazines in Canada represents the largest export of magazines to a single country in the world. Nothing in Bill C-55 would in any way try to stop this. Canada will remain open to magazines from countries around the world, including south of the border. The free flow of ideas across national borders is enriching and important. This should, and will, continue unabated.

Our magazine industry is, however, threatened by foreign publishers who would sell discounted advertising services directed at the Canadian market to Canadian advertisers. Let me elaborate.

In the Canadian market, one page of advertising generally covers the cost of producing one page of original Canadian content. As we are all aware, there is a limited pool of Canadian advertisers who buy advertising services from magazine publishers. American magazine publishers benefit from economies of scale that are unimaginable and unattainable for Canadian publishers. Because American print-runs are so much higher than ours, their unit production costs are lower.

When they then take a magazine whose production costs have already been covered by their U.S. advertising revenues and re-issue essentially the same magazine to the Canadian market, they can afford to offer advertising at discounted prices to Canadian advertisers. Even if they add a small amount of Canadian content, the advertising revenue required to pay for that content is simply not comparable to that required by a Canadian magazine to pay for a whole issue of original Canadian content which includes editors, writers, photographers, and a host of others.

Honourable senators, the magazine industry in Canada is not a very profitable industry. Indeed, approximately half of Canadian magazines do not make a profit. In 1997, there were 90 new magazine launches in Canada, and 31 magazines closed that year. It is a difficult industry at the best of times. It is simply not realistic to expect our magazine publishers to compete with American publishers for Canadian advertising services when the American publishers do not bear the same costs.

If, indeed, we wish to ensure the continued viability of our magazine industry, then we must ensure continued access to revenues from the sale of advertising services. That is exactly what Bill C-55 would do. Bill C-55 would prohibit foreign publishers from supplying advertising services directed at the Canadian market to a Canadian advertiser. It would not prohibit sales of advertising services directed at other markets.

For example, nothing would prevent a Canadian advertiser from advertising in a foreign publication directed at the U.S., North American, or worldwide markets. The bill will, however, ensure that Canadian publishers continue to have access to Canadian advertisers for advertising services directed at the Canadian market.

The act would be enforced in several ways. First, if the minister becomes aware of an alleged breach of the act, or that a breach is about to occur, the minister may send a letter to the foreign publisher demanding that the contravention stop or the transaction not be completed. This can then be followed with a civil action to enjoin the foreign publisher from contravening the act.

In the event that this is not sufficient to deter foreign publishers from contravening the act, the legislation also

provides for criminal prosecution. The penalties that may be imposed range from \$20,000 for individuals prosecuted on summary conviction for a first offence under the act to \$250,000 for a corporation prosecuted on indictment. On conviction, the court may also impose a fine equal to the amount of any monetary benefit obtained as a result of committing the offence. This would be in addition to any other penalty.

•(1550)

The bill contains clauses providing for investigative authority and ensuring that publishers do not try to evade their obligations by committing prohibited acts outside of Canada. The definitions and obligations are similarly carefully structured so that third parties are not used to avoid the prohibitions of the bill.

Let me emphasize that there are several foreign publications which have for many years been publishing Canadian editions of foreign magazines. I emphasize that it is not this government's intention to now suddenly change the rules for these magazines which have coexisted peaceably for a long time in the Canadian market. These magazines have been grandfathered under the bill. Indeed, there was some question about the extent of the grandfathering in the bill as originally drafted. An amendment was passed in committee in the other place to make it absolutely clear that foreign publishers will be permitted to continue and expand their businesses within the confines of publications already operating in the Canadian market.

Honourable senators, I wish to address briefly some of the international trade concerns that have been raised about the bill. As honourable senators know, in October 1997, the World Trade Organization ruled that the customs and excise taxes levied on split-run periodicals contravened the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The WTO panel was very clear in its decision that it was not in any way challenging the policy objectives of the Canadian government in seeking to protect our cultural identity. The difficulty was with the particular instrument chosen to implement that policy.

The Government of Canada has fully complied with the WTO ruling. It has removed the segments of the Excise Tax Act and Customs Tariff dealing with split-run publications. It has restructured the delivery of postal subsidies, and it has harmonized domestic and international postal subsidies.

Bill C-55 is completely distinct from the legislation addressed by the WTO. The bill deals with advertising services which would fall under the General Agreement on Trade in Services, not the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The provisions of Bill C-55 are consistent with Canada's obligations under the General Agreement on Trade in Services. They are also, of course, consistent with our obligations under NAFTA.

Honourable senators, the Canadian magazine industry is a critical part of the cultural fabric of our country. Bill C-55 establishes a fair and effective framework to ensure that Canadian magazine publishers continue to have access to the advertising revenues that they need to survive. It will guarantee

that only Canadian publishers can sell advertising services aimed at the Canadian market, except for those who have been grandfathered. It will put in place tough, appropriate penalties for foreign publishers who contravene the act.

I am pleased to add that this bill has received the support of all but one of the political parties in the other place.

For example, Mr. Scott Brison, the member for Kings—Hants in the other place, stressed the importance of this legislation and described how it would send a clear message to everyone that we are determined to protect our cultural sovereignty in the face of ever-increasing global pressures.

Members of the New Democratic Party and the Bloc Québécois also expressed their strong support for the bill. The Reform Party has been alone in opposing it.

Honourable senators, I believe Bill C-55 is a balanced and effective response to an urgent need by a critical Canadian industry and I hope that you will join me in supporting this bill.

Hon. John B. Stewart: Honourable senators, I wish to ask Senator Graham whether he is convinced that the purpose of maintaining cultural identity will be accepted by the WTO as a valid basis for the distinction which this bill will make.

Senator Graham: Yes, absolutely.

Hon. Lowell Murray: Honourable senators, Senator Stewart's question suggests a supplementary one. I understood that Canada had offered to go to the WTO with this bill for determination and that the United States had resisted. Is that offer still on the table?

Senator Graham: There have been ongoing negotiations between Canada and the United States, as my honourable friend knows. It was the intention of the government not to hold up the bill but to proceed with it. If such an opening were provided and the Government of the United States decided they would like to have this measure examined by the WTO, it would be up to the Government of Canada to respond. However, at this time, it is the intention of the government to proceed with the bill as it currently stands.

Senator Murray: Honourable senators, until the Leader of the Government gave that answer, he had not, and the government had not, volunteered so much as a syllable about the negotiations which appear to be going on between Canada and the United States. I congratulate my friend on a very cogent and comprehensive speech, but I believe that was a glaring omission in his speech, given that these negotiations may, at any time, overtake this bill.

What can the minister tell us about the state of play of those negotiations at present?

Senator Graham: Honourable senators, the negotiations are not ongoing as we speak. I know that last week there were negotiations at a very high level. I am not aware that negotiations are continuing at the present, but I would be happy to make an

inquiry and bring that information forward. Certainly we shall get firsthand information when the bill goes to committee.

Senator Murray: Is the honourable senator telling us that there are no further meetings planned, so far as he knows?

Senator Graham: There are none that I am aware of.

Senator Murray: Who has been in charge of these negotiations? I am led to believe, by the media, that the delegation is headed by the deputy ministers of Canadian Heritage and International Trade.

Senator Graham: That is correct, to my understanding.

Senator Murray: Who is in charge?

Senator Graham: The minister responsible for the bill is the Minister of Canadian Heritage. Obviously, there are implications for the Minister of Trade. As Senator Murray indicated, both deputy ministers have been involved in negotiations with their counterparts in the United States.

•(1600)

Senator Murray: Who provided the mandate to those negotiators?

Senator Graham: Quite obviously, they are acting under the direction of both ministers.

Senator Murray: Can the minister say what issues are being discussed in those negotiations?

Senator Graham: The issues are undoubtedly the concerns by the United States that American magazines will be treated unfairly. That is not the case, I believe, as I elucidated in my remarks. The magazines that have already been doing business and selling advertising in Canada prior to the introduction of the bill in the other place would be free to continue as they have been.

I wish to emphasize that Canada has played by the rules. In August of last year, Canada complied completely with all aspects of the World Trade Organization ruling on periodicals. We acted to repeal the tariff code. We moved to amend the Excise Tax Act. We altered the administration on postal subsidies and we lowered the postal rate for foreign magazines.

Hon. John Lynch-Staunton (Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, I have a supplementary question to the last exchange. I listened carefully to the minister's speech and his strong endorsement of the bill and his assertion that it now abides by the WTO ruling.

Am I to understand that the government is satisfied with the bill as presently written and will not bring any amendments to it before the committee or at third reading?

Senator Graham: That is my understanding as I speak today.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: As we speak today and as we speak next week, we hope to speak about the same thing. If the government has in mind amendments to be brought forward which change the whole complexion of the bill, any debate we have between now and then may not be very profitable.

Senator Graham: Honourable senators, I am not aware of any amendments that are contemplated at the present time.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: I should have thought that a government bill presented at second reading would come without any thought of a government amendment. Otherwise what is it doing here? Has there ever been a government bill which has come to this chamber from the other place where the sponsoring minister cannot tell us that no amendments are planned or intended?

Senator Graham: I just said we have no amendments planned nor are any amendments intended.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: Honourable senators, the sponsoring minister in the other place has told us to expect amendments to the bill here. Unfortunately, the minister sponsoring the bill here cannot or will not confirm that.

Senator Graham: I cannot confirm it because no decision of that nature has been taken.

Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Acting Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, at second reading we debate the principle of the bill. We just heard there are ongoing negotiations on the matter with our friends to the south. Which principle of the bill is non-negotiable and which principle of the bill is part of the ongoing negotiation?

Senator Graham: Honourable senators, the negotiations that I alluded to took place in previous weeks. I am not aware that there are any negotiations going on at the present time.

[Translation]

Hon. Roch Bolduc: Honourable senators, am I to take it that the government has made up its mind? Regardless of pressures by the steel, textile or some other industry, has the decision been made to go ahead with the bill? Is that the government's decision?

[English]

Senator Graham: Honourable senators, I said no matter what pressures are applied. Is the opposition not listening?

Senator Lynch-Staunton: The government will not give in?

Senator Graham: I am the sponsor of the bill and, as far as I am concerned, the bill stands as it is. It is open to my honourable friends opposite at any time, either in committee or at third reading, to move amendments. That is their prerogative.

[Translation]

Senator Bolduc: We are not talking here about our amendments but about yours, and that is the difference.

Regardless of what could be termed the U.S. blackmail relating to steel and other industries, has the government decided to go ahead with the bill?

[English]

Senator Lynch-Staunton: Honourable senators, the Minister of Canadian Heritage was on *As It Happens* last night. She said she thought it would take four to six weeks for the bill to get through this chamber. She said negotiations, if not going on now, would continue. The point of the negotiations must be that the United States and Canada are trying to come to a compromise or an understanding. If that takes place, then the bill will be affected accordingly.

Senator Graham: That might be wonderful.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: Honourable senators, I do not know if that would be so wonderful. Will we cave in to the Americans again? If you call that wonderful, then, yes, you are probably right. Why are we negotiating then if we are satisfied with the bill? What are we negotiating?

Senator Grafstein: This is a chamber of second sober thought.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: Give us something to think about.

Senator Kinsella: Honourable senators, my question to the minister in presenting the bill is this: Is he telling us that there are no principles that are negotiable in this bill or that there are some that might be negotiable?

Senator Graham: Honourable senators, listen carefully. The principles enunciated in this bill are to preserve Canadian culture and to give Canadian magazines, their writers and their editors, a chance to ply their trade and to tell us more about what being Canadian really means. That is the principle behind the bill.

Canada is acting fully consistently within our trade obligations. Officials for the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade have made those points clearly to their counterparts in the United States. We are fully confident that this bill encompasses all the necessary tools and, indeed, the necessary compromises that were suggested as a result of previous legislation that had been introduced. We see no reason why our American friends would not be happy with this legislation.

Senator Kinsella: Honourable senators, to the minister again, my colleagues on this side are the strongest defenders of Canadian culture. Indeed, that is why we made efforts when we were in government to have that file left out of the free trade agreements. There is no question on that as far as our position is concerned.

We are trying to understand the government's position. You have come in here with a piece of legislation and told us that something is under negotiation. I wish to know, is the principle of the bill non-negotiable?

Senator Graham: The principle of the bill is not under negotiation with our American friends.

Hon. Mira Spivak: Honourable senators, imagine a situation in which the bill is approved. It will come into force, I presume, in four to six weeks. There have been many different versions of this bill.

To what extent can our American friends, if they wish to do so, retaliate in terms of trade?

Senator Graham: Honourable senators, I can see no reason for the United States to retaliate. As I said earlier, Canada is acting fully and consistently within our international trade obligations. We have played by the rules. If the United States, in the final analysis, dislikes the provisions of the bill, then it can turn to the international dispute settlement procedure. That is how such disagreements are addressed, not by retaliation.

•(1610)

Senator Spivak: Many statements have been made at the highest level with the trade representatives that there will be retaliations.

I certainly support what you are saying as a perfectly logical course. However, that course is not what has been suggested. Besides which, we have heard from various representatives of the publishing industry who say that Time Warner is not content with 98 per cent of the market; they want 100 per cent of the market. They are exercising their influence.

What I am asking you is: Should there be retaliation? Under the trade laws, what is the extent of that retaliation? In the press, they are talking about billions of dollars. I do not believe that is accurate. Could the Minister provide us with some understanding of what sort of retaliation the Americans could undertake?

Senator Graham: That is a hypothetical question, in the sense that I could not forecast what type of retaliation would be undertaken.

It is important for us to understand, as Canadians and as senators, that we must stand up for our country. We can only be bullied so far. Enough is enough! Let us get on with business and support this piece of legislation.

Senator Stewart: If I may ask a question, members of the opposition seem to be asking for a guarantee that the government will not bring forward amendments in committee. Surely, that is a guarantee that no one can give.

As Senator Kinsella has said, Bill C-55 has a principle. An independent senator, for example, would not be blocked from bringing forward in committee, if that senator were a member of the committee, an amendment consistent with the principle of the bill. At this stage of the bill's progress, it seems unreasonable to ask anyone in the house to post a bond that they will not bring forward an amendment. That is my first point.

With regard to American behaviour, Senator Spivak's question seems to imply that if Parliament enacts this bill, and subsequently it is challenged in the World Trade Organization, and the World Trade Organization upholds the Canadian position, that the United States will suddenly throw aside the rule of law. Is this not a serious presumption?

I say "serious" because if it is valid, then surely every American commitment to either the GATT in the old days or the World Trade Organization now means nothing. Can we operate in a world market for goods and services if that is a valid presumption?

Senator Graham: If that question were posed to me, I would say "no."

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, a question may only be asked of the person who has made the speech. Therefore, the question must be addressed to the Leader of the Government.

Senator Murray: Honourable senators, I have a question for the Leader of the Government, inspired by the tenor of his last response.

The minister urged us very eloquently to proceed with this bill. I wish to know what the government's hope and expectation is with regard to this bill. One assumes that it will proceed to committee next week. Would the government hope and expect to have it disposed of and granted Royal Assent before Easter, for example?

Senator Graham: I would anticipate that the bill would be handled in the normal course of events. I understand that the Leader of the Opposition would like to speak and respond perhaps next week. The Leader of the Opposition has just indicated that he is quite ready, and perhaps he may proceed to speak today. Other honourable senators may wish to speak on the bill, and then it will be moved to the appropriate committee.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: Honourable senators, I should like to have some clarification. We have heard the Leader of the Government tell us very eloquently to stand up for Canada, to resist the bullying from those horrible people across the border, let us get on with this bill, we believe in it, it meets all the tests of our international agreements, et cetera.

Senator Murray asks whether we might pass this bill before Easter. In response to his question, he is told that there is no rush. Why is there no rush? There are negotiations ongoing, or which may start again. What are those negotiations about? What exactly are Canada and the United States negotiating which may have an impact on this bill? These negotiations are occurring behind closed doors. In other words, Parliament, which is responsible for passing legislation, is waiting for closed-door negotiations taking place in Washington before determining the final features of this bill. It is unheard of, at least since I have been here, to have a bill sent to us with the unwritten understanding that negotiations with another country will determine its final content.

The question is, honourable senators, what are the negotiations on that will determine changes to this bill?

Senator Graham: There are always negotiations, conversations and discussions that go on between the two friendliest allies in the world.

It is not without precedent that when a bill has reached this place, of very careful and sober second thought, that senators on both sides have enlightened the government and amendments have been brought forward.

It is not my intention, as the sponsor of this bill or as the Leader of the Government in the Senate, to introduce any amendments. I am not aware that it is the intention of the government, at this time, to suggest amendments.

I am merely saying that we have due process in this place, and due process will be followed. The Leader of the Opposition and any other honourable senators in the chamber who wish to address this important legislation may do so. Unless the Honourable Senator Lynch-Staunton wishes to put this proposed legislation on a fast track and move it to committee quickly. We would be most cooperative in that regard on this side, I assure honourable senators.

On motion of Senator Lynch-Staunton, debate adjourned.

•(1620)

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 Tkachuk, P.C.*)

Hon. David Tkachuk: Honourable senators, first, I wish to thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak over the period of two days.

I ended my remarks yesterday on the question of Employment Insurance premiums. I mentioned that the 3 per cent federal surtax was removed by the Minister of Finance at a cost of some \$1.5 billion. That 3 per cent federal surtax was not a surtax on everyone; it was imposed on a special group of people depending upon their income.

The Minister of Finance has said that he will use the surplus in the EI account to provide tax benefits to other Canadians. He removed the 3 per cent federal surtax and, at the same time, charged workers and companies close to \$5 billion per year in EI premiums. That, in effect, amounts to a surtax on workers and companies. I say that because it applies to a special group. Not everyone pays EI premiums. Farmers and self-employed business people do not pay EI premiums. Yet, everyone except people who work received the 3 per cent reduction in the federal surtax.

That tax, as a progressive tax, treats Canadians differently. As well, those who pay EI premiums are treated differently. The results of this type of tax treatment to which we have been exposed will be catastrophic.

Technology in the global village has not only increased the speed and flow of information, it has also increased the freedom of people to choose where they will live and where they do business. It matters less today where you work and from where you sell your product. This means people in business will go to where it is most economically advantageous. This is not a good thing for the country. It means that the best educated people will be the first to leave, leaving those who have more difficulty making their way in the country without the benefits provided by entrepreneurs, creative people and those who, technically, are looking forward to the next century.

This is something which has been talked about for a number of years. In an article in *Maclean's* magazine to which I referred earlier, it was stated that the OECD has warned that high Canadian taxes could tempt firms and skilled workers to relocate south. Ottawa is well aware of the potential risk, the OECD stated.

Statistics Canada told *Maclean's* that the number of people leaving the country is anywhere from 12,000 to 20,000 per year, including highly trained engineers and high-tech workers. That is in addition to the approximately 9,770 workers who permanently emigrated in 1996, giving notice of their intention never to come back. In return, we gained 3,500 U.S. citizens out of a population of 300 million. Microsoft has a standing offer of employment for every graduate from the computer science program at the University of Waterloo, 80 per cent of whom leave Canada every year.

Mr. Desmarais, a Quebec businessman and a close friend of the Prime Minister, I am sure, said recently:

Intelligent and ambitious Canadians have no choice but to immigrate to the U.S. because Canadian taxes are exorbitant.

He asked: "Can you blame them?"

He points out that this is a brain drain, as well as a drain of potential income for Canada. He said that when the government is too greedy, people find other solutions.

Vancouver businessman Jim Pattison, in a March 16 article in the *National Post*, was quoted as having said that high taxes drive Canada's best and brightest to the United States:

It's a big and growing problem. We're just not competitive with tax rates...

Good people are leaving the country. It's the people that are making the investment decisions, the people who are creating the jobsthat we're chasing out of town.

Mr. Bryden, the President of the Ottawa senators, has lobbied hard to show that taxes and the low Canadian dollar are killing professional sports, namely, hockey in Canada. Taxes. He has spoken about real estate taxes. His 1998 tax assessment was \$4.5 million. He appealed that assessment. Yesterday, he received a response from the government which purports to increase the assessment to \$7.2 million. He has pointed out that retail sales taxes and entertainment taxes cost his team \$5.6 million, while the GST costs him \$5 million. The highway surcharge levied on his team is \$2.1 million. Large corporation and capital taxes cost him \$1.1 million. The team's non-residential withholding taxes amount to \$450,000.

The majority of the other teams in the NHL pay no sales tax or very little. All U.S. teams combined paid \$2.2 million in capital and real estate taxes last year, which means all of them combined paid a lot less than he paid on his own stadium. It is no wonder that businesses are leaving the country.

We talked earlier today about culture and writers and how we will protect Canadian magazines. Yet, we are losing entertainers, artists and athletes to the United States and Great Britain. In the 1970s, people wanted to leave Great Britain. Now, people want to move there because the taxes are lower than they are in Canada.

While we struggle with ineffective tax subsidies and tax breaks, we are losing these people to the United States. We are losing their most important assets — their money and their presence. When Shania Twain takes up residence in the United States, we will be losing an artist who fills the Corel Centre two nights in a row.

I do not blame these people for moving from Canada. They are doing so because it costs them millions of dollars extra to live here. It is not that they do not want to live here. In this new environment that we have, it is just as easy to do business living in Canada as it is living in the United States. All our extremely talented actors, directors and producers who can make it in the big leagues all take up residence in the United States for the same reason.

Yet, here we are, arguing about a 3 per cent surtax and small minimum tax breaks for people. People are having a difficult time. Our savings are going down. There is no money left over.

•(1630)

We consider a salary of \$60,000 a year to be a high income, and we tax it at a rate of 50 per cent. In the United States, a high income is \$200,000. Why is it considered a high income? Because it is a high income, whereas \$60,000 is not. That is the level at which they are taxed at 50 per cent, and that is U.S. dollars. We wonder why we have a problem with productivity and we wonder why we have a problem with savings. Our savings rate is one-half of what it is in the United States. That will affect productivity and small business.

All I can say to end this speech — because it is at an end — is that while we spend a billion dollars trying to save the CBC, we will lose professional hockey in Canada. Professional hockey inspires young Canadians all over Canada — men and women — to play hockey. There is nothing that binds our country together more than that game — that wonderful game that we play on ice, on ponds and creeks and rivers and in stadiums all across the country. I will take that game over every CBC station in Canada, because that game is important to the country. It will be easy to watch it because CTV will run it.

TSN has a greater cultural influence on this country than the CBC does. They broadcast junior games, they broadcast university games. They — not the CBC — give us culture. They give us all the sports that CBC has ignored over the years. Our young people are shown much more often on stations that are private in nature than on the stations that we subsidize by \$1 billion. Junior hockey could never get on the CBC, but it is on TSN. University volleyball and hockey are on the sports networks, not on CBC.

Frankly, honourable senators, I do not think any Canadian will miss the CBC.

Paul Martin has given us a budget in which we should be highly disappointed, and we should be extremely concerned about what our taxes and our tax system are doing to the country. We should be very concerned for our young people — our children and our grandchildren — and we should take some action so that they can succeed and find a career in Canada and not have to go south of the border or across the ocean.

Hon. John B. Stewart: Honourable senators, I said yesterday that I had some points that I wished to have clarified by Senator Tkachuk. They add up to three.

Let me start with a relatively minor one. He said yesterday — and he said it again today — that the fact that the savings rate in Canada is low is evidence that taxes are too high in Canada, with the result that Canadians are leaving Canada for the United States. However, is it not true that the savings rate in the United States is at an all-time low? Does this mean that taxes are too high in the U.S.? If saving rates are so low in Canada, why is it that people are going to the United States where the savings rates apparently are even lower?

Senator Tkachuk: Honourable senators, the savings rate in the United States is twice ours. I do not expect that our saving rate will be higher than before, because our interest rate is lower, and that is a good thing. At the same time, our present savings rate in Canada is one-half of what it is in the United States. I did not give that as a reason, as Senator Stewart implied, for why people are leaving the country. I think savings are a strong economic indicator because the rate shows whether people have some cash left over to put aside for the future, so that people can borrow and banks can exist and all of those goods things that go along with multiples can happen. Our savings rate is one-half of what it is in the United States. That is all I said. I did not give it as a reason as to why people are leaving the country.

Senator Stewart: I wish to have, at a convenient opportunity, the honourable senator's documentation on the actual rates. He seems to be saying that the savings rate in Canada is low because people do not have money. Perhaps some are spending the money they have on vacations in Florida, just to take a minor example. I do not know that the savings rate is all that conclusive, even as one item of evidence.

Let me go to my second question, honourable senators.

Again and again in his speech yesterday, the honourable senator complained about high taxes of various kinds in Canada, such as gasoline taxes, et cetera. Let us stick to the federal taxes. If we keep the deficit under control and thus the debt under control, which of the major spending programs will the honourable senator abolish? For example, will the honourable senator get rid of equalization? I am from Nova Scotia; we rely greatly on equalization. The honourable senator is from Saskatchewan; which I gather is not dependent on equalization. What about medicare? That is to go, presumably, as well as assistance for post-secondary education. I shall stop with those three. What is the other side? Where will the honourable senator make the savings which will permit your drastic cut in taxes?

Senator Tkachuk: Honourable senators, a number of years ago, I published a list of government departments, along with grants and subsidies, that I would like to see abolished. I also thought there could be great reductions in the civil service. Some of those actions have taken place under this government, and it seems to have been at no great pain to the country. However, I do not believe that a reduction in taxes means a decrease in revenue. In the United States, President Kennedy showed that, when he decreased taxes, he increased revenue. President Ronald Reagan decreased taxes and greatly increased revenue in the United States. When President Bush increased taxes during a recession, it exacerbated the recession. I do not buy the Liberal argument that the cash taken from a government till disappears. It goes into peoples' pockets. That cash still remains in the country and contributes to the gross domestic product, where it is more efficiently spent than if it were transferred to the government and spent somewhere else.

Senator Stewart: The honourable senator seems to be saying that the deficit in the United States has gone down more rapidly than the deficit in Canada, and that the debt in the United States has been reduced at a more rapid rate than in Canada. Is that the implication of your trickle-down argument?

Senator Tkachuk: Honourable senators, I am not implying anything except that taxes are too high. People are voting with their feet. They are leaving the country. That is a concern for parliamentarians, for parents, and for people throughout the country. Why are people leaving the country? Are they leaving the country because they are hoping to find a better place to live? I do not believe so. They are leaving for economic reasons, and part of that is the fact that we have some of the highest taxes in the western economies.

Senator Stewart: Surely, the honourable senator will admit that those in certain forms of endeavour will be attracted to

centres with major populations and with established traditions. For example, I suspect that a Canadian actor might very well be attracted to Hollywood, or that someone interested in theatre might well be attracted to London. We have a country that is sparsely populated, and I do not think it surprising that people who want to play in "the big league" should go to the centres of the big league. The honourable senator seems to think that is wrong, but that is not why I rose this third time.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable Senator Stewart, we are getting into a debate. Can we have direct questions, please.

•(1640)

Senator Stewart: Honourable senators, I have one further question.

When we talk about the debt, should we not take the inflation of past years into account? It used to be that governments, regardless of their stripe, would run up debt intending to monetize it — in other words, to melt it down, as ice cream melts down, by inflation. We work to eliminate inflation, but that has made it more difficult for governments, whether in Canada or the United States, to deal with their debts. Inevitably in that situation there will be difficulty. I did not hear my honourable friend mention that point. He mentioned many, so perhaps I should not hold him accountable on this one. However, in his analysis, he ought to take into consideration that very serious point.

Senator Tkachuk: Honourable senators, I could have spoken for 90 minutes on this issue, but I was only given 15 minutes. By the kind consideration of the Senate, I was given a little more time. I could have addressed all of these problems.

I am not an economist. All I know is that the province of Alberta has the lowest taxes in Canada. The province of Saskatchewan has some of the highest taxes in Canada. Saskatchewan lost 4,000 jobs last year, while the province of Alberta gained 50,000 net jobs. The province of Manitoba, which has lower taxes, gained 20,000 jobs. The province of Ontario, which a number of years ago was a basket case under the NDP and Liberal administrations, is now one of the strongest economies and is a net gainer when it comes to jobs. I think there is a lesson there for the federal government and for Paul Martin, and they should have a look at it.

Hon. Pierre De Bané: Honourable senators, my friend is very much struck by the fact that some Canadians, between 15,000 to 20,000 — particularly university graduates — migrate to the United States every year. However, he does not seem to be struck by the fact that roughly the same number of American university graduates migrate to Canada. That movement occurs in both directions.

Senator Stewart said that we can reduce taxes in Canada, but what programs would you cut? He suggested that the honourable senator's province does not benefit from equalization payments. Well, it does. I see on that side of the chamber my good friend Senator Simard, a former minister of finance for

New Brunswick, who can explain to you the importance of that concept. I also see on that side of the chamber my colleague Senator Keon, one of the most competent cardiac surgeons in North America. He was offered millions to practice his profession in the United States. He said, "No, I wish to work in Canada." There are other values that make our society stick together.

My honourable friend's point is well taken — we must have a system that encourages personal initiative and creates a more human society with central values.

Senator Tkachuk: Honourable senators, I went through all of the taxes we have and made fun of some of them. I tried to show how deep the tax knife has cut into the salaries of Canadian citizens.

People talk about human values and the values of Canadians. I do not disagree with those values. I love this country, and that is why I am speaking here today. I do not wish to disassemble the country. However, I think a little differently. Liberals seem to speak as if the money belongs to the government. I speak of that money as belonging to the people of Canada, and it should always be justified as to why it is being removed from the pockets of Canadians and spent somewhere else. When taxes take 50 per cent of a \$59,000 salary, it is time for governments to justify why they are removing so much income from the people of Canada. It is most unfair.

Hon. Nicholas W. Taylor: Honourable senators, I should like to ask my honourable friend a question with respect to his voodoo economics, which I found hard to follow, except that he does not tax the rich. He seems to be saying that we should get our money from the poor because they do not know what to do with the money anyhow.

I was interested in his statement that hockey is a great thing and should be subsidized; the CBC is bad and should not be subsidized. However, he watches everything on TSN, which is an American network broadcasting our national game. My honourable friend is quite happy with that. My friend then mentioned that he would be in favour of letting CTV cover hockey.

Does my honourable friend opposite believe that the law should be changed in such a way that Americans could buy out CTV to be like TSN so that we could then watch our subsidized hockey games?

Senator Tkachuk: Honourable senators, I missed all of that. Not only did the honourable senator make up a whole bunch of stuff about my speech, things I did not say, I did not understand his question.

Senator Taylor, we have to go west soon.

Senator Taylor: Honourable senators, I could repeat my question, but I have a hunch my colleague would miss it the second time, too.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Maurice Simard: Honourable senators, when the Minister of Finance, the Honourable Paul Martin, first indicated that the federal government had finally eliminated the budget deficit, he also suggested that the government would no longer return to its profligate ways and no longer pursue the policies that produced decades of debt accumulation. If only he were right.

The 1999 federal budget is, in many ways, a return to past practices. What the minister had done, however, is to create a screen masking that turnabout. Never before have federal budgets lacked transparency as this one does. And as we all know, once transparency is lost, accountability will fall by the wayside as well.

One of the features of the budget the federal government is congratulating itself on is its prudent economic forecasts, its establishment of a contingency reserve. What was once viewed as a measure of caution, is now viewed cynically as "cooking of the books" to enable the minister to hide the true state of government finances and a way by which he can manipulate the net effect of the budget to suit the government's needs.

Honourable senators, as you will have noticed, I am having difficulty speaking, only temporarily I hope. As agreed by the leadership of the two political parties in this house, I would invite my colleague from New Brunswick, Senator Kinsella, to finish reading my text.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, under the circumstances Senator Simard has spoken to me about, Senator Kinsella, with the consent of the Senate, may continue the speech. Is leave granted honourable senators?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Acting Deputy Leader of the Opposition — speaking on behalf of Hon. Senator Simard): Honourable senators, we all know that even though the minister predicts a balanced budget for the next fiscal year, there will be a surplus of some \$8 billion to \$10 billion — no one is fooled any more. Unfortunately, he uses the budget as an opportunity to squander the better part of any surplus to be able to demonstrate the accuracy of his previous budgetary projections.

The economy of New Brunswick, like that of the rest of Atlantic Canada, has tended to lag behind that of the rest of Canada. This remains true today. According to a study by the economic research service of the Bank of Montreal, New Brunswick's cumulative economic growth for the period between 1998 and 2000 should lag behind that of all of Canada by two full percentage points. Based on the 1998 GDP, this is a loss of \$360 million in output. Compared to that of Ontario, the economic forecast for New Brunswick is much more sombre. After three years, the gap in economic growth is expected to reach 4.6 per cent. As a result of this, New Brunswick's unemployment rate will not fall below 11.4 per cent, even in the year 2000. In the year 2000, the unemployment rate is expected to be about 44 per cent greater than the national average, as it is today.

More significantly, however, is the conclusion by the bank that the population of New Brunswick is in decline, for the first time since the Second World War. Demographic conditions are not expected to improve significantly in the near future.

In many respects, these demographic conditions are an indication of poor economic health and pessimism as to the province's future. New Brunswickers are leaving the province because they see better opportunities elsewhere. Canadians outside the province and people outside the country are not being attracted to New Brunswick.

And despite the efforts of local business and the provincial government, roadblocks are being placed in the way of policies designed to counter this negative perception. What might such roadblocks be?

The primary roadblock to economic growth and development is the tax system. Economic growth is fed by innovation, and innovation is an inherently risky endeavour. The tax system is unfriendly to risk taking. Not only do we have high rates of personal income taxes in Canada — they consume 30 per cent in GDP more than they do in the United States, our major competitor for goods and services, capital and labour — our capital gains tax rate has been increased steadily throughout the past decade. In the 1980s, 50 per cent of capital gains were included in income for the purposes of taxation, as opposed to 75 per cent today. This means that the capital gains tax facing entrepreneurs and innovators is almost double that in the United States. Yet it is precisely this entrepreneurial spirit and innovative activity that is vital to provinces like New Brunswick. It is one thing to talk about the success of McCain Foods and the \$750 million expansion to the Saint John refinery by Irving Oil, but how many similar projects have been stifled by the high tax policy of the federal government?

Provinces such as New Brunswick, with relatively weak tax potential, will always have tax rates above the average. However, they need not be excessive. What makes the New Brunswick tax rate excessive is the high level of federal tax. Let us have a look at some reasons for this.

The first place to look is the role of inflation on the tax system. While the tax system is partially indexed, providing protection against general price increases in excess of 3 per cent per year, with our low rates of inflation since 1992, the personal income tax system has been effectively de-indexed. Even low rates of inflation provide the federal government with large sums every year. According to the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), partial indexation since 1988 has caused the effective federal tax rate to increase by 13 per cent. It has trebled the average tax rate for those with incomes below \$10,000 per year and has increased the average tax rate by one-third for those earning between \$10,000 and \$25,000 per year. It pushed 1.4 million low-income individuals onto the tax roles and pushed 1.9 million individuals from the lowest tax bracket into the middle bracket. At 26 per cent federal rate, this middle bracket has a marginal tax rate which

is virtually the same as that for the highest income-earning Canadians — 29 per cent.

[English]

•(1650)

This lack of full indexation is a veritable gold mine for the federal government. It is today receiving in excess of \$8 billion per year from this stealth tax.

The government has, of course, taken some steps to ease the tax burden on Canadians. It has raised the amount of income that individuals and families can earn before paying tax and has argued that these increases in the basic personal and spousal credits are greater than that which a restoration of indexation would have produced. While this is true, the government fails to tell the whole story. Its initiatives go only part way to offsetting the impact of inflation on the tax system, leaving unaffected the thresholds at which higher tax brackets take effect.

[Translation]

It is this stealth tax that hinders job creation and keeps all of Canada, but particularly the poorer regions, from achieving their full potential. Moreover, the fact that the tax cutting initiatives announced in this budget do not take effect until July 1, 1999, suggests a grudging recognition that high taxes are a problem. In addition, the CPP reforms brought in a year ago, coupled with the excessively slow reduction in EI premiums have the combined impact of increasing the cost of hiring new workers. And the fact that both taxes have a disproportionately large effect on lower-wage workers, means that the negative effects will affect Atlantic Canada to a greater extent than the rest of the country.

[English]

While the government continues to make life more difficult for the people of the Maritimes, what do we hear but voices suggesting that professional sports teams with franchises in Canada be given preferential tax treatment? This amounts to demanding that the people of the Maritimes pay for the upkeep of teams of millionaires in Ottawa, Toronto and elsewhere. That is insane.

There are those, including Mr. Rod Bryden, owner of the Ottawa Senators, who say that professional teams are simply asking to be given the same treatment as other industries that benefit from tax brakes. Before they start comparing themselves to the industrial sector, the people in professional sports should think about the fact that industries create jobs, control their expenditures, and control their employees' salaries.

•(1700)

I have researched this issue thoroughly. I have read a number of reports, including the report by the parliamentary committee chaired by Mr. Dennis Mills. I do think the question deserves to be discussed in greater depth to determine what role, if any,

government should play with regard to professional sport. For example, I am not necessarily opposed to the idea of a municipality taking special measures to attract a team if it deems that the spinoffs from the team's presence are worth it.

However, the federal government must certainly not give in to pressure from lobbyists without knowing more about the whole question, at a time when it is still dragging its feet on solving the underlying problems of Canada's economy, in particular, the historic disadvantage suffered by the economy and people of the Maritimes.

[Translation]

It is one thing to reform the employment insurance system to make it more efficient and save money. However, when the government fails to reduce EI premiums in line with reduced program costs, it is merely exploiting a program designed to assist workers so as to provide itself with more fiscal room to manoeuvre. As Mr. Yvon Godin, the Member of Parliament from Acadie—Bathurst put so well, the government has converted a trust fund into a slush fund. A witness to his inquiry said it all:

The government is wrong when it says that ... workers become dependent on Unemployment Insurance. It's rather the Minister of Finance, Paul Martin, who is dependent on the Unemployment Insurance fund, because without it, the deficit would still be there, and his budget would show a deficit and not a surplus.

Now in excess of \$20 billion, the EI Account continues to grow unjustifiably, simply because the government has become addicted to the revenue that this program brings in every year. As Mr. Godin again points out, more EI money is going into the surplus than is going into the hands of unemployed workers in this country. Surely, no one could argue that this is the purpose for which the program was created.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate MPs Yvon Godin and Angela Vautour of the New Democratic Party for the efforts they are making to defend their fellow citizens in New Brunswick.

[English]

If we really want some day to solve the economic problems faced in this part of the country, it is absolutely essential that all political parties, all levels of government, businesses and unions work together.

I wish to propose the holding of a Maritimes economic summit that would bring together all stakeholders in a search for comprehensive and sustainable solutions to the region's socio-economic problems. Together we can find such solutions.

[Translation]

As I said earlier, taxes in New Brunswick are high in large measure because the federal component is high. Provincial taxes are also higher than they should be because of the significant

decline in federal transfers to the provinces, which need to be compensated for by either higher provincial transfers or lower program spending. Much is made, for example of this budget's \$11.5 billion increase in transfers for health care and the higher equalization entitlements that were announced in the budget. Yet even with all this, the provinces will still be receiving far less in transfers in the future than they did in the past. In 1993-94, for example, New Brunswick received \$760 million in EPF and CAP entitlements. In 2003-04, it will receive only \$746 million under the CHST. And if we look only at the cash component, of these transfers, that province will receive in 2003-04, 28 per cent less than it received in 1993-94.

It is vital that a national government provide a commitment to economic growth and development for the entire nation. This government has failed to do that. It has imposed an enormous burden on the Atlantic region through its deficit cutting measures. And as the federal government has withdrawn from its leadership role, it has failed to provide the provincial governments with the tools with which they could undertake this role instead. This is truly ironic. In 1993, this region delivered all but one seat to the Liberal Party. The region was repaid by an economic betrayal in which the federal government withdrew hundreds of millions of dollars from the region, failed to provide any measures to develop the region and denied local governments the means by which they could address their economic malaise.

[English]

The federal government is misusing the concept of prudent budgeting to the extent that Canadians no longer know the true state of the government's fiscal position. More important, however, the process that the government is following, designed to minimize the surplus at the end of any fiscal year, is distorting the government's priorities, leading to bad economic policy.

In a sense, the Minister of Finance has become the ultimate bureaucrat. We have heard all the stories about government departments, flush with cash near the end of a fiscal year, that struggle to spend the funds knowing that, if they do not, they will lose access to those funds. Bureaucrats spend money inefficiently and unwisely and in ways that do not support the public policy goals which they are supposed to advance. In effect, they spend money because they have the money to spend.

The minister is doing precisely the same thing, but he is doing it with sums that free-spending bureaucrats could only dream of. Last year, he added \$5.5 billion in one-time spending programs to keep the surplus at \$3.5 billion. He did so by booking \$2.5 billion for the Canada Millennium Scholarship Foundation; \$800 million for hepatitis C victims; \$350 million for the Aboriginal Healing Strategy; and \$1.8 billion with respect to change to accounting practices for assistance to international financial institutions.

This year he is doing the same. He added a total of \$4.2 billion in one-time spending to the 1999 budget for the fiscal year 1998-99. This is comprised of \$3.5 billion for the CHST supplement, which is to be disbursed to the provinces in this

fiscal year. To that, he added \$200 million for the Canada Foundation for Innovation; \$200 million for other health initiatives; \$200 million for international assistance; and \$100 million in other spending.

Prior to the budget, the government announced another \$1 billion in spending: \$400 million for the Canadian Fisheries Adjustment and Restructuring Program and \$600 million for the Agricultural Income Disaster Assistance Program.

Some of these may be good programs but their need and efficacy are not the driving force behind them. Instead, it is their impact on the budget's bottom line that matters most. These one-time measures average more than \$5 billion per year. They are designed specifically to erode fairly substantial pre-budget surpluses, even though the ultimate disbursement of funds to individuals, institutions or provinces may not take place for several years.

As the C.D. Howe Institute notes, the tendency to employ this kind of one-time initiative to lower the reported surplus has the effect of biasing initiatives against tax cuts and into program spending and, in particular, into program spending of the type that can be delivered through some sort of foundation or fund.

Decisions are being made not on the basis of good policy but on the basis of what will produce the desired accounting result. Surely, this is not a recipe for good policy.

•⁽¹⁷¹⁰⁾

In conclusion, honourable senators, Mr. Martin tells anyone who will listen that he and the Chrétien government have made hard choices in planning the country's finances. He is quite right. The Chrétien government made the choice to waste \$1 billion of taxpayers' money on the Pearson airport fiasco. It made the choice to impose gun control legislation at a cost of \$300 million, and climbing, when it was predicted to cost no more than \$60 million. It made the choice to cancel the contract for new helicopters on purely partisan and vote-getting grounds, and then decided to purchase the same helicopters after all. Disguised thereby, squandering millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money, the government made the choice to reduce its deficit by looting \$20 billion from the Employment Insurance Fund. Yes, this government has made choices all right.

[*Translation*]

By nature, state budgets are political documents. However, more important, they are designed to dictate the thrust of government policies, which should be aimed at improving the well-being of our citizens and our society.

However, the government in place increasingly politicizes the budget process and makes decisions not aimed at improving the

well-being of Canadians, but at achieving the budget results that the minister would like to see. This is why we have a deficit reduction program that does not take into account the impact that it may have on the poorest regions of the country. We also find ourselves with an employment insurance program that puts more money into the government's coffers than into the pockets of the unemployed. We have a government that commissioned a major study on Canada's corporate tax system, only to shelve it because it does not provide the answers that it expected. We have a government that works very hard at playing fast and loose with the financial books, so as to get the results that it seeks.

Honourable senators, we are on the eve of a new millennium and a new budget landscape is taking shape. Chronic indebtedness is, fortunately, a thing of the past. Yet, if we look at the government's attitude, we can only conclude that it is once again very tempted to implement policies such as those which led us to the budget problems that we are all aware of.

On motion of Senator Carstairs, for Senator Graham, debate adjourned.

[*English*]

ASIA-PACIFIC REGION

REPORT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE ON STUDY—
INQUIRY—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the inquiry of the Honourable Senator Stewart calling the attention of the Senate to the eighth report of the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs entitled: "Crisis in Asia: Implications for the Region, Canada and the World."—(*Honourable Senator Andreychuk*)

Hon. Mabel M. DeWare: Honourable senators, as we are coming down to the wire on inquiry No. 50, I should like to say that this inquiry on the eighth report of the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs entitled: "Crisis in Asia: Implications for the Region, Canada and the World," is important at this time. We have another speaker who would like to speak to it. I should like to have the order stand in the name of Senator Andreychuk.

The Hon. the Speaker: Is it your pleasure, honourable senators, to adopt the motion?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

CANADA'S POLICY AND INTERESTS IN RUSSIA, UKRAINE
AND THE CASPIAN SEA REGION—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 Canada's policy and interests in Russia, Ukraine and the Caspian Sea region;

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 should like to ask His Honour to delete paragraphs 2 and 3 of the proposed motion. Subject to the deletion of those two paragraphs, I move the motion.

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

That the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs be authorized to examine and report on Canada's policy and interests in Russia, Ukraine and the Caspian Sea region;

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.

The Hon. the Speaker: Is it your pleasure, honourable senators, to adopt the motion?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

The Senate adjourned until Tuesday, March 23, 1999, at 2 p.m.

**THE SENATE OF CANADA
PROGRESS OF LEGISLATION
(1st Session, 36th Parliament)
Thursday, March 18, 1999**

**GOVERNMENT BILLS
(SENATE)**

No.	Title	1st	2nd	Committee	Report	Amend.	3rd	R.A.	Chap.
S-2	An Act to amend the Canadian Transportation Accident Investigation and Safety Board Act and to make a consequential amendment to another Act (Sen. Graham)	97/09/30	97/10/21	Transport and Communications	98/04/02	four	98/05/27	98/06/18	20/98
S-3	An Act to amend the Pension Benefits Standards Act, 1985 and the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions Act (Sen. Graham)	97/09/30	97/10/21	Banking, Trade and Commerce	97/11/05	seven	97/11/20	98/06/11	12/98
S-4	An Act to amend the Canada Shipping Act (maritime liability) (Sen. Graham)	97/10/08	97/10/22	Transport and Communications	97/12/12	three	97/12/16	98/05/12	06/98
S-5	An Act to amend the Canada Evidence Act and the Criminal Code in respect of persons with disabilities, to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act in respect of persons with disabilities and other matters and to make consequential amendments to other Acts (Sen. Graham)	97/10/09	97/10/29	Legal and Constitutional Affairs	97/12/04	one	97/12/11 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 pre-clear 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	99/03/16			
GOVERNMENT BILLS (HOUSE OF COMMONS)										
No.	Title	1st	2nd	Committee	Report	Amend.	3rd	R.A.	Chap.	
C-2	An Act to establish the Canada Pension Plan Investment Board and to amend the Canada Pension Plan and the Old Age Security Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts	97/12/04	97/12/16	Committee of the whole 97/12/17	97/12/17	none	97/12/18	97/12/18	40/97	
C-3	An Act respecting DNA identification and to make consequential amendments to the Criminal Code and other Acts	98/09/30	98/10/22	Legal and Constitutional Affairs	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 amending and repealing other Acts as a consequence	97/12/09	98/03/26	Transport and Communications	98/05/13	none	98/05/28	98/06/11	10/98	

C-10	An Act to implement a convention between Canada and Sweden, a convention between Canada and the Republic of Lithuania, a convention between Canada and the Republic of Kazakhstan, a convention between Canada and the Republic of Iceland and a convention between Canada and the Kingdom of Denmark for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income and to amend the Canada-Netherlands Income Tax Convention Act, 1986 and the Canada-United States Tax Convention Act, 1984	97/12/02	97/12/08	Banking, Trade and Commerce	97/12/09	none	97/12/10	97/12/10	38/97
C-11	An Act respecting the imposition of duties of customs and other charges, to give effect to the International Convention on the Harmonized Commodity Description and Coding System, to provide relief against the imposition of certain duties of customs or other charges, to provide for other related matters and to amend or repeal certain Acts in consequence thereof.	97/11/19	97/11/27	Banking, Trade and Commerce	97/12/04	none	97/12/08	97/12/08	36/97
C-12	An Act to amend the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Superannuation Act	98/04/28	98/04/30	Social Affairs, Science & Technology	98/06/04	none	98/06/08	98/06/11	11/98
C-13	An Act to amend the Parliament of Canada Act	97/10/30	97/11/05	Legal and Constitutional Affairs	97/11/06	none	97/11/18	97/11/27	32/97
C-15	An Act to amend the Canada Shipping Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts	98/05/05	98/06/03	Transport and Communications	98/06/10	none	98/06/11	98/06/11	16/98
C-16	An Act to amend the Criminal Code and the Interpretation Act (powers to arrest and enter dwellings)	97/11/18	97/12/11	Legal and Constitutional Affairs	97/12/16	none	97/12/17	97/12/18	39/97
C-17	An Act to amend the Telecommunications Act and the Teleglobe Canada Reorganization and Divestiture Act	97/12/09	98/02/24	Transport and Communications	98/03/25	none	98/04/29	98/05/12	08/98
C-18	An Act to amend the Customs Act and the Criminal Code	98/02/10	98/02/18	Legal and Constitutional Affairs	98/04/02	none	98/04/28	98/05/12	07/98
C-19	An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code (Part I) and the Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts	98/05/26	98/06/08	Social Affairs, Science & Technology	98/06/18	none	98/06/18	98/06/18	26/98
C-20	An Act to amend the Competition Act and to make consequential and related amendments to other Acts	98/09/24	98/11/17	Banking, Trade and Commerce	98/12/03	none + two at 3rd	98/12/10 <i>Commons amendments referred to Committee 99/02/11</i>	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	99/02/16 <i>concur in Commons amendments</i>	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 Tuktoyaktuk National Park)	98/06/15	98/06/17	Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources	98/12/01	none	98/12/10	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	98/06/10	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	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	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	99/03/18	none				
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	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	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	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	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	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	98/12/10	36/98
C-55	An Act respecting advertising services supplied by foreign periodical publishers	99/03/16								
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	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	99/03/17	none	99/03/18			
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	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	98/12/10	40/98

C-61	An Act to amend the War Veterans Allowance Act, the Pension Act, the Merchant Navy Veteran and Civilian War-related Benefits Act, the Department of Veterans Affairs Act, the Veterans Review and Appeal Board Act and the Halifax Relief Commission Pension Continuation Act and to amend certain other Acts in consequence thereof	99/03/16	99/03/18	Social Affairs, Science & Technology
C-65	An Act to amend the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act	99/03/11	99/03/16	National Finance
C-73	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	99/03/17		
C-74	An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of Canada for the financial year ending March 31, 2000	99/03/17		

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	99/03/16		
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 pursuant to Rule 27(3)	98/10/01	

S-10	An Act to amend the Excise Tax Act (Sen. Di Nino)	97/12/03	98/03/19	Social Affairs, Science & Technology	98/06/03	none	referred back to Committee 98/09/24
S-11	An Act to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act in order to add social condition as a prohibited ground of discrimination (Sen. Cohen)	97/12/10	98/03/17	Legal and Constitutional Affairs	98/12/09 98/06/04	one 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 98/12/02</i>
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 98/12/08</i>
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. Forrester)	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					
S-27	An Act to amend the Canada Elections Act (hours of polling at by-elections) (Sen. Lynch-Staunton)	99/03/16					

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	98/12/03 three 98/12/09
S-25	An Act respecting the Certified General Accountants Association of Canada (Sen. Kirby)	99/03/04			

CONTENTS

Thursday, March 18, 1999

	PAGE		PAGE
SENATORS' STATEMENTS		Senator Murray	2832
International Francophonie Day		Senator Di Nino	2833
Senator Poulin	2828	National Defence	
Senator Comeau	2828	Accumulation of Unpaid Bills—Shortfall in Army Budget Due to Expenditures for Disaster Relief—Government Position.	
Human Rights		Senator Forrestall	2833
International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination.		Senator Graham	2833
Senator Oliver	2828	Canadian Forces Budget Shortfalls—Request for Answers to Order Paper Questions. Senator Forrestall	2833
Senator Butts	2829	Senator Graham	2833
Senator Di Nino	2829	Human Rights	
International Year of Older Persons		International Convention for Elimination of Racial Discrimination—Possibility of Intervention on Behalf of Dissidents in Cuba—Government Position. Senator Andreychuk	2833
Senator Ferretti Barth	2830	Senator Graham	2834
Senator Kinsella	2830	Improvement of Situation of Democracy in East Timor—Role of Government. Senator Di Nino	2834
<hr/>		Senator Graham	2834
ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS		Religious Freedom in Tibet Under Chinese Occupation—Government Position. Senator Di Nino	2834
Canada Customs and Revenue Agency Bill (Bill C-43)		Senator Graham	2834
Report of Committee. Senator Stratton	2830	Veterans Affairs	
Adjournment		Compensation Package for Merchant Marine Veterans—Government Position. Senator DeWare	2834
Senator Carstairs	2831	Senator Graham	2835
Foreign Affairs		Industry	
Notice of Motion to Authorize Committee to Study Changing Mandate of North Atlantic Treaty Organization.		Remarks of Minister on Problems with Productivity—Government Position. Senator Oliver	2835
Senator Lynch-Staunton	2831	Senator Graham	2835
Africa		Delayed Answer to Oral Question	
State Visit of Governor General to Ivory Coast, Tanzania, Mali and Morocco—Notice of Inquiry. Senator Corbin	2831	Senator Carstairs	2835
Role of Canadian Judicial Council		Human Rights	
Media Comments—Notice of Inquiry. Senator Cools	2831	Report of U.S. State Department on Record of Various Countries—Mention of Incidents of Arrests in Vancouver and Treatment of Aboriginals—Government Position. Question by Senator Kinsella.	
International Criminal Tribunal For Former Yugoslavia and Rwanda		Senator Carstairs (Delayed Answer)	2835
Stance of Madame Justice Louise Arbour—Notice of Inquiry.		Answers to Order Paper Questions Tabled	
Senator Cools	2832	Prime Minister's Office and Privy Council Office—Number of Officials Who Received Public Service Bonuses.	
International Position in Communications		Senator Carstairs	2836
Notice of Motion to Authorize Transport and Communications Committee to Extend Date of Final Report on Study.		Treasury Board—Scope of Public Service Bonuses Paid to Public Servants. Senator Carstairs	2836
Senator Forrestall	2832	National Finance—Canadian Forces Superannuation Account—Reasons for Appropriation—Government Position.	
<hr/>		Senator Carstairs	2836
QUESTION PERIOD		Treasury Board—Scope and Magnitude of Public Service Performance Pay and Bilingual Bonuses Paid for 1995-96 and 1996-97. Senator Carstairs	2836
National Finance			
Canada Customs and Revenue Agency Bill—Cost of Speech-Writing in Support of Legislation—Application of Goods and Services Tax—Position of Chairman. Senator Kinsella	2832		
Senator Graham	2832		
Senator Stratton	2832		

	PAGE		PAGE
Visitors in the Gallery		Senator Murray	2843
The Hon. the Speaker	2836	Senator Lynch-Staunton	2843
<hr/>			
ORDERS OF THE DAY		Senator Kinsella	2844
Railway Safety Act (Bill C-58)		Senator Bolduc	2844
Bill to Amend—Third Reading, Senator Poulin	2836	Senator Spivak	2845
War Veterans Allowance ACT		The Budget 1999	
Pension Act		Statement of Minister of Finance—Inquiry—Debate Continued.	
Merchant Navy Veteran and Civilian		Senator Tkachuk	2846
War-related Benefits Act		Senator Stewart	2847
Department of Veterans Affairs Act		Senator De Bané	2848
Veterans Review and Appeal Board Act		Senator Taylor	2849
Halifax Relief Commission Pension		Senator Simard	2849
Continuation Act (Bill C-61)		Senator Kinsella	2849
Bill to Amend—Second Reading, Senator Gill	2837	Asia-Pacific Region	
Senator Phillips	2838	Report of Foreign Affairs Committee on Study—Inquiry—	
Referred to Committee.	2840	Debate Continued, Senator DeWare	2852
Senator Murray	2840	Foreign Affairs	
Foreign Publishers Advertising Services Bill (Bill C-55)		Canada's Policy and Interests in Russia, Ukraine and the	
Second Reading—Debate Adjourned, Senator Graham	2840	Caspian Sea Region—Committee Authorized to Study—	
Senator Stewart	2843	Notice of Motion Amended, Senator DeWare	2853
		Progress of Legislation	i



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