



# Debates of the Senate

---

1st SESSION

•

36th PARLIAMENT

•

VOLUME 137

•

NUMBER 126

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Tuesday, April 13, 1999**

---

**THE HONOURABLE GILDAS L. MOLGAT  
SPEAKER**

This issue contains the latest listing of Officers of the Senate, the Ministry,  
Senators and Members of the Senate and Joint Committees.

## 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

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

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

Prayers.

[*Translation*]

- (1410)

### THE LATE HONOURABLE PAUL DAVID

#### TRIBUTES

**Hon. John Lynch-Staunton (Leader of the Opposition):** Honourable senators, I wish to offer a final tribute to Paul David, who sat in this chamber from 1985 to 1994. His funeral last Thursday was attended by hundreds of relatives and friends, colleagues and acquaintances, all of whom considered it a privilege to have known him.

His appointment to the Senate, the first Quebecer appointed by Prime Minister Mulroney, was a surprise to many people, for obvious reasons. It did not, however, take long for his qualities to be recognized, among them a lively intelligence, which Mr. Mulroney had come to know as a member of the board of the Montreal Heart Institute.

That institute is the great accomplishment of Paul David, who as a medical student and young physician was quick to realize that advances in cardiology held promise for a better life.

#### BUSINESS OF THE SENATE

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable senator Lynch-Staunton, pardon me for interrupting, but can the interpreters hear us?

[*English*]

Honourable senators, the technicians are now in the interpretation booth, but I do not have a precise statement as to what the problem is. If you are agreeable, perhaps we should wait another five minutes. If by that time the problem is not resolved, then I will suggest that we suspend the sitting to the call of the Chair.

#### VISITORS IN THE GALLERY

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable senators, I should like to introduce to you some special guests in our gallery. I am sorry that I cannot introduce them in the normal way, but we have a sound problem.

Honourable senators, in our gallery is a delegation of speakers and deputy speakers from nine legislatures of northern Russia. The delegation is led by Mr. Vladimir A. Torloпов.

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

**Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear!

The sitting of the Senate was suspended.

- (1510)

The sitting of the Senate was resumed.

[*Translation*]

### THE LATE HONOURABLE PAUL DAVID

#### TRIBUTES

**Hon. John Lynch-Staunton (Leader of the Opposition):** Honourable senators, I wish to offer a final tribute to Paul David, who sat in this chamber from 1985 to 1994. His funeral last Thursday was attended by hundreds of relatives and friends, colleagues and acquaintances, all of whom considered it a privilege to have known him.

His appointment to the Senate, the first Quebecer appointed by Prime Minister Mulroney, was a surprise to many people, for obvious reasons. It did not, however, take long for his qualities to be recognized, among them a lively intelligence, which Mr. Mulroney had come to know as a member of the board of the Montreal Heart Institute.

That institute is the great accomplishment of Paul David, who as a medical student and young physician was quick to realize that advances in cardiology held promise for a better life, a longer life.

The history of the institute, from its modest beginnings in 1954 as a unit attached to the Hôpital Maisonneuve-Rosemont in Montreal to the present day, is a tribute to the determination and tenacity of this man. Today, the institute is recognized as one of the leading centres of its type in the world, and it attracts hundreds of researchers and physicians from all over.

[*English*]

As a senator, he served as Chairman of the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology, and was an active member of a number of other committees. His interventions in this place were listened to with special attention, as he always spoke as a deeply religious person, a dedicated physician, and a committed believer in the family, principles that influenced him throughout his life.

To his loving wife, Yvette, and to his family, as well as the countless to whom he brought so much comfort and care, I offer my deepest sympathy.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Lise Bacon:** Honourable senators, on behalf of my colleagues, I would like to take a few minutes to pay tribute to Dr. Paul David. Last week, the Senate lost one of its illustrious members. A number of you learned of the death of a friend you had the privilege of knowing for many years. However, beyond the suffering and the sadness it caused his family and members of our institution, Dr. David's death left all of Quebec and Canada in mourning.

April 5 1999 marked the passing of the father of Quebec cardiology. Inexorably, disease carried off one of the pioneers of medicine in Quebec and Canada. With his demise, Quebec and Canada lost a great man. Dr. David was one of the regrettably few exceptional people who through their will and their action leave a mark time cannot erase.

After studying in Montreal, Boston and Paris, Paul David started his practice at the Notre-Dame hospital in Montreal in 1948. He had barely begun his career when he established the Montreal Heart Institute in 1954, a risky bet since cardiology was just in its infancy. Dr. David had the ambition, tenacity and will to succeed where most others would fail. The institute quickly became one of the jewels of Canadian medicine and was imitated throughout the world. It was at the Montreal Heart Institute that, in 1968, Canada's first heart transplant took place.

However, Dr. David was not only the founder of the institute, he was its soul. Here are the words of Dr. Raymond Carignan, the current director general of the Institute on the day Dr. David died, and I quote:

He had the ability to get people to go further and to be the best internationally, in research or other fields. If our cardiologists and surgeons are demanding and want to be the best, it is thanks to Dr. David.

Dr. David could be proud of the Montreal Heart Institute, which employs 1,300 people and treats 8,000 patients annually. Each year, 11,550 people use its emergency services and over 30,000 outpatients are seen.

Dr. David pursued his mission by creating the Canadian and Quebec Heart Foundations. His dedicated work and international reputation brought him many honours. In 1981, he became a Companion of the Order of Canada and, in 1998, a grand officier de l'Ordre national du Québec.

Dr. David also led his fight against suffering and disease beyond Canada's borders. As chairman of the board for Cardinal Léger's leper institute, Dr. David supported research to overcome this terrible disease.

Dr. David was a very gifted researcher and administrator who did not hesitate to take a public stand to protect the integrity of

health care. He was the first one to condemn the salaries and working conditions of nursing staff in hospitals, and he also strongly criticized the bureaucratization of the health system, which threatened the quality of care provided to patients.

Even after the serious stroke he suffered in 1992, which left him partly paralysed and aphasic, Dr. David did not let the disease get the better of him. I want to quote the moving words spoken by his daughter, Thérèse, at his funeral:

Your greatest victory was overcoming the difficulties of the past seven years. You were paralysed and unable to speak, but you communicated with your eyes and hands. I discovered a new man.

Through his passion and his work, Dr. David helped improve our lives in a concrete manner. Canada and particularly Quebec will dearly miss this great humanist.

I offer my sincere condolences to his wife, Dr. Lemire, and his children. They should find some comfort in the sympathy of all those who knew him and of all the friends who appreciated him.

**Hon. Gérald-A. Beaudoin:** Honourable senators, I wish to pay tribute to a remarkable man, the Honourable Paul David. I had the tremendous honour of working with Senator Paul David for a few years, after I entered the Senate, in 1988.

Scion of a prominent family, Paul David was a man of vision, a builder and a humanist. His grandfather, Senator L.O. David, was a friend and confidant of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. L.O. David wrote a biography of Laurier and the history of the Patriotes.

His father, Senator Athanase David, played a key role in Quebec politics, and was a leading figure in the arts and humanities. One of the things we have to thank him for is the celebrated Prix David.

As has been pointed out by other senators in their speeches, our colleague Paul David was the founder of and driving force behind the Montreal Heart Institute. It is his greatest achievement.

He began his political career at the age of 65. A doctor by profession, he was also interested in history, and constitutional and social issues. I was always very impressed by his judgment and the breadth of his knowledge.

It is not an exaggeration to say that Paul David was an exceptional human being who will leave his mark on our society.

The funeral service, held last Thursday at Saint-Viateur in Outremont, was very moving. His children's tributes were deeply touching and there was a great sense of dignity and love.

To his wife, Dr. Lemire, and his children, I extend my deepest condolences.

**Hon. Thérèse Lavoie-Roux:** Honourable senators, this is probably the last time I will rise in the Senate to pay tribute to Senator David and it is with great sadness that I do so.

The Senator David I remember was a profoundly human individual, always attentive to the needs of others. During the years I spent with him in the Senate, I had occasion to admire his vast knowledge, his remarkable intelligence, his keen judgment and his extraordinary wisdom. He never got embroiled in partisan discussions. He was there to serve others, not just one political party.

Several speakers have already referred to his legacy, the Montreal Heart Institute. He transmitted to those working there his desire to serve everyone, to be always available, to get involved in research, in advancing the sciences of cardiology.

Yesterday, as it happens, I was at a board meeting of the Montreal Heart Institute. They were examining the evaluation of the institute by the Fonds de recherche de santé du Québec. This research fund analyzes all applications for research grants. It is well known in Quebec and plays a very important role. In the conclusion of this evaluation, it is stated that the members of the evaluation committee are unanimous in their opinion that the Montreal Heart Institute's research centre is a leading light in research in Quebec and in Canada, that its presence is vital to leading-edge research in the country, and that it occupies a lead role internationally in cardiology research.

If this kind of comment is still being made several years after Dr. David left the institute, it is because he had instilled this concern for thorough research, this concern for serving the people, this concern for constant progress.

In conclusion, I would like again to extend my sympathies to his wife, Dr. Lemire, who took very good care of him during the last seven years of his life. They were not easy years as some of my colleagues mentioned earlier.

I also would like to offer my sympathies to his children Françoise, Pierre, Charles-Philippe, Anne-Marie, Hélène and Thérèse who, in their own field, seem to be following in their father's footsteps in the sense that they are constantly seeking to surpass themselves. I want to convey to them my deepest sympathies again, as I did a few days ago.

Doctor David, I want to thank you for having been a humanist serving others, for what you did and for what you are leaving us, especially the Montreal Heart Institute. Farewell, dear friend.

[English]

**Hon. Wilbert J. Keon:** Honourable senators, I also rise to pay tribute to a very great Canadian, our dear friend and former colleague, Dr. Paul David.

From his appointment to the Senate in September of 1988 until his mandatory, yet very sad, retirement in December of 1994, Paul David graced this chamber with his clear and concise comments, sense of humour, solid judgment, great culture, and remarkable intellect. He showed great sensitivity and humanity to all causes that were dear to him, such as the abortion issue, health care, Canada's demographic changes, and the future of Canada's youth, as well as the status of Quebec as a distinct society. In the tradition of his grandfather and father, who also served in this chamber, Senator David was a highly committed politician, an international figure who was celebrated with many

honorary distinctions and awards for his wisdom and accomplishments.

I had the great fortune of knowing Dr. David long before he entered this chamber, during his illustrious career as a cardiologist and an administrator. In 1954, barely in his 30s, his bold and ambitious project of establishing a centre for cardiac care and progressive research finally took shape in the creation of the Montreal Heart Institute. Imagine the courage that he showed at that time. While there was a heart institute in Russia, there was not a single heart institute in the U.S. The British Heart Institute had not been created. The Japanese Heart Institute in Tokyo had not been created. He was truly way out in front. His visionary efforts marked a milestone in health services in Quebec, Canada and around the world. Indeed, Dr. David created the model that later heart institutes would follow.

When I came back to Ottawa in 1969, with the mission of building the Ottawa Heart Institute, which would become Canada's second heart institute, I had had by then the opportunity to tour such institutes as the one in London, the National Heart Institute in Washington, and of course the Minnesota Heart Hospital. However, Dr. David was totally unique. I recall going down to the Montreal Heart Institute with a delegation of architects, engineers, planners, and scientists, walking about with a portable dictaphone, followed by photographers, having total access to all of his ideas. Yet here we were, coming into Canada to compete with him for the research dollars in heart research. His magnanimity was such that he knew this was necessary and he was enormously supportive.

Dr. David made extraordinary breakthroughs in the fields of science and medicine. In 1968, Canada broke ground with the first heart transplant at the Institute of Cardiology. Throughout his career, he had a number of breakthroughs and participated in the first balloon angioplasty with Dr. Bourassa at the Montreal Heart Institute. When he retired as medical director from the heart institute, he continued to devote his wealth of knowledge and humanity to the public good here in the Senate.

Our country has lost a truly great Canadian, and we have lost a very dear friend. To his wife, Dr. Yvette Lemire, his six children and his grandchildren, I wish to offer my deepest condolences.

Dr. David touched so many in so many ways. He touched me in tangible ways that I will cherish forever.

[Translation]

**Hon. Léonce Mercier:** Honourable senators, when Dr. Paul David passed away on March 30, Canada and Quebec lost not only a pioneer in the medical field, but also a conscientious and honest politician, a model citizen and a great humanist.

Dr. David was appointed to the Senate in 1985, by Mr. Mulroney. However, Senator David had deep roots in the Liberal Party, both at the federal and provincial levels. His grandfather, Laurent Olivier David was Wilfrid Laurier's advisor and confidant, and was appointed to the Senate by the latter, in 1903. His father, Athanase David, who was a distinguished minister under Louis-Alexandre Taschereau between 1919 and 1936, was appointed to the Senate in 1940 by Prime Minister Mackenzie King.

In spite of all these family ties with politics, it is in the medical field that Senator David found his calling and truly distinguished himself. After graduating from Montreal University's medical school, he specialized in cardiology in Boston and Paris. Dr. David, one of the world's foremost cardiologists, founded the Montreal Heart Institute in 1954 by grouping together the various cardiology services. He headed the Institute for 30 years, during which a team of doctors performed Canada's first heart transplant.

Dr. David's enormous contribution was recognized by the various prizes and awards given him, including honorary doctorates and many decorations. Among other things, he was a companion of the Order of Canada, a grand officer de l'Ordre national du Québec and a Grand Montréalais.

Honourable senators, I was one of those able to personally appreciate the humanitarian side of Senator David during many Red Cross blood drives. When called to help his fellow man, Paul David was always willing.

Many years ago, with one of my daughters, who is a nurse, I was responsible for blood donor clinics. At that time, donors were rare. Dr. David explained things simply so everyone understood. He said, for example, that there was going to be a heart operation. Everyone was afraid of it, no one wanted to go. His presence, his image and his calm reassured people.

Those of my Senate colleagues who knew him remember as a man of warmth, honesty and total devotion to those causes he held dear. His departure leaves us in great sadness.

Honourable senators, Canada and Quebec have lost one of their most famous sons, and I would invite all those present to join me in offering our most sincere condolences to his wife and to his children, Anne-Marie, Hélène, Françoise, Pierre, Charles-Philippe and Thérèse, and to his grandchildren. We have lost a most honourable individual.

[English]

• (1540)

## SENATORS' STATEMENTS

### YUGOSLAVIA

#### KOSOVO—PROBLEMS OF WAR

**Hon. Nicholas W. Taylor:** Honourable senators, to preface this statement, I wish to state that I have worked in the area of the Balkan peninsula, from Vienna to Istanbul and from the Black Sea to the Aegean and the Adriatic, since 1960. I do not tell you that to profess in any way to being an expert on Yugoslavia, except to emphasize that anyone who tells you that they are an expert on Yugoslavia is not an expert on Yugoslavia. It is probably one of the areas in the world whose politics are the most complicated and difficult to understand.

I introduced this topic on March 25. I spoke in this chamber immediately after Senator Kinsella, who had proposed a very good solution to the problem. Unfortunately, neither NATO nor the U.S. presidency was listening to either one of us. I spoke about the foolishness of the bombing project at that time.

After listening to the debate in the last couple of days, I was interested in knowing how many people believe as God's word what Ted Turner's CNN television stations churns out. In other words, if he says there is a massacre on one side, that is the only one that has occurred. Apparently, no one even thinks for a minute that war is a nasty business and atrocities are committed on both sides. Mr. Turner, the same fellow who gave former president Bush 70 per cent popularity and then took it back to 30 per cent in one year, is now doing the same thing with this war.

The second item that I thought was interesting in listening to the House of Commons debate is that no one is saying what we will do when we win. Supposing Milosevic beats his head and says, "Uncle," what will we do? That will probably mean that the KLA will move in there and start killing the Serbs. No matter which way you look at it, we are using violence and we will be stuck with years and years of policing. There must be another way, and I think there are other ways.

I am afraid that NATO members are guilty of ignoring history — at least the lessons that it teaches us — in their desire to punish the Serbian people for being foolish enough to allow a dictator to take over their government and to re-ignite the racist and religious wars that have swept the Balkans for the last hundred years. The present program of bombing everything and anything — including homes and workplaces, which have nothing to do with the war movement — and calling it "collateral damage" is wrong on three fronts: politically, militarily and morally.

It is wrong politically, since there is no evidence, historically, that bombing or attacking a country weakens the resolve of, or the support for, their leadership. Whether we are talking about support for Churchill when Hitler attacked London, or support for Saddam Hussein when we bombed Iraq, the result has always been the same, namely, to reinforce the leadership.

It is also wrong militarily. As a geologist, I have done a significant amount of work in that area, and if you think that it is rough country and you want to see what it looks like, drive from Revelstoke to Golden. There are nothing but mountains and more mountains. I was originally hired by Mr. Tito to establish their geological survey. I remember him bragging that with 100 men — and later, with 500 men — he had been able to keep three German Panzer divisions tied up for three years. This is the type of country in which our troops will be operating. The idea that we will get out of there without deploying ground forces does not hold water.

Lastly, I think it is morally wrong. You cannot use violence to teach others not to use violence to solve their problems. The end never justifies the means.

**Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear!

## COMMEMORATION OF THE HOLOCAUST

**Hon. Jerahmiel S. Grafstein:** Honourable senators, this day has been set aside around the world to commemorate the Holocaust, the “Shoah.” How can one best commemorate the Holocaust? Honourable senators, allow me to relate, very briefly, one family’s saga that holds some current resonance.

About 220 years ago, the family Grafstein, at the behest of the Hapsburg authorities in Vienna, joyfully aided by local officials, were uprooted from their village in southwest Austria, where they had been scratching out a living for some centuries. One family branch travelled northeast to a town in the Russian lands called Vitebsk, later made famous by the magical paintings of Chagal. Vitebsk, even then, was a renowned educational centre of Jewish culture, education and religiosity. Unfortunately, some three decades later, Vitebsk was also on the direct route of Napoleon’s march towards Moscow and his famous retreat. Uprooted again, my branch of the Grafstein family moved to the then more hospitable climes of southern Poland, where my great great grandfather eventually settled in a small crossroads county town called Wasniow, located 100 kilometres from the birthplace of Pope John II. There the family flourished for almost 100 years, despite periodic anti-Semitic eruptions.

At the turn of the century, my aunt, a woman of some musical talent which she passed on to her children, came to Canada and then settled in New York. She was followed by an energetic uncle who, riled at the Orthodox strictures of his father and elder brother, broke loose from the family and found his way to Toronto, first as a socialist labour organizer and later as a businessman. Shortly thereafter, he was joined by yet another brother, also a socialist, who had been an actor and a writer in Poland and later became a book and newspaper publisher and entrepreneur in Canada. A decade later they were joined by yet another brother, a man of devout practices all his life, unlike his two secular brothers.

In 1927, my father, the youngest of the litter, came to visit his brother in Toronto after serving in the Polish army for five years, with some distinction, after completing his studies in Warsaw. He was introduced to my mother by my uncle. My mother had emigrated with her family some 20 years earlier from the same region of Poland. My father fell madly in love, married and settled in London, Ontario, where I was born in the midst of the depression.

Left behind in Wasniow, Poland, was my eldest uncle and his sprawling family, which had interests in the small town businesses of textiles, hardware, lumber, and wine and spirits. In 1939, at the outbreak of World War II, according to records, there were 191 residents living in that town of Wasniow. Over half that population was Jewish, and of the half that was Jewish, more than half, again, comprised members of the Grafstein family, including first and second cousins. In 1940, when the Germans arrived, the family was quickly assembled with all other Jews in the village and surrounding areas on the lovely town square. There they were divided into two groups: one group of able-bodied men and boys; one group of the elderly, women and children. The elderly, women and children were shipped to the

death camps and disappeared in smoke. Of the men and boys, only two cousins survived the work and death camps. This brief history was written down by my father in 1944, when he first heard of the almost total liquidation of his family and relatives who had been left in Poland.

One surviving second cousin was brought to Canada in 1947 by my father. The last Grafstein caught behind the Iron Curtain I helped to bring to Canada with his small family in 1966. They also settled in Toronto.

Honourable senators, two years ago, I visited Poland and was privileged to meet the President of Poland and other senior officials, almost 70 years to the date from the time my father left Poland to emigrate to Canada. During that visit, one afternoon I —

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable Senator Grafstein, I am sorry, but the three-minute period allotted for statements has expired. Is leave granted, honourable senators, to extend the honourable senator’s time?

**Hon. Senators:** Agreed.

• (1550)

**Senator Grafstein:** Honourable senators, one afternoon I travelled 140 kilometres south to visit my father’s hometown. The tree-lined, grass-covered square was still there, as was the handsome, yellow-painted baroque church and library, now a school, where my father had served as the head of the County Polish Library. The library graces two sides of that small square. Across the square from the church were shops once owned and operated by my grandfather, my uncle and his extended family.

Around the corner from the square is a large, empty, grass-covered lot where once stood a sprawling wood synagogue and a large school. The Jewish cemetery has disappeared completely. No traces remain of 1,000 years of Jewish settlement in that town.

So, honourable senators, the Holocaust is more than a word. We believed it was the culmination, the final obscene cycle of violent death in the heart of Europe. We were wrong. As we approach the millennium, are there lessons we can derive from the Holocaust — a word that remains beyond definition, beyond imagination? Man’s random and episodic outbursts of inhumanity to man continue. Regretfully, such violence is still fulsomely sanctified by the organized might of state violence.

Inside this miserable heart of darkness, can we discover redeemable virtue in the human condition? Regretfully, only with eternal diligence and renewed human sacrifice can the contemptible cycle of violence be disrupted and dispersed. From irredeemable tragedy, the triumph of the human spirit, a civil society, may yet be uncovered.

Ani maamin, ani maamin — “I believe, I believe,” death-camp inmates sang, and let us say, “Amen.”

**Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear!

## INTERNATIONAL POLICY CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN AND TOBACCO

**Hon. Colin Kenny:** Honourable senators, I rise in accordance with the provisions of the Standing Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration as they relate to international travel to report on a trip I took to Washington, D.C. for the International Policy Conference on Children and Tobacco, March 17 through 19. During that two-and-a-half day period, we had 22 hours of meetings. Sixty delegates from some 31 countries participated.

The sponsors of the conference were Senators Durbin, Wyden and Collins; the American Cancer Society; the American Public Health Association; the Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids; and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. The conference objective was to establish an international policy network on the issue of youth and tobacco. My objectives were to contribute a Canadian perspective and to learn of effective programs being implemented by other countries and to positively represent the Senate of Canada at this conference.

In addition to the 31 countries represented, the following organizations also sent delegates: the World Health Organization, the United Nations International Children's Fund, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund.

The discussion leaders included Gro Harlem Brundtland, the director of the World Health Organization; Dr. Donna Shalala, the U.S. Secretary of Health; the Honourable Rob Knowles, the health minister from Victoria, Australia; and the Honourable Bernard Kouchner, the Secretary of State for Health from Paris, France.

From the conference we came away with some interesting comparisons of spending and smoking rates. In Victoria, Australia, they are spending \$11.50 per capita, in Canadian funds, and have a youth smoking rate of 19 per cent. In Florida, they are spending \$7.50 per capita and have a youth smoking rate of 20 per cent. In California they are spending \$4.00 per capita and have a youth smoking rate of 12 per cent. In Canada, we are spending 33 cents per capita and have a youth smoking rate of 29 per cent.

Health Canada has announced that deaths attributable to smoking have increased from 40,000 Canadians per year to 45,000 Canadians per year. Last year, it was estimated that 85 per cent of all smokers started before the age of 18. This year, the figure has been revised to reflect the fact that 85 per cent of smokers start before the age of 16.

## HUMAN RIGHTS

### UNITED KINGDOM REPORT ON RACISM OF POLICE OFFICERS

**Hon. Donald H. Oliver:** Honourable senators, I would like to draw to your attention a recent report issued in the United

Kingdom with which all Canadians should make themselves familiar. I had an opportunity to read it over the Easter break.

On February 25, 1999, Sir William MacPherson, a retired High Court judge in Great Britain, delivered his report on the inquiry which he led into the death of Stephen Lawrence. At approximately 10:30 in the evening of April 22, 1993, in a district southeast of London, Stephen Lawrence, the 18-year-old son of Jamaican immigrant parents, was attacked while waiting for a bus. When he tried to escape, he was stabbed to death by five white youths.

Neither a public nor private prosecution of these youths resulted in convictions. The reasons for the inquiry arose because the parents of Mr. Lawrence believed that, at the root of these unsuccessful prosecutions was a corrupt, conspiratorial and racist police department.

While Sir William MacPherson in his report does not impute any fault to the police department in this particular case, he does reach the conclusion that the British government, especially in the area of law enforcement, is gripped by institutional racism.

His recommendations, which I believe are for the most part well reasoned, present us with a blueprint for dealing with racism or combating racism in all areas of law enforcement in Canada. The report recommended that the:

...full force of the Race Relations legislation should apply to all police officers, and Chief Officers of Police should be made vicariously liable for the acts and omissions of their officers relevant to that legislation.

This would ensure, the inquiry held, that there would be accountability for the racial acts of police officers. One of the issues discovered by the inquiry was that there was a belief among some officers that the racism or racial acts would be tolerated by the senior command. This recommendation places responsibility for such acts squarely upon the most senior officers to ensure that they lead by example.

The inquiry defined "racist incident" to be one that is perceived to be racist by either the victim or some other neutral person. It could also include an incident which may or may not be criminal. This definition is to be universally adopted by the police, local government and other similar agencies.

I believe that this definition is an important step towards dealing with race relations. Racism must be defined by those who are on the receiving end. It should make those who are in sensitive positions consider the feelings of others before acting or speaking.

In conclusion, I believe that we in Canada can learn a lot from the recommendations of this inquiry. Police forces and those involved in the criminal justice system in Canada should review these recommendations, especially the ones dealing with family assistance, with a view to adopting them for use in Canada.



## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### ADJOURNMENT

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

That when the Senate adjourns today it do stand adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 14, 1999, at 1:30 p.m.

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

**Hon. Senators:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

### TRANSPORTATION SAFETY

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

**Hon. J. Michael Forrestall:** Honourable senators, I give notice that on Wednesday, April 14, 1999, I will move:

That, notwithstanding the Order of the Senate adopted on Thursday March 25, 1999, the date for the final report of the Special Committee on Transportation Safety and Security be extended to November 30, 1999.

• (1600)

### PRIVATE BILL

ALLIANCE OF MANUFACTURERS & EXPORTERS CANADA—  
NOTICE OF MOTION TO REINSTATE TO ORDER PAPER

**Hon. James F. Kelleher:** Honourable senators, I give notice that on Wednesday next, April 14, 1999, I will move:

That, notwithstanding rule 27(3), the Order of the Day for the second reading motion of Bill S-18, An Act respecting the Alliance of Manufacturers & Exporters Canada, a private bill, be now restored to the Order Paper, day one, for the purpose of reviving the bill.

### HEALTH CARE IN CANADA

NOTICE OF INQUIRY

**Hon. Wilbert J. Keon:** Honourable senators, I give notice that on Thursday, April 15, 1999 I will call the attention of the Senate to the present state of the Canadian health care system.

## NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

INVOLVEMENT IN YUGOSLAVIA—RELATIONSHIP  
TO INTERNATIONAL LAW—NOTICE OF INQUIRY

**Hon. Jerahmiel S. Grafstein:** Honourable senators, I give notice that on Thursday next, April 15, 1999, I will call the attention of the Senate to the question of international law: Canada and the NATO action in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

## QUESTION PERIOD

### FOREIGN AFFAIRS

EFFECTS OF EVENTS IN FORMER YUGOSLAVIA—  
CRITERIA FOR CANADIAN MILITARY INTERVENTION  
OUTSIDE OF NATO INVOLVEMENT—GOVERNMENT POSITION

**Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Honourable senators, my question is to the Leader of the Government in the Senate. Could the minister inform this house whether or not the Government of Canada has given instructions to our representatives at the United Nations to move forthwith with proposals to receive the support of the entire world community as represented in that body to deal with the crisis and tragedy in Kosovo?

**Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators would know that our representatives at the United Nations are monitoring the situation on a daily basis and are, indeed, making representations to all the member countries. Clearly, Canada would have preferred to see the United Nations Security Council provide explicit authorization for the NATO military action. That said, we could not wait for the possibility that the council might eventually reach a consensus when hundreds of thousands of people were at risk. However, I am aware that there are ongoing discussions both at the United Nations and elsewhere.

**Senator Kinsella:** Could the minister provide the Senate with some specificity? Is it the position of the government that, using its seat on the security council, Canada will be bringing forth a creative resolution to deal with this matter, or is Canada sitting back and watching events unfold?

**Senator Graham:** I do not think that would be a fair characterization of Canada's role in this very difficult situation. The Honourable Senator Kinsella would know that the Minister of Foreign Affairs attended the NATO foreign affairs meeting in Brussels yesterday. He is back in Canada today.

A number of suggestions have been made over the past few weeks following the failure of the Rambouillet framework, which currently continues to be the only framework that has any standing in the international community. Other proposals have been mooted, ranging from the partition of Kosovo, to making the province an international protectorate, to outright independence.

However, I would emphasize again that, although the conflict has made the implementation of the Rambouillet accords very difficult, it remains the only framework that has any standing in the international community.

### UNITED NATIONS

#### EFFECTS OF EVENTS IN FORMER YUGOSLAVIA— POSSIBILITY OF PROPOSAL OF RESOLUTION TO SECURITY COUNCIL—GOVERNMENT POSITION

**Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Honourable senators, I have a further question for the Leader of the Government in the Senate.

Does the minister believe that the Security Council of the United Nations is no longer an effective forum by which to achieve a resolution of this tragedy?

**Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, I believe I indicated earlier that I have confidence in the Security Council. It is regrettable that the Security Council could not reach a consensus, as a result of the veto power of China and Russia. However, with so many hundreds of thousands of human lives at risk, it was deemed necessary by the membership of NATO to take the action that they have indeed taken.

**Senator Kinsella:** Surely the minister recognizes that the veto power which is exercised by the five permanent members of the Security Council has been around since the San Francisco Conference of 1945. The veto power is not something new. Why has the Government of Canada been unable to bring forward a resolution that would secure the support of all members of the Security Council and meet the test of all members of the Security Council so they would not have to use their veto power? It is not that the West has not used the veto power.

**Senator Graham:** I think Canada's record at the United Nations, beginning with our own Lester B. Pearson, former prime minister of Canada, former foreign affairs minister, former president of the General Assembly of the United Nations, has been exemplary from the very beginning. We have led the world in our peacekeeping efforts, and even more recently with the initiatives taken by Minister Axworthy respecting the land mines treaty.

**Senator Kinsella:** As a final supplementary, honourable senators, if the Government of Canada's position is that it fears that some permanent members of the Security Council might exercise their veto, then why has the Government of Canada not instructed its representative at the United Nations to bring forward resolutions in the General Assembly where there is no veto?

**Senator Graham:** I am not aware that such instructions have been given. However, I shall inquire further to clarify the situation for my honourable friend and for all honourable senators.

### FOREIGN AFFAIRS

#### DIPLOMATIC EFFORTS SURROUNDING EVENTS IN FORMER YUGOSLAVIA—REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

**Hon. A. Raynell Andreychuk:** Honourable senators, following on those answers, I would understand that Canada has not given up on the diplomatic route in addition to the military route that NATO is taking. If that is the case, could the Leader of the Government enumerate the diplomatic actions we are presently taking, particularly the overtures we have made to the governments in Russia and the Ukraine and their missions, and advise us whether we have encouraged them to seek some resolution of this matter, and what diplomatic steps we are taking other than our participation in the actions taken by the Security Council and the General Assembly?

**Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, Canada continues its consultations with Russia, Ukraine, and other countries. I think honourable senators would know that Russia continues to oppose the NATO military action and has taken a number of steps to support the Yugoslavian government. To this point, the conflict has not threatened the relationship between NATO countries, including Canada, and Russia.

Today's meeting between U.S. Secretary of State Albright and Russian Foreign Minister Ivanov was useful in terms of preserving the U.S.-Russia relationship. The two countries have yet to reach agreement on a number of key issues, including the deployment of an international military presence in Kosovo.

### NATIONAL DEFENCE

#### NATO FORCES IN FORMER YUGOSLAVIA— DEPLOYMENT OF GROUND TROOPS TO ALLEVIATE PLIGHT OF KOSOVAR REFUGEES—GOVERNMENT POSITION

**Hon. Gerry St. Germain:** Honourable senators, my question is also to the government leader in the Senate. In response to a question I asked on March 25, the minister stated:

...our objective is to help avert a greater humanitarian crisis by ensuring that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia complies with its obligations.

We are now faced with a situation where approximately one million people have been driven out of the state of Kosovo. We do not know how many have been murdered or raped in the pillage that has gone on.

Senator Lawson and I, who conferred on this about March 25, were wondering why ground troops were not being sent in immediately. That remains an outstanding question. It appears that an organization such as NATO is holding back, waiting for the polls to change in the U.S.

• (1610)

Will a decision be made based on the humanitarian aspect, as opposed to the strategic aspect about which I spoke in my question of March 25?

**Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, the humanitarian aspect is the key point that must be considered in all these discussions and actions.

At the outset of the crisis, NATO military planners began to develop options for the deployment of ground forces in response to a range of different scenarios. The only option that has been considered formally by Allied governments is the deployment of ground troops to help implement a settlement after a peace agreement has been reached. This would be similar to what NATO is doing in Bosnia.

At this time, however, the deployment of ground troops in any other scenarios is not being considered.

**Senator St. Germain:** Honourable senators, is that because there is the possibility there will be no one left in the country by the time they arrive there? The scenario upon which we have embarked appears similar to the Vietnam situation where the original theatre of war started off with bombing exercises and ended up with ground troops. Basically, it was too late by then.

Historically, has there not always been a vote in the House of Commons before any of our forces were deployed in a theatre of action? If that is the case, why did we not do that this time?

**Senator Graham:** Honourable senators, my honourable friend, who is a veteran and who was a distinguished member and minister while in the other place, perhaps knows better than I, the answer to his question.

Historically, I do not know whether requiring parliamentary approval before sending our CF-18s to the current theatre of action would be a precedent. Certainly, the Prime Minister has indicated that further consultations will be held before a deployment of ground troops.

UNITED NATIONS AIR STRIKES BY NATO FORCES IN FORMER YUGOSLAVIA—POSSIBLE SOLUTION TO CONFLICT—STATEMENT BY SECRETARY GENERAL—GOVERNMENT POSITION

**Hon. Douglas Roche:** Honourable senators, the Leader of the Government in the Senate has referred to Canada monitoring the situation. With respect to a resolution of this terrible problem, he referred to the Rambouillet agreement as if that agreement were still alive. The Rambouillet agreement is dead.

Specifically, what is Canada doing to follow up on the opening given by the Secretary General of the United Nations a couple of days ago when he said that if the Yugoslav authorities would allow the deployment of an international military force to ensure a secure environment for the return of the refugees and unimpeded humanitarian aid, he would urge NATO to suspend immediately the air bombardments on the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. That is a specific proposal that Canada, with its strength as a member of the Security Council, could push. Has Canada taken note of that?

**Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government):** Yes, indeed, it has, honourable senators. However, in order to put

the statement of the Secretary General of the United Nations in proper context, it would be useful if I were to read the conditions the Secretary General of the United Nations would ask that the leaders of NATO to suspend immediately the bombings. He stated:

I am deeply distressed by the tragedy taking place in Kosovo and in the region, which must be brought to an end. The suffering of innocent civilians should not be further prolonged. In this spirit, I urgently call upon the Yugoslav authorities to undertake the following commitments:

- first, to end immediately the campaign of intimidation and expulsion of the civilian population;
- two, to cease all activities of military and paramilitary forces in Kosovo and to withdraw these forces;
- three, to accept unconditionally the return of refugees and displaced persons to their homes;
- four, to accept the deployment of an international military force to ensure a secure environment for the return of the refugees and unimpeded delivery of humanitarian aid; and
- finally, to permit the international community to verify compliance with these undertakings.

Upon the acceptance by the Yugoslav authorities of these conditions, I urge the leaders of the North Atlantic Alliance to suspend immediately the air bombardments upon the territory of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

Ultimately, the cessation of hostilities I propose is a prelude to a lasting political solution to the crisis, which can only be achieved through diplomacy. In this context, I would urge the resumption of talks on Kosovo among all parties concerned at the earliest possible moment.

With all of the above, I certainly agree, as does the Government of Canada.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear!

**Senator Roche:** Honourable senators, I thank the Leader of the Government for his response. He did not say that Canada is actually pushing this idea. The Secretary General needs help in this grave, international crisis that is in danger of spinning out of control. Canada is instrumentally placed to play a leading role in trying to re-engage both the Russians and the United Nations. Canada could be calling for an emergency session of the General Assembly in order to focus world attention on an international solution and not one that would be western produced.

**Senator Graham:** Honourable senators, the Secretary General has the continuing unequivocal support of Canada.

## FOREIGN AFFAIRS

### AIR STRIKES BY NATO FORCES IN FORMER YUGOSLAVIA— IMMEDIATE AND LONG-TERM GOALS BEHIND BOMBING CAMPAIGN—GOVERNMENT POSITION

**Hon. J. Michael Forrestall:** Honourable senators, my question is for the Leader of the Government in the Senate. Yesterday, many of you may have noted that former U. S. secretary of defence Weinberger in an opinion editorial noted with regard to Kosovo:

...we have neither defined victory nor established any real goals.

What are the immediate and long-term goals of NATO's air campaign?

**Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, the immediate and long-term goals are to restore peace to the area and bring hostilities to an end, to have the Kosovars returned to their homeland, and to have a peacekeeping force in the area.

**Senator Forrestall:** On April 1, U.S. General Wesley Clark, NATO Supreme Commander directing the air campaign stated:

We can't stop paramilitary actions from the air... we never thought that air power alone can stop this kind of paramilitary tragedy.

The U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff reportedly agreed with General Clark's assessment that the bombing campaign will not work.

This morning, we learned that the Yugoslav army forces crossed into Albania and attacked a village.

• (1620)

What are the immediate and long-term goals of NATO's air campaign? What does the minister define as success, given those two comments from the general and from former secretary Weinberger?

**Senator Graham:** I would define success as peace, along with the return of the Kosovars to their normal habitats.

**Senator Lynch-Staunton:** They have been destroyed!

**Senator St. Germain:** They will all be dead!

**Senator Graham:** Think of the consequences if we had not taken action. It is to be hoped that the bombing will end at an early date.

**Senator Lynch-Staunton:** After you have destroyed everything.

**Senator Graham:** Failing action on the part of NATO, what do my honourable friends opposite suggest? The diplomatic route failed at Rambouillet and action was required. The Balkans were

turning to the rest of the world and asking where we were. NATO, which includes Canada, responded in a responsible way. If we are to be at the table, we must take appropriate action and be part of that team. It is a humanitarian team which is working in the name of the people who are threatened, and who have been savaged by the "Butcher of the Balkans."

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear!

**Senator Kinsella:** What about Rwanda?

**Senator Forrestall:** I do not believe anyone disagrees with that. What we are asking is what is your definition for success, and when will we see some parameters that will lead us towards a definitive goal? In the eventuality that NATO does deploy ground troops, what Canadian troops and equipment are combat-ready at this time? What delays might those Canadian Armed Forces experience if NATO decided to deploy ground troops at this time? Are we ready to send a properly trained expeditionary force? What will the Canadian place in the command hierarchy of NATO be in the case of a ground operation? Would the Canadian Armed Forces be under the command of British commanders, as was the case in Bosnia? What measures has the government taken to reinforce Canadian troops stationed in Bosnia in the event that the conflict spills over those borders once again?

**Senator Graham:** That is a long series of questions. I believe I answered some of them earlier.

I do not know what would be the chain of command there. Previously, we had our own Major General MacKenzie in charge of allied forces in a very important area of the world. It may be that they will be looking to Canada, a moderate country with skilled members of our Canadian forces anxious to help and willing to carry out their duty as members of the Canadian Armed Forces wherever the people of Canada ask them to serve in the world.

**Senator Forrestall:** The question was not that hard to follow. I asked what troops are combat-ready that we can send?

**Senator Graham:** There are a number of regiments across this country which are combat-ready, and I feel it would be wrong for me at the present time to indicate what measures are being taken. However, I shall attempt to find that answer for the Honourable Senator Forrestall. I know that there are troops in the western part of the country which are preparing at the present time. Please remember that the only indication that we have had is that any troops deployed to the part of the world we are discussing, under the present conditions, would be in a peacekeeping role.

### NATO FORCES IN FORMER YUGOSLAVIA—PLIGHT OF KOSOVARs

**Hon. Gerry St. Germain:** I should like all honourable senators to know that I do not believe that anyone on this side of the house does anything but support one hundred per cent the actions of the government in trying to assist these people.

**Senator Taylor:** You are wrong.

**Senator St. Germain:** This is key. What we are concerned about, is that, according to the information we are receiving through the media, these people are being expelled from their country or they are being killed. The only information we can get is what we read or what we see on television, that the women are being raped, people are being murdered, and that there are mass graves.

The question we are asking, and the question which was asked on March 25, is that if you need to use air strikes, that is one method; however, without ground troops, really, will there be anything left to warrant sending peacekeeping troops into the State of Kosovo?

That is my question, and it is a concern. It is not confrontational. I should like the Leader of the Government in the Senate to understand that we are prepared to support and, if need be, do whatever we must to do what is right.

I, like many, was appalled as we all sat on our hands and watched the Rwanda situation. Nobody in the world did anything. Therefore, I ask, in all fairness and in the spirit of non-partisanship, is there no way that we can expedite this theatre of activity without seeming to be waiting for the Americans to get the right polls so that they can go in and do the right thing?

**Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, I am aware that Canada has an infantry battle group that I understand is being made ready in the event that they would be called upon for peacekeeping measures. We have a reconnaissance squadron, plus helicopters. Canada is one of five countries involved in strategic strike campaigns. We have, as honourable senators would know, 12 CF-18s in that area, plus two Hercules aircraft which are there primarily for transport and humanitarian aid.

By way of observation, when we think of NATO, we think purely in terms of its military activities. I would suggest to my honourable colleagues on all sides of the chamber that NATO at the present time is probably the most effective humanitarian aid group in the world.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear!

## INDUSTRY

### RESOLUTION OF INTERPROVINCIAL DISPUTE INVOLVING CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY—ABSENCE OF DISPUTE SETTLEMENT MECHANISM IN AGREEMENT ON INTERNAL TRADE—GOVERNMENT POSITION

**Hon. James F. Kelleher:** Honourable senators, my question is for the Leader of the Government in the Senate. Last month, the Government of Ontario announced measures to press the Government of Quebec to open its construction industry to Ontario workers. Since then, we have seen bridges blocked in the National Capital Region and much talk of an escalating interprovincial trade war.

We would not be faced with this trade war if the agreement on internal trade that the Prime Minister signed in 1994 had an effective dispute resolution system. In December 1996, the Minister of Industry admitted to *The Financial Post* that the dispute resolution system, agreed to by the Prime Minister, was:

Too slow, too cumbersome, too complicated and doesn't have enough teeth.

Over two years later, nothing has been done to address this problem.

Given the fact that an interprovincial trade war has demonstrated that this problem can no longer be ignored, will the leader consult with the Prime Minister and report back to the Senate on the precise steps that this government is taking to ensure that interprovincial trade disputes can be resolved effectively?

**Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, I would be very pleased to do that. I know that this is a subject which Senator Kelleher returns to quite frequently. As a former minister of trade, he has a special interest in this area.

I should point out that many of the issues being disputed between Ontario and Quebec really fall outside of the agreement on internal trade. If I am wrong on that, then I am open to correction.

The agreement on internal trade, as I understand it, does not include specific commitments with respect to such things as enforcement of transportation, taxation, and workplace safety related measures. We, as the Government of Canada, encourage both Ontario and Quebec to continue to try and resolve their differences regarding construction work in particular. Our hope is for a speedy bilateral settlement between the two provinces.

Most certainly I will bring the representations of the Honourable Senator Kelleher to the attention of the Prime Minister and other colleagues who are directly involved.

• (1630)

**Senator Kelleher:** Honourable senators, in their 1993 Red Book, the Liberal Party of Canada recognized that interprovincial trade barriers were costing Canadians about \$6 billion every year. The Prime Minister promised that his government would "be committed to the elimination of interprovincial trade barriers within Canada and will address the issue urgently."

However, six years later, the bridges that unite Ontario and Quebec have been blockaded as a result of the Prime Minister's failure to fulfil his promise to eliminate interprovincial trade barriers. In fact, *The Globe and Mail* reported earlier this month that a spokesman for the responsible cabinet minister could not even confirm whether interprovincial trade was part of the Minister of Industry's portfolio.

Given that the Minister of Industry represents an Ottawa riding that is in proximity to these blockaded bridges, it is clear that a cabinet shuffle is long overdue.

Honourable senators, in its discussion of interprovincial trade, *The Globe and Mail* also reported that the Canadian Chamber of Commerce had concluded "the federal government does not think that this is a problem." For the record, I raised this issue in the Senate on June 2, 1998, and my records indicate that I never received a full response.

Honourable senators, this trade war demonstrates once again that this government has failed to promote interprovincial trade. As a result, Canada's job creation, investment and national unity have suffered. Will the leader consult with the Prime Minister and report back to the Senate on the action this government is taking to resolve this construction dispute and when he expects this trade war will be resolved?

**Senator Graham:** Honourable senators, the honourable senator is not as well informed as I thought he was.

**Senator Kelleher:** You would not be the first one to feel that.

**Senator Graham:** Honourable senators, I should point out that for construction contracts issued by government departments and agencies, specific provisions of the agreement on internal trade apply. If any province feels that another province is not fulfilling these commitments, they are free to call upon the dispute settlement provisions contained in the agreement.

Do not blame Ottawa, honourable senators. Ask the provinces why they are not making use of those provisions.

**Senator Kelleher:** Honourable senators, the reason they are not making use of the provisions contained in that agreement is not because I am misinformed. It is because the dispute settlement clause contained in the existing agreement, which the Prime Minister signed, is toothless, cumbersome, not effective and not binding. It does not work. That is why the Ontario government became so frustrated. That is why they have taken this action by themselves. The agreement does not work, and the clause that is supposed to make it work is totally inefficient.

**Senator Graham:** Honourable senators, I shall certainly bring that matter to the attention of my colleagues. However, I should say that the Government of Canada is working with the provinces to strengthen the procurement and labour mobility provisions and to finalize an energy chapter, which I believe Senator Kelleher is interested in as well. Our objective is to promote open markets within Canada by eliminating all barriers. Until that is achieved, our hope is that Ontario and Quebec can resolve their difficulties in the construction sector.

## ANSWERS TO ORDER PAPER QUESTIONS TABLED

### NATIONAL DEFENCE— LAND FORCES COMMAND BUDGET SHORTFALL

**Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Deputy Leader of the Government)** tabled the answer to question No. 57 on the Order Paper—by Senator Forrestall.

### NATIONAL DEFENCE—LAND FORCES COMMAND BUDGET SHORTFALL—PLANS FOR FURTHER PERSONNEL REDUCTIONS

**Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Deputy Leader of the Government)** tabled the answer to question No. 129 on the Order Paper—by Senator Forrestall.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### FIRST NATIONS LAND MANAGEMENT BILL

#### SECOND READING

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Chalifoux, seconded by the Honourable Senator Maloney, for the second reading of Bill C-49, providing for the ratification and the bringing into effect of the Framework Agreement on First Nation Land Management.

**Hon. Gerry St. Germain:** Honourable senators, I rise today to speak to Bill C-49, which deals with the ratification of the Framework Agreement on Land Management by 14 aboriginal groups which are in a position to opt into this legislation. Five of these bands are in my province, the province of British Columbia.

Senator Chalifoux, the sponsor of this bill, did an excellent job in presenting the legislation. Senator Ghitter has also spoken for our side, as has Senator Carney. All three senators have done an excellent job in trying to portray the concerns that have arisen as a result of this legislation.

In speaking to this bill, I would be remiss if I did not address the wider issue of aboriginal rights and the current situation that we are facing today in Canada.

Honourable senators, I sit on the Standing Senate Committee on Aboriginal Peoples. I view this work in as non-partisan a fashion as one will see within this entire institution. I do so because I believe all governments have partially failed in the past in trying to deal with aboriginal issues. I firmly believe that we must strike down partisanship when we deal with aboriginal issues in the country today.

Honourable senators, we are at a crossroads in our dealings with Canada's aboriginal peoples. Negotiations on many land claims agreements, especially the Nisga'a claim in British Columbia, have begun to pit well-meaning people against each other with regard to how they see the evolution of aboriginal rights, especially the right to self-government, which we are presently studying in our committee.

As parliamentarians, we are put in an impossible situation in many instances. Agreements are negotiated. Once signed, they become attached to a piece of legislation, and we must then consider it. If we question the legislation or suggest amendments, we are told that we are against aboriginal rights. Often the accusations are more extreme than that, unfortunately.

For example, we are told that the Nisga'a agreement is a template for all future land claims and self-governments, especially in British Columbia. I will speak to that in more detail later.

Later this year, we will receive a bill designed to implement this Nisga'a agreement. What are we to do with it? What are we to do with Bill C-49, which implements and gives legal effect to a number of land management agreements previously negotiated?

Parliament basically has no effective role in dealing with some of these aboriginal issues because it always receives agreements after they have been concluded. I know this is a problem, but I do not know exactly how to deal with it. We are studying the issue in great detail at the present time. I hope that we have the collective wisdom to come up with the proper solutions so that there is fairness on both sides.

Parliament, if it questions these arguments or rejects the implementation legislation, will actually be driving a wedge between the aboriginal community and the rest of Canada, instead of building a bridge, which I believe is the proper role. Our dealings with aboriginal issues should be constructive and, as I mentioned earlier, conducted on a non-partisan basis. Collectively we here represent all the people of Canada, and we should act to protect or enhance, as the case may be, the interests of all Canadians.

Unfortunately, the role of Parliament in aboriginal matters has become virtually irrelevant for many reasons. The aboriginal community has taken the debate to the courts, where they have been very successful. In the majority of cases, they have been forced to take that course. Hence, instead of debates in principle over aboriginal matters in Parliament, we are left with the courts defining these issues and reaching solutions, solutions which are then negotiated by bureaucrats, leaving parliamentarians to enact implementing legislation.

- (1640)

The *Delgamuukw* case recently decided by the Supreme Court of Canada is a good example. In this case, the Supreme Court of Canada described the nature and scope of aboriginal title, set out the rules for proving its existence, and ruled where it exists. It is a constitutionally protected right, according to the courts. The court went on to say that, in future cases, aboriginal oral history may be used with great weight attached to it to establish the right to assert aboriginal title to lands.

This decision overturned the British Columbia trial court's judgment as well as the judgment of the British Columbia Court of Appeal. The Supreme Court ordered a new trial. However, in ordering a new trial, the Chief Justice did not expect the parties to go back to court. He said:

Ultimately, it is through negotiated self-government, with good faith and give and take on all sides, reinforced by the judgments of this Court, that we will achieve the reconciliation of the pre-existence of aboriginal societies

with the sovereignty of the Crown. Let us face it, we are all here to stay.

Where is Parliament in this? I am concerned about uncorroborated oral history being used to establish land claims and self-governing rights. However, as a parliamentarian, I have no say. The courts have dictated.

I am not here court bashing. I believe that the Charter of Rights and Freedoms has taken us to where we are, but I still feel that Canadians want the supremacy of Parliament to prevail, that is, the other place and our Senate.

Honourable senators, we cannot right the wrongs of the past with money and legislation. Fair and just solutions to the problems of the past must be achieved in the context of the time period in which we live. As Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau said, "We should seek to do justice within our own time." I cannot be less partisan than by quoting a former Liberal prime minister.

There is an onus on us, as parliamentarians, to take the debate out of the bureaucracy and place it squarely here in Parliament, the senior legislature in the country. We must set down guidelines as to how this relationship between the federal government, the provinces and the aboriginal community is to continue, so that there will be certainty in all our dealings.

We can begin this movement by giving Bill C-49, which is now before us, close scrutiny, and recommend and implement changes which we believe are necessary.

I should like to address the problems associated with the non-native residents on the Musqueam Reserve, one of the 14 reserves that will be impacted by the passage of Bill C-49. The leases that they signed in 1965 were entered into between themselves and the Queen on behalf of the federal government. There is no mention of the Musqueam Indian band. Taxes were paid to the City of Vancouver. Since that time, property taxes have been reallocated to the Musqueam band and, in 1980, management of the leases was actually transferred to the Musqueam band by a ministerial letter of authority. This was not disclosed to subsequent purchasers and no notice of transfer was sent to those who bought properly previously by either the band or the federal government.

In addition to taxes, renegotiation of the leases to the land which supports the residential dwellings built by tenants is also in the hands of the Musqueam band. The band has increased the new lease rates to a new high of about \$28,000 to \$38,000 per year.

The result of all this, including two trips to the courts by the band, has been that the marketability and the negotiability of these properties has been put into question. Add to this mix the new power of expropriation which will be given to the Indian bands under Bill C-49 and we will have — at least in this portion of the province that I represent — chaos and panic. "Taxation without representation!" is being shouted across our province.

The only solution that I can envisage at this time requires the federal government involving itself to address the situation it has created. It must look seriously at compensating the non-natives living on the Musqueam band for their economic losses. The federal government must do this. I am sure the Musqueam situation will become the subject of hearings before the Senate Standing Senate Committee on Aboriginal Peoples. I intend to pursue solutions to it with those who appear as witnesses.

As I said earlier, the Musqueam is one of the 14 bands pursuing passage of Bill C-49. I have a litany of correspondence in regard to this which I will address at the end of my short presentation here today.

I should also like to address in some detail other problems presented in Bill C-49. Here I am repeating concerns that have been put to me by others, mainly from the Province of British Columbia.

First, Bill C-49 permits First Nations to develop land codes to regulate land use and management on reserves. However, the draft legislation provides only general guidelines for the required contents of a land code. First Nations will have significant discretion in determining how those guidelines are to be met in their individual land codes.

The minister has stated that the land codes must meet her approval. Bill C-49, as it is currently worded, does not require the minister's approval of land codes before they take effect. As long as a land code meets the requirements of the draft legislation and it is approved by its members, the verifier appointed under the draft legislation is obliged to certify it.

The verifier is a party independent of Canada or the First Nation. Once certified, the land code takes legal effect without further approval required from Canada. In fact, the verifier's decision on the land code is final and binding on the parties. Therefore, there is no supervisory role open to the minister with respect to the contents of the land codes.

Perhaps that is not so bad. Perhaps we are getting away from DIAND and the minister, and what have you. Perhaps this is an improvement in some ways. However, there are still hue and cries out there for checks and balances.

Second, the proposed First Nations power over expropriation as they are currently worded are unclear with respect to the purposes for which First Nations may expropriate interests in reserve land. Clause 28(1) of Bill C-49 states that:

A first nation may...expropriate any interest in its first nation land that, in the opinion of its council, is necessary for community works or other first nation purposes.

It is unclear what "other first nation purposes" may include.

Such language differs significantly from previous federal legislation, such as the Sechelt Indian Band Self-Government Act, giving a first nation the power to expropriate. The Canada Expropriation Act refers to expropriation for "a public work or

other public purposes." While in Bill C-49 expropriation power is intended to be limited to community purposes, the words used do not say that.

Clause 28 states that a first nation may expropriate land for any purpose that it may lawfully undertake, including commercial activities. The meaning of clause 28 is further clouded by the introduction of a subjective test for determining whether the purpose is valid "in the opinion of its council."

What constitutes a valid First Nations purpose is therefore not to be judged by an impartial body on objective grounds, as under the Sechelt Indian Band Self-Government Act and the Expropriation Act but, rather, by the first nation itself, based on its subjective view of what constitutes a First Nations purpose.

Third, Bill C-49 does not require a first nation to apply the Expropriation Act rules for determining fair compensation. The first nation is only required to "take into account the rules set out in the Expropriation Act." By way of comparison, the Sechelt band is bound to apply the rules of the Expropriation Act. The imprecision in clause 28(5) as it is currently worded, combined with the unknown nature of the internal appeal or dispute resolution process to be developed by First Nations under their land codes, suggests that an expropriating first nation will not be bound to apply the Expropriation Act rules in determining fair compensation.

There is no supervisory role in this procedure for the minister.

- (1650)

I am also concerned about the effect that this bill will have on the rights of aboriginal women. Senator Chalifoux pointed to this same concern at the conclusion of her speech. First Nations which opt into the statute will have a year to establish rules for the disposition of property on the breakdown of marriage. At present, this situation is dealt with by tradition in the band or by the band council. Indian women's groups are concerned that the new regime developed under this bill will not protect them or their children. As senators we are obligated to try to come up with a workable solution that gives these people living on reserves the comfort they rightly deserve.

Honourable senators, this bill, while attempting to give our aboriginal people more control over the land they occupy, creates some problems. I hope the government is willing to listen and accept proposals to solve these problems.

As we know, many government members in the other place, while they did not like this bill, voted for it, hoping we would amend it. Let us not disappoint our friends in the other place. I know what it is like to be in that situation in the other place. I know how often you are forced to vote a certain way. I was the caucus chairman of 211 members at one time. I know exactly what happens. If we are going to be non-partisan and fair on all sides, we cannot point fingers at anyone.

**Senator Kinsella:** Name names!



**Senator St. Germain:** No, I will not name names. I said I would be non-partisan so I will not name names. I will try to understand and, because of my experiences on the other side, I will not pick on anyone. I will simply direct my attention to the bill and try to come up with some good solutions. Let us do what is correct for all Canadians.

There is much more to be said about Bill C-49, but let me conclude with these more general remarks. I will likely speak again on Bill C-49 after we hear witnesses and study the bill and consider recommended amendments.

Honourable senators, I am not trying to fan the flames of discord regarding aboriginal rights in this country. However, if we fail to deal properly with their issues, we will create greater problems than those we now face.

I received tons of letters. I have some of them here.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable Senator St. Germain, I regret to inform you that your 15-minute time limit has expired.

**Senator St. Germain:** Your Honour, would you question such a great speech? May I continue, sir?

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable senators, it is not my responsibility to decide whether speeches are great or not. However, is leave granted for the honourable senator to continue?

**Hon. Senators:** Agreed.

**Senator St. Germain:** Thank you, honourable senators.

I have received over 100 letters regarding the Musqueam lease and tax issues and on Bill C-49. I have spoken to people all across my province. I have been to Castlegar and to Prince George and all through the lower mainland. One day, I was sitting in a Pemberton restaurant. There was a logger there named Jeff McLeod. He lives right next to Mt. Currie, one of the larger reserves in British Columbia. I asked him what he thought about these native issues that we are trying to address in government. He answered that he knows many Westerners are labelled as rednecks because they work in the bush and wear suspenders, because they hunt occasionally and they drive these big logging trucks. He also said he honestly believes that most people in British Columbia want to do what is right for our aboriginal peoples. They see that some natives have suffered from their treatment in residential schools. They see them shuffling along, having lost their dignity and their pride because of the things done to them in these institutions. The people want to do something for them instead of doing things to them, and he said he would support me.

Then he asked if I was shocked by that response. I told him that I was not, and he urged me to do what is right. He urged us not to fall for the run-around given by bureaucrats or lawyers but to do what is right. He urged us to take up our lead role as senators and, in that way, we would regain respect. He asked us not to blindly follow the so-called academics and wise people who so far have not resolved anything. If we do what is right, he said, we will have the support of all British Columbians.

We talked about the petitions compiled and the referendums taking place in our province with regard to the Nisga'a agreement. He said those actions are not necessary and that they would not vote against a people who have been historically downtrodden ever since we as Europeans began to occupy this land with them.

Honourable senators, the will is there, if we do things correctly. The Premier of British Columbia called the Nisga'a agreement his deal, the "Clark deal," despite the fact that negotiations have been ongoing for 120 years. He comes out of the wood work in the 1990s and suddenly it is his deal. Premier Clark is running roughshod over the Nisga'a agreement. He has turned it into a political football, saying he will stake his political future on it. That is totally wrong. I would urge the federal government to become more vociferous on this issue. This issue should be properly respected and duly completed.

British Columbians know we must settle this issue once and for all, and it must be settled with the knowledge that there are 15 other potential negotiations waiting to follow.

Whether in reference to Bill C-49 or to the Nisga'a agreement, I hope the government can tell us, if it can, what the costs will be from a social aspect and from an economic aspect. That is a legitimate question which should be answered for British Columbians. British Columbians want to support this proposal. Their hearts are in the right place.

There is a perception in the eyes of some British Columbians that we no longer control our own destiny in some of these issues. It is our responsibility as senators to convince them that their destiny is in good hands. Their destiny is in the hands of senators who have knowledge and experience and who will put aside partisan ways to settle these issues. So far, every government has failed to deal effectively with this issue. Otherwise, I would not be standing here today. I would be in British Columbia golfing or flying my airplane —

**Senator Whelan:** Or taking care of your chicken.

**Senator St. Germain:** — or taking care of my chicken.

The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court said it best when he said: Let's face it; we are all here to stay.

Honourable senators, we must take part in the debate on Bill C-49. We must work together towards a resolution because, yes, we are all here to stay.

**Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear!

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

It was moved by Honourable Senator Chalifoux, seconded by the Honourable Senator Maloney, that this bill be read the second time. Is it your pleasure to adopt the motion?

**Hon. Senators:** Agreed.

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?

On motion of Senator Chalifoux, bill referred to the Standing Senate Committee on Aboriginal Peoples.

• (1700)

**PRECLEARANCE BILL**

## REPORT OF COMMITTEE—DEBATE ADJOURNED

The Senate proceeded to consideration of the tenth report of the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs (Bill S-22, authorizing the United States to preclear travellers and goods in Canada for entry into the United States for the purposes of customs, immigration, public health, food inspection and plant and animal health, with amendments), presented in the Senate on March 24, 1999.

**Hon. John B. Stewart:** Honourable senators, I move adoption of the report.

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

Did you wish to speak, Senator Stewart?

**Senator Stewart:** I had not intended to speak because it seemed to me that the report speaks for itself. However, if there are questions, I will try to answer them, although I do not pretend to understand all the legal implications of some of the clauses. We will do the best we can.

**Hon. A. Raynell Andreychuk:** Honourable senators, I am inclined to agree with Senator Stewart that the report speaks for itself. However, I did want to put on the record a few comments about Bill S-22, a bill covering preclearance.

Preclearance has been known in Canada, since we have had it in place at some airports for some time, and it is a principle with which I think every member of the committee — and certainly most Canadians — agree. It is more efficient, and it is certainly easier for goods and for people to preclear through our airports and our points of entry into the United States. We have been used to what was originally a pilot project and an informal system whereby we would submit to American authorities here in Canada, preclear, and then be on our way to the United States.

More recently, however, there has been a preclearance project in British Columbia, which will now be expanded through Bill S-22, and it is intended that there be a reciprocal piece of legislation with the United States entering into the same type of legislation through their Congress.

The difficulties that I want to put on record are these: While we all agree with preclearance, under the existing system Canadians could voluntarily submit and be questioned by American authorities. If at any time we felt we did not want to continue, we had the option to withdraw, and we could, therefore,

withdraw and remain within Canada. With the bill, a certain procedure is put in place that seizes American authorities with the right to not only question Canadians entering the United States, but also to require Canadians to submit to a search by the American authorities with respect to the American law. This will also cover third parties who come to Canada for the purpose of entering the United States.

This piece of legislation is financially rewarding, perhaps, to Canadian air carriers because it will now be a more competitive routing for them, and certainly one more advantage for non-Canadians travelling from outside of Canada to choose of transiting through Canada into the United States. They will, therefore, enter a transit area, be taken immediately off the airlines and put into the transit area, submit to U.S. authorities, and continue.

The problem that the committee faced was the fact that we, with our sovereignty in Canada, would be allowing American authorities, with the assistance of Canadian authorities, to implement American law. This is a measure that I do not think we should take lightly. During discussions on Bill C-55 and others, we talked about Canadian sovereignty and the need to protect Canadian sovereignty. While the concept of preclearance is one with which we all probably agree, we should be very careful to understand that under Bill S-22 we are, in fact, allowing American authorities to exercise their authority on Canadian soil, and thereby affecting Canadian sovereignty.

The committee did an excellent job. I must commend the chair for providing time for the witnesses to deal with this act. We made a number of amendments. In the main, I accept the amendments. They go a long way towards easing some of the concerns about the search and seizure that was originally placed in the act for American immigration officers.

However, I find that some of the amendments do not go as far as I would have liked. In other words, there is still a section that is permissive, allowing that if a traveller refuses to answer any questions asked for preclearance purposes, the preclearance officer may order the traveller to leave the preclearance area. However, it is permissive to the officer, not to the traveller, and this gives me some concern.

We were told that this act would only go forward and be administered with the continual consultation and involvement of authorities from the United States and Canada. While this may be true, we should all be aware of the fact that how an American immigration officer conducts himself in Canada can have an effect on the reputation of Canada, and the attitudes of tourists about Canada and our immigration processes. It is not far-fetched to believe that tourists or third parties who enter Canada will be confused as to the treatment that they have received. Was it really at the hands of the Americans, or was it at the hands of Canadians with Americans?

I have some concern that the Canadian government should be very cautious and vigilant in the way that it administers this act by establishing a pilot period in order to ascertain whether, in fact, it serves our purposes and maintains the integrity of our system.

I have some difficulty also with the fact that third parties will be entering through Canada for immigration purposes into the United States. The United States' immigration authorities will have the right to deny access to these people to enter Canada. These people will then forthwith be taken to the Canadian authorities for the purposes of processing them into Canada. That means that all cases that do not make it through to the United States instantly become the responsibility and the problem of the Canadian authorities. Who will pay for this extra burden and how they will be processed in Canada remains to be seen.

Further, will we be used as a conduit? Will there be immigration representatives in other countries using one or the other method and technique to bring people to Canada with the ostensible purpose of entering the United States, but really for the purpose of trying to get into Canada? In other words, will they be queue-jumpers in the process of coming into Canada either for immigration or refugee status? We were told that this would probably not be likely because the American visa system is rigorous, but we were also told by immigration lawyers that the system is different, and that this could, in fact, take place. Therefore, I have some concern that we maintain and continue the integrity of our immigration process and not be subject to the whims and wishes of the American authorities when they either allow or disallow immigrants to pass through into the United States.

We were also told that there will be signs posted in third countries telling people that this might happen to them because when people will be entering the United States for purposes of immigration, they will certainly deal with the United States authorities only for the purposes of the United States immigration. However, should they fail at the last step in Canada, how will they know that they are then subject to Canadian immigration and entry processes? The answer we were given was that there will be some notices posted in other countries. If we take Thailand as an example, somewhere in the airport there will be a notice telling you that if you are taking a plane, for example Canadian Airlines going through Vancouver into Seattle, you may be in a position of not being allowed into the United States and will need to stay in Canada. However, one wonders whether all people will read the signs and have the language to do so, because we cannot assume that only people from Thailand will be boarding the planes in Thailand. That could be their third, fourth or first or second stop in entering Canada. Thus, I see that there are some mechanical difficulties that must be addressed.

• (1710)

One other issue that troubled me was the fact that we were told that, despite the fact that this area will be the domain of American law, the Charter of Rights and Freedoms will apply. That may be true. We were told by representatives of the Department of Justice that the protections in our Charter are much better than those which exist in the United States. However, the Canadian Bar Association pointed out that that is not necessarily the case. There is case law and procedure in the United States that may be more advantageous to the client than the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Thus, two sets of standards

that will apply, which leaves one wondering whether that is fair and just.

Will there be the ability within the American system to fully bring forward a bilingual capacity, which is one of the commitments of the Canadian government? We were told that the United States authorities have bilingual officers. However, one needs to be vigilant that anyone passing through Canada will be afforded the ability to communicate in both official languages. I think this needs more scrutiny.

Overall, I believe that preclearance is a good idea. No one disagrees with it. However, the fact that we will have U.S. laws entrenched into our law for the first time, causes me some difficulty.

This is to be reciprocal legislation. However, we were told that, while enabling legislation may be passed in the United States, there will be no preclearance centres in the United States. In fact, the reciprocity, which this bill has as its main principle, will not be in place because of the insufficient flow of traffic from the United States into Canada. A pilot project may be put in place in Anchorage, Alaska. One wonders if, in the long run, we are doing the right thing by giving so much authority to the Americans.

The amendments that were put forward go a long way to ease my concerns about the full force and authority of the Americans. However, it has yet to be tested in practice. Therefore, I urge both the Government of Canada and honourable senators to monitor this legislation after it is passed to ensure that it works to the benefit of Canada and the travelling public. If there is a different standard of care and hospitality afforded by American officers from that which Canadians demand of their officers, then we should note that and consider whether further changes require to be made.

What troubled us most was that, if an answer given to an American officer was deemed to be false, then the person could be subjected to a search. I think an amendment has improved the legislation. However, it does not go the full measure to alleviate my concerns of having to submit to American authorities on Canadian soil.

While I support this bill in principle, and I certainly support the amendments, I would signal some warnings of difficulties with it. To date, we have received complaints from some people who have been treated less than properly by American officials. These cases were taken up informally. With passage of this bill, I hope that we will rigorously ensure that American officers on Canadian soil adhere explicitly to the act and utilize customs and attitudes that are consistent with Canadian values.

**Hon. John B. Stewart:** Honourable senators, I should like to ask the honourable senator a question.

She referred to the situation where a traveller presents herself or himself for preclearance. I assume she did not wish to imply by what she said that the traveller who does this is locked into, as it were, a preclearance tunnel. Clause 10(1) of the bill states:

Every traveller has the right, at any stage of the preclearance process, to leave a preclearance area without departing for the United States, unless a preclearance officer informs the traveller that the officer suspects on reasonable grounds that the traveller has committed an offence under section 33 and 34.

As I understand it, a traveller has the right to say, "I have changed my mind," and to walk away. Clause 10 states "...that the officer suspects on reasonable grounds that the traveller has committed an offence..." However, we changed clause 33 of the bill to deal with the situation where a person makes an oral or written statement with respect to preclearance of the person or goods, and that person does so believing that she or he is telling the truth. The mere fact that the officer suspects does not become reasonable grounds for the traveller to be subjected to what formerly were the consequences of clause 33, because that clause has been amended.

I do not want to leave the suggestion that when you go in the door, you are trapped in the tunnel until the Americans let you out the other end of the tunnel.

**Senator Andreychuk:** Senator Stewart is right. As the clause was originally worded, a traveller would be "trapped in the tunnel," as the honourable senator has said. The amendments will now eliminate that situation. However, a traveller would still be trapped in the tunnel, as I understand it, if the officer suspects that an offence has been committed. Therefore, it remains to be seen how that will be implemented.

**Senator Stewart:** Honourable senators, the making of a statement which although inaccurate was not wilfully inaccurate does not constitute reasonable grounds for the imposition of the charges and the penalties which formerly were set out in clause 33 because the wording of clause 33 has been completely revised.

**Senator Andreychuk:** Honourable senators, that is another issue that I think has been dealt with correctly by amending the first draft of the bill. The penalties have been lessened. Therefore, that part has been corrected.

• (1720)

However, I still believe some discretion should be left in the hands of the officer if there are some reasonable grounds to suspect that an offence has been committed, and it remains to be seen how that will be implemented.

As I say, we have come light years from what we had. Previously, we were at the total mercy of the American system, in my opinion. We were trapped in the tunnel, and no matter what statement we made, it was the officer's interpretation that ruled the day. We are now saying that it must be the answer. As you say, the refusal by a traveller to answer any question asked by a preclearance officer does not, in and of itself, constitute reasonable grounds for the officer to suspect that the search of a traveller is necessary, whereas it did before. Nonetheless, we still have in one area a permissive section for the officer to search, and that causes me some difficulty.

There may be some very valid reasons, because we are talking about people who may be travelling with drugs, or indulging in other activities, and it may be in our best interests that these people be detained also and searched. However, the opposite could be true, and therefore I believe that there is some reason to worry about this legislation.

I commend to all senators a reading of the Canadian Bar Association report because the committee there raise these concerns, but they also put it in the same language that I have, that everyone is in support of the preclearance concept. It is merely to make sure that we do it right, and that we monitor to ensure that the American authorities understand the sensitivities of the Canadian system and the Canadian needs.

**Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Honourable senators, I have a question for my colleague Senator Andreychuk. If the chairman of the committee wishes to address this question as well, perhaps he could find a means to do that.

Did your committee canvass the matter of sovereignty and to what extent Canadian sovereignty is being yielded?

I watched an interview on CPAC with the Canadian Ambassador to the United States, Raymond Chrétien, and on commenting on this measure, he made the remark that yes, there will be some sovereignty that we would be giving up, and he thought that was a good thing. Therefore, my question to the committee, through either Senator Andreychuk or the chairman, is: Did your committee canvass the question of sovereignty?

**Senator Andreychuk:** I believe that was the whole premise upon which we questioned many of the clauses in this bill on preclearance. We all came to the study of the bill with the attitude that preclearance was a good and desirable thing. However, when we started reading the bill, we began to realize that some sovereignty would be given up. The question is what is a legitimate amount. That is probably the wrong legal phrase. What must we give up and what do we gain, was the way in which we weighed it, and I believe that a minimum amount of sovereignty is being given up with the one exception. As I say, there is a permissive clause that gives me some concern as to how it will be interpreted.

The question is that if at some point we believe that the law is not being interpreted and administered appropriately — and this is my comment — I would hope that the government would monitor the situation and either amend this act or withdraw it completely if it does not serve our purposes.

By virtue of implementing this act, there is some measure of sovereignty that is given up, however legitimate the amount, as we often have done in many of our past proceedings, particularly when we submit to any international scrutiny or other bilateral scrutiny.

**Senator Kinsella:** Could the honourable senator inform us as to whether or not this procedure requires any enactments by the Congress of the United States, or is there in place sufficient authority under whatever instrument, their naturalization or their customs legislation? Must the Americans pass similar legislation?

**Senator Andreychuk:** Honourable senators, as I understood the evidence before the committee, the aim of the negotiation was that there would be a reciprocal agreement, and we were advised that the Americans are proceeding with reciprocal legislation in the United States but that it has not gone as far as ours. In fact, we will be passing our act before theirs passes. The Americans, however, will not be implementing their act because there was no need to have a preclearance centre in the United States. It was simply not efficient. There are not enough travellers coming from the United States.

I believe the people who have applied the most pressure to have this legislation in place have been the airline companies in Canada, who stand to benefit from the increased traffic and from the easier flow of goods from Canada to the United States. My memory fails me now, but I do not believe that the Americans need to pass any enabling legislation for our portion of the act to come into effect. Their customs officers can take positions in Canada, as they have done already and under a slightly different basis, so there is no enabling legislation they need. However, there will be reciprocal legislation.

**Senator Stewart:** I should like to ask a supplementary question just to get more information.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable senators, the time period has been far exceeded. Is there leave granted to extend the question period?

**Hon. Senators:** Agreed.

**Senator Stewart:** Senator Andreychuk touched upon this angle, and I believe she covered approximately 75 per cent of the ground. Is it not true that, simply because of the shape of the globe, more travellers from third countries are likely to present themselves at Canadian airports who are going to the United States than vice versa? If a traveller is coming, let us say, from Japan, Vancouver is a very convenient point of entry. It is a more convenient point of entry than Los Angeles or San Francisco to the North American continent, unless one's ultimate destination is next door, to San Francisco or Los Angeles. The same is true on the East Coast. It is easier to come into North America through a Canadian airport, especially if one is going to the American Midwest. Is that not true?

**Senator Andreychuk:** The short answer is certainly yes, and we heard that so many of the air routes are routes over the North Pole, and that it is convenient to stop in Canada going the other way. Those are existing patterns both from Europe and from Asia.

However, I would take the opportunity to also state that we have two excellent airlines which provide the kind of service and the competitive air fares that make it desirable for tourists and business people to take the Canadian alternative with the one problem, that they were required to come into Canada, clear Canadian customs and then clear U.S. customs. We are now giving them an added incentive to take this route, as opposed to other carriers. I believe it commends itself that way also.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Normand Grimard:** Honourable senators, Senator Andreychuk said repeatedly that she did not take kindly to American immigration or customs officials conducting searches on Canadian soil. I agree with her but, 20 years ago, when we were travelling to Florida from Montreal, Toronto, or Vancouver, we had to go through customs in Miami, Tampa or elsewhere in the United States. At that time, American customs officials acted on their own territory.

It is a great advantage to have this American customs service in Canada, in our international airports. In my view, there is no inconvenience to American customs officials preclearing us in Canada. It is an improvement, because I would rather be cleared by American officials in Canada than in the United States. I therefore disagree with you on that score.

[*English*]

• (1730)

**Senator Andreychuk:** Honourable senators, some people expressed the view that there was some advantage in how Americans could deal with Canadians on Canadian soil. It certainly is a convenience.

However, up to this point, it was by agreement and, may I say, a project. Now it will be law. It is incumbent on us to ensure that, if action is taken by Americans on Canadian soil, it is the least intrusive into our sovereignty and that it is with the spirit and attitude that is in keeping with Canadian values.

As a traveller, I always find it convenient to clear customs quickly after a long trip. This bill is before us so that we may enjoy that convenience.

On motion of Senator Kinsella, debate adjourned.

## CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING—DEBATE ADJOURNED

**Hon. John Lynch-Staunton (Leader of the Opposition):** moved the second reading of Bill S-27, to amend the Canada Elections Act (hours of polling at by-elections).

He said: Honourable senators will recall that the 1997 election was the first one held which provided that polls across the country closed more or less at the same time. As a result, definitive results from the east are no longer known while voting is still taking place in the west.

There were complaints, particularly from British Columbians, that votes cast there lost their significance or could even be influenced by the results from the more populated central provinces, particularly when a party was being heavily favoured and voting on the West Coast would make no difference to the final outcome.

Bill S-27 provides an exception for by-elections by allowing poll hours between 8:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m., no matter the time zone in which the by-election is being held. There have been two by-elections since the 1997 general election, the first in Sherbrooke, in September, 1998, and the second one yesterday in Windsor—St. Clair. The polls were opened from 9:30 a.m. 9:30 p.m., as the Elections Act does not differentiate between a general election and a by-election. If I were as politically partisan as Senator St. Germain refuses to be, after hearing the results from both ridings, I would have preferred to keep the polls open indefinitely. However, once again, I put partisanship aside in favour of the national interest.

There are those who will point out that a number of by-elections can be held in different time zones on the same day and that the law affecting a general election should apply in such a case. I doubt if knowing the results of a by-election in the east before voting in one in the west would have any influence on one's choice as the government would likely remain the same the next day.

I have deliberately avoided complicating the issue by suggesting exceptions to the bill. I believe the main argument for it is valid, that savings in human and financial resources would be affected by holding by-elections at what are considered reasonable hours, 8:00 in the morning until 8:00 in the evening, while causing no inconvenience to the elector. This makes it easier for the candidates and their supporters to either enjoy the results or to try to get away from them as soon as possible.

Among those most qualified to evaluate Bill S-27 are the Chief Electoral Officer and his officials. I look forward to their comments as well as any others which this bill may provoke when it goes to the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs which I hope it will do in due course.

On motion of Senator Carstairs, debate adjourned

### MERCHANT NAVY WAR SERVICE RECOGNITION BILL

SECOND READING—ORDER STANDS

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Forrestall, seconded by the Honourable Senator Atkins, for the second reading of Bill S-19, to give further recognition to the war-time service of Canadian merchant navy veterans and to provide for their fair and equitable treatment.—(*Honourable Senator Carstairs*)

**Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Honourable senators, may I might ask Senator Carstairs a question with reference to Bill S-19? Tomorrow will be the 14th day that this matter has been stood. Senator Forrestall has been inquiring whether or not we would hear from Senator Carstairs tomorrow or the next day.

**Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Deputy Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, if you do not hear from me

at length, then you will hear from me briefly enough to extend the matter.

Order stands.

### REVIEW OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS POLICIES

MOTION ADOPTED

Leave having been given to revert to Order No. 128:

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Roche, seconded by the Honourable Senator Lavoie-Roux:

That the Senate recommend that the Government of Canada urge NATO to begin a review of its nuclear weapons policies at the Summit Meeting of NATO April 23-25, 1999.—(*Honourable Senator Roche*)

**Hon. Douglas Roche:** Honourable senators, I rise on a point of order. As this motion is in my name, I have some interest in it. Perhaps I am a little confused, but as I saw Senator Kinsella rising to speak to this matter, I questioned whether he could proceed because of the time constraints related to the debate on this motion.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** I thought I had heard the word “stand” when the order was called. I would ask honourable senators who wish to stand orders to say so more loudly so that there will be no confusion at the Table.

This matter was stood. It cannot be debated at this time.

**Senator Roche:** Honourable senators, is it possible to ask for unanimous consent that Order No. 128 be debated at this time?

**The Hon. the Speaker:** I find myself in an awkward position because the matter has been stood. However, I could consider a request by the Senate to revert to this order. I would point out, however, that the order stands in the name of Honourable Senator Di Nino, though nothing would prevent another senator from speaking, of course, if such is the wish of the Senate.

Honourable senators, is it unanimously agreed to revert to Order No. 128?

**Hon. Senators:** Agreed.

• (1740)

**Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Honourable senators, Senator Di Nino, who has injured himself and will not be here for a period of time, took the adjournment of the debate on this motion prior to the Easter recess. The reason I wish to hear the full reading of the motion is that it is time sensitive. The motion by the Honourable Senator Roche was to the effect that the Senate recommend that the Government of Canada urge NATO to begin a review of its nuclear weapons

policy at the NATO summit meeting on April 23-25, 1999. That time-frame for the summit meeting, 10 days from now, has caused me to rise, mindful of Senator Di Nino's indisposition, to say a few words on his behalf. The matter can then be adjourned in the name of another senator. Senator Di Nino wished to make a few points on this motion.

This motion makes a recommendation to the Government of Canada to take a certain course of action. Of course, the Government of Canada is represented by the cabinet. I would suspect that, by tradition, the cabinet meets once a week at least. Therefore, the cabinet will probably be meeting in the next day or so, prior to this meeting of the NATO summit. I think that is part of the reason there is a certain time consideration to this matter.

Honourable senators, recently we passed another motion dealing with NATO. Indeed, we referred the matter, with instructions, to the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs. The involvement of NATO in the bombing of Yugoslavia these days is very much front and centre in our considerations. Given the fact that NATO is celebrating its 50th anniversary, and that this is the first time that NATO has gone into an offensive posture in its history, I believe there are many NATO policies that Canadians would want to reassess. The course of history demonstrates that this particular alliance has evolved and its policies have evolved. Therefore, there must be a thoughtful consideration in our country of that evolution of policy, and whether we are clear on NATO policy as we go into the new millennium. This particular subset of questions, namely the review of NATO's nuclear weapons policy, is one among many NATO policy questions that I am sure many Canadians have these days.

I am not sure, in the order of priority, whether that is the most important policy question that should be addressed; I am sure, however, that it is an important policy question.

Honourable senators, speaking for my colleague Senator Di Nino and my colleagues who discussed this matter in our caucus, we are prepared to support the motion.

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

**Hon. Senators:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

## BUSINESS OF THE SENATE

**Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, it is my intention to speak to the sixth budget of the current Minister of Finance, which was delivered in the other place, but in my wild enthusiasm for what I might have to say, I may very well speak past six o'clock. Perhaps I could have agreement in advance that, if we reach that particular point, we will not see the clock.

**Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Honourable senators, there is agreement from this side that we will not see the clock should we still be dealing with business at six o'clock.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Is it agreed, honourable senators, that if we are still in session at six o'clock, I will not see the clock?

**Hon. Senators:** Agreed.

## THE BUDGET 1999

STATEMENT OF MINISTER OF FINANCE—  
INQUIRY—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

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

**Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, along with speaking to the sixth budget of the Minister of Finance, I also intend to address some of the more interesting assertions and claims made by our honourable colleagues opposite in their analysis of this most excellent budget, and in their historical reflection on budgets in the era during which they last sat on this side of the chamber.

The 1999 budget articulates the government's vision for tomorrow — a vision of Canada with a strong economy and a secure society. The budget also sets out the government's plan for today — a plan that will make our vision a reality; a plan that generates a higher standard of living for all Canadians and builds a foundation for making Canada an even better place to live.

This is the same goal that we have consistently pursued through the last five budgets. The government has followed a strategy designed to advance living standards by promoting well-paying jobs, productivity growth and equal opportunity for all, and providing a safety net for those in need. This strategy, applied through each of the government's budgets, takes actions on three fronts: maintaining sound economic and financial management; investing in key economic and social priorities; and providing tax relief and improving tax fairness. All three elements of this plan work together to improve the standard of living and the quality of life for all Canadians.

First, strong economic growth, the elimination of the deficit and a reduced debt burden give the government the flexibility to take important initiatives in key areas of the economy. As we all appreciate, the elimination of the deficit was not an end in itself.

• (1750)

Second, investments in health care, in people, in research and innovation, and in other key areas, improve the opportunity for Canadians to work and improve their quality of life.

Third, there is tax relief that is broad-based and permanent — that is, not financed with new borrowing — and will not jeopardize the soundness of Canada's finances. Overall, our balanced, three-front strategy has already proven that it is working, and working well by producing unprecedented results: the elimination of the deficit, low interest rates, the creation of over 1.6 million jobs, and an unemployment rate of 7.8 per cent.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear!

**Senator Graham:** I might add that these achievements were hard won, and were achieved in the face of the harshest of starting conditions for the government. That is, a serious recession, high unemployment, high interest rates, debt servicing charges and, finally, low confidence in financial markets regarding Canadians' ability to meet fiscal objectives.

While I know that the government's critics, including those on the benches opposite, struggle with this government's tactical approach of setting firm two-year rolling targets to attain our strategic objectives, I should like to point out that this approach has actually worked. It is this government's consistency in setting reasonable, step-by-step targets and then achieving them that has given Canadians and the financial markets the confidence to plan for the future and attain the high level of growth experienced in the last five years. Look at how far we have come from a \$42-billion deficit for the fiscal year 1993-94 to a \$3.5-billion surplus for 1997-98.

**Senator Kinsella:** Yes, thanks to free trade!

**Senator Graham:** We have come from a debt-to-GDP ratio that was growing at a rate of about 5 percentage points a year to a debt-to-GDP ratio that, in 1997-98, saw its largest single decline since 1956-57: from 70.3 per cent to 66.9 per cent. It is expected to fall to 65.3 per cent in 1998-99, and to fall under 62 per cent in 2000-2001.

Let us look at market debt. The debt outstanding and held by investors is expected to decline to about \$457 billion in 1998-99, down about \$20 billion from its peak.

Honourable senators, I would not normally wish to take time from speaking about the many positive initiatives in this budget to discuss the record of the previous government. However, I cannot, in good conscience, let go unchallenged some of the assertions made by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition in this debate. In particular, I should like to draw the attention of this house to the legacy of the last government in terms of its inability to meet its own goals for financial responsibility.

In November of 1985, the then minister of finance, Michael Wilson, set out what he called his "realistic medium-term plan" for discussion in a paper entitled: "Reducing the Deficit and Controlling the National Debt." In it, he stated that the government had taken steps that, by the early 1990s, would reduce the annual deficit by \$19 billion; reduce public debt charges by \$4 billion per year; and, in his own words, reduce the stock of debt by \$70 billion. How Mr. Wilson intended to both reduce the so-called stock of debt and still run a deficit was not

obvious. The important fact to note is that none of his five-year targets were met.

Let us now look at the facts as of 1990-91, after the so-called realistic five year plan had run its course. Rather than the debt having fallen by \$70 billion, net public debt had increased by \$183 billion. Rather than the annual deficit having fallen by \$19 billion, the annual deficit had only fallen by \$6.4 billion, and rose in each year thereafter. Rather than public debt charges having fallen by \$4 billion, public debt charges had risen by a staggering \$20.2 billion. On not one of these objectives did the government come within a mile of its targets.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition tried to make the point that the national debt only tripled under the nine years of Conservative government. Let us look at the absolute numbers. The debt rose from \$208 billion to \$508 billion. That is \$300 billion in just nine years — a sum greater than the accumulated deficit or debt incurred by previous Canadian governments since the time of Confederation. Looking at the best measure of Canada's ability to support its national debt, the debt-to-GDP ratio, we see that it nearly doubled from 40.1 per cent to 66.7 per cent. Would the Leader of the Opposition seriously argue that sending Canada's leverage ratio skyrocketing to the second highest among the G-7 nations was the work of a government of fiscal prudence? Were there extenuating circumstances? I would argue that there were not. This record was nothing less than a squandering of the opportunity to restore the nation's finances.

In the mid and late 1980s, Canada, like a number of OECD nations, experienced one of its greatest economic expansions. The recession of the early 1980s was behind us, and the opportunity to bring the federal government's fiscal house back under sound management was as bright as it has been in this half of the century. However, honourable senators, it is clear that the restructuring did not take place, and that the present Liberal government was thus obliged to make the tough choices needed, even while the economy was climbing out of severe recession. It was the present Liberal government that earned back the confidence of Canadians that government could follow through on a strategy, could set targets and keep them, and could be counted on to deliver sustainable measures.

• (1800)

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear!

**Senator Graham:** What does this mean for Canadians? It means that they can now have confidence in this government's ability to continue the initiatives it undertakes. It means that Canadians will not experience unaffordable tax cuts, as they did in 1984 and 1985, only to be followed by massive tax increases, as in 1986 and 1987. It means no more financing of investments and tax reductions out of new borrowings. It means that Canadians can count on us to continue to provide investments in key social and economic priorities, as well as broad-based tax cuts year after year and budget after budget. This is a result of our balanced approach: financial prudence, investments in the health and wealth of the nation, and fair tax relief.



Honourable senators, I should like to return to the particulars of this most excellent budget of the present Minister of Finance. I have spoken of this government's investments in Canada, and there is none that makes me personally more pleased and proud than the additional \$11.5 billion transferred for health care over the next five years. This is the largest single investment that this government has ever made. It is an investment in helping our provinces deal with the immediate concerns of Canadians about health care. It is an investment in one of our most cherished social programs — medicare. In fact, I would argue it is our most cherished program, one that represents the fundamental values of fairness and equity that defines us as Canadians.

However, this government's commitment to strengthening health care does not end with this \$11.5 billion investment. The 1999 budget also announced that the government will further invest about \$1.4 billion over four years in health information systems, research, First Nations and Inuit health services, and health problem prevention.

The 1999 budget also invests in Canada's economic future through a number of measures aimed at creating knowledge through research, disseminating and commercializing knowledge, and supporting employment.

In all, this represents over \$1.8 billion over the next four years. It builds on the Canadian opportunity strategy that was introduced in the 1998 budget and on knowledge and innovation investments in our previous budgets.

Honourable senators, fair tax relief is there also. The 1998 budget benefited low-income Canadians by increasing by \$500 the amount of income that they can earn each year before paying income tax. The 1999 budget builds on this by increasing that amount by another \$175 for a total increase of \$675. Even more, the 1999 budget extends this increase in the basic exemption to all taxpayers.

These measures will more than offset the effects of inflation on this exemption since this government came into office. For low- and middle-income families, there is an additional \$300 million for the child tax benefit. This is in addition to the \$1.7-billion increase in funding for the child tax benefit announced in the 1997 and 1998 budgets.

Further, this government, having successively defeated the deficit, is in a position to fully eliminate the 3 per cent surtax that was introduced by the previous government.

In sum, honourable senators, this budget is another important step in a journey that has taken Canada from a situation that compelled difficult cuts to a new era in which government can make sustainable investments, and a journey that has taken us from rising taxes to falling taxes.

The initiatives of this budget are mutually reinforcing. They build on what this government has done before, and they will work together towards an ambitious but achievable vision of

Canada's future. This budget vividly demonstrates that government can make a positive contribution to all Canadians as they go about their day-to-day lives at work or at home.

It is a budget that should be supported by everyone who cares about the future and, equally important, by everyone who remembers the failures of the recent past and acknowledges the achievements of the last five years. We have gone, remember, from a \$42-billion deficit to a \$3.5-billion surplus. We have gone from a debt-to-GDP ratio that was growing, to one that is falling faster than in any other G-7 country. We have gone from an 11.3 per cent unemployment rate to a 7.8 per cent unemployment rate through the creation of over 1.6 million jobs. We have gone from recession to steady growth, most recently with 4.6 per cent GDP growth in the fourth quarter of 1998, and we have gone from falling productivity to growing labour productivity of 2.9 per cent in 1997, its largest increase since 1984.

Honourable senators, we have positioned ourselves so that we can move forward from a sound financial footing on issues that are of the highest importance to Canadians, whether they be health care, learning, or child poverty. However, honourable senators, none of this would have been possible if we had not gone beyond saying what needed to be done and actually doing it.

In conclusion, let me repeat, honourable senators, that the great economic achievements of the last five years were no accident, nor were they the inevitable result of some alleged sacrifices made by past governments. This government faced grave circumstances with respect to Canada's economic fundamentals when it came into office. We decided that the status quo was not acceptable — that it was not good enough for us or for the people of Canada. We took decisions with what some consider an excess of prudence, but we did so in order to ensure that this government would not be going back to the people of Canada to report another set of failures and excuses.

**Senator Lynch-Staunton:** Just broken promises.

**Senator Graham:** Instead of failures and excuses, honourable senators, we have given Canada a firm foundation for the new millennium.

On motion of Senator Kinsella, for Senator Lebreton, debate adjourned.

## INCOME TAX ACT

INCREASE IN FOREIGN PROPERTY COMPONENT  
OF DEFERRED INCOME PLANS—MOTION PROPOSING  
AN AMENDMENT—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion as modified of the Honourable Senator Meighen, seconded by the Honourable Senator Kirby:

That the Senate urges the Government to propose an amendment to the *Income Tax Act* that would increase to 30 %, by increments of 2 % per year over a five-year period, the foreign property component of deferred income plans (pension plans, registered retirement savings plans and registered pension plans), as was done in the period between 1990 to 1995 when the foreign property limit of deferred income plans was increased from 10 % to 20 %, because:

(a) Canadians should be permitted to take advantage of potentially better investment returns in other markets, thereby increasing the value of their financial assets held for retirement, reducing the amount of income supplement that Canadians may need from government sources, and increasing government tax revenues from retirement income;

(b) Canadians should have more flexibility when investing their retirement savings, while reducing the risk of those investments through diversification;

(c) greater access to the world equity market would allow Canadians to participate in both higher growth economies and industry sectors;

(d) the current 20% limit has become artificial since both individuals with significant resources and pension plans with significant resources can by-pass the current

limit through the use of, for example, strategic investment decisions and derivative products; and

(e) problems of liquidity for pension fund managers, who now find they must take substantial positions in a single company to meet the 80 % Canadian holdings requirement, would be reduced.—(*Honourable Senator Eyton*)

**Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):**

Honourable senators, we support the motion that was moved by Senator Meighen and seconded by Senator Kirby proposing a number of amendments to the *Income Tax Act* that would increase to 30 per cent by increments of two per cent a year over a five-year period the foreign property component of the deferred income plans, pension plans, registered retirements savings plans and registered pension plans, as was done in the period between 1990 to 1995 when the foreign property limit of deferred income plans was increased from 10 to 20 per cent.

In view of the time of day and the impending meeting of the committee where a minister will be a witness, I would simply move the adjournment of the debate in the name of Senator Eyton.

On motion of Senator Kinsella, for Senator Eyton, debate adjourned.

The Senate adjourned until Wednesday, April 14, 1999 at 1:30 p.m.

---

## **APPENDIX**

Officers of the Senate

The Ministry

Senators

(Listed according to seniority, alphabetically and by provinces)

Committees of the Senate

**THE SPEAKER**

THE HONOURABLE GILDAS L. MOLGAT

**THE LEADER OF THE GOVERNMENT**

THE HONOURABLE B. ALASDAIR GRAHAM, P.C.

**THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION**

THE HONOURABLE JOHN LYNCH-STAUNTON

---

**OFFICERS OF THE SENATE****CLERK OF THE SENATE AND CLERK OF THE PARLIAMENTS**

PAUL BÉLISLE

**DEPUTY CLERK, PRINCIPAL CLERK, LEGISLATIVE SERVICES**

RICHARD GREENE

**LAW CLERK AND PARLIAMENTARY COUNSEL**

MARK AUDCENT

**USHER OF THE BLACK ROD**

MARY McLAREN

**THE MINISTRY**

According to Precedence

(April 13, 1999)

|                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| The Right Hon. Jean Chrétien  | Prime Minister   |
| The Hon. Herbert Eser Gray    | Deputy Prime Minister  |
| The Hon. Lloyd Axworthy       | Minister of Foreign Affairs  |
| The Hon. David M. Collenette  | Minister of Transport  |
| The Hon. David Anderson       | Minister of Fisheries and Oceans   |
| The Hon. Ralph E. Goodale     | Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible<br>for the Canadian Wheat Board         |
| The Hon. Sheila Copps         | Minister of Canadian Heritage  |
| The Hon. Sergio Marchi        | Minister for International Trade   |
| The Hon. John Manley          | Minister of Industry   |
| The Hon. Diane Marleau        | Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible<br>for Francophonie            |
| The Hon. Paul Martin          | Minister of Finance  |
| The Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton   | Minister of National Defence   |
| The Hon. Marcel Massé         | President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for<br>Infrastructure                 |
| The Hon. Anne McLellan        | Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada   |
| The Hon. Allan Rock           | Minister of Health   |
| The Hon. Lawrence MacAulay    | Solicitor General of Canada  |
| The Hon. Christine Stewart    | Minister of the Environment  |
| The Hon. Alfonso Gagliano     | Minister of Public Works and Government Services   |
| The Hon. Lucienne Robillard   | Minister of Citizenship and Immigration  |
| The Hon. Fred J. Mifflin      | Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State<br>(Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)  |
| The Hon. Jane Stewart         | Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development  |
| The Hon. Stéphane Dion        | President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and<br>Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs |
| The Hon. Pierre Pettigrew     | Minister of Human Resources Development  |
| The Hon. Don Boudria          | Leader of the Government in the House of Commons   |
| The Hon. B. Alasdair Graham   | Leader of the Government in the Senate   |
| The Hon. Lyle Vanclief        | Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food  |
| The Hon. Herb Dhaliwal        | Minister of National Revenue   |
| The Hon. Claudette Bradshaw   | Minister of Labour   |
| The Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew | Secretary of State (Children and Youth)  |
| The Hon. Raymond Chan         | Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)  |
| The Hon. Martin Cauchon       | Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada<br>for the Regions of Quebec)        |
| The Hon. Hedy Fry             | Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)  |
| The Hon. David Kilgour        | Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)  |
| The Hon. James Scott Peterson | Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)                                      |
| The Hon. Ronald J. Duhamel    | Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)<br>(Western Economic Diversification)   |
| The Hon. Andrew Mitchell      | Secretary of State (Parks)   |
| The Hon. Gilbert Normand      | Secretary of State (Agriculture and Agri-Food)<br>(Fisheries and Oceans)                       |

## SENATORS OF CANADA

### ACCORDING TO SENIORITY

(April 13, 1999)

| Senator                       | Designation              | Post Office Address     |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| THE HONOURABLE                |                          |                         |
| Herbert O. Sparrow            | Saskatchewan             | North Battleford, Sask. |
| Gildas L. Molgat, Speaker     | Ste-Rose                 | Winnipeg, Man.          |
| Edward M. Lawson              | Vancouver                | Vancouver, B.C.         |
| Bernard Alasdair Graham, P.C. | The Highlands            | Sydney, N.S.            |
| Raymond J. Perrault, P.C.     | North Shore-Burnaby      | North Vancouver, B.C.   |
| Louis-J. Robichaud, P.C.      | L'Acadie-Acadia          | Saint-Antoine, N.B.     |
| Jack Austin, P.C.             | Vancouver South          | Vancouver, B.C.         |
| Paul Lucier                   | Yukon                    | Whitehorse, Yukon       |
| Willie Adams                  | Nunavut                  | Rankin Inlet, Nunavut   |
| Philip Derek Lewis            | St. John's               | St. John's, Nfld.       |
| Reginald James Balfour        | Regina                   | Regina, Sask.           |
| Lowell Murray, P.C.           | Pakenham                 | Ottawa, Ont.            |
| C. William Doody              | Harbour Main-Bell Island | St. John's, Nfld.       |
| Peter Alan Stollery           | Bloor and Yonge          | Toronto, Ont.           |
| Peter Michael Pitfield, P.C.  | Ontario                  | Ottawa, Ont.            |
| William McDonough Kelly       | Port Severn              | Mississauga, Ont.       |
| Leo E. Kolber                 | Victoria                 | Westmount, Qué.         |
| John B. Stewart               | Antigonish-Guysborough   | Bayfield, N.S.          |
| Michael Kirby                 | South Shore              | Halifax, N.S.           |
| Jerahmiel S. Grafstein        | Metro Toronto            | Toronto, Ont.           |
| Anne C. Cools                 | Toronto Centre           | Toronto, Ont.           |
| Charlie Watt                  | Inkerman                 | Kuujuuaq, Qué.          |
| Daniel Phillip Hays           | Calgary                  | Calgary, Alta.          |
| Joyce Fairbairn, P.C.         | Lethbridge               | Lethbridge, Alta.       |
| Colin Kenny                   | Rideau                   | Ottawa, Ont.            |
| Pierre De Bané, P.C.          | De la Vallière           | Montréal, Qué.          |
| Eymard Georges Corbin         | Grand-Sault              | Grand-Sault, N.B.       |
| Brenda Mary Robertson         | Riverview                | Shediac, N.B.           |
| Jean-Maurice Simard           | Edmundston               | Edmundston, N.B.        |
| Michel Cogger                 | Lauzon                   | Knowlton, Qué.          |
| Norman K. Atkins              | Markham                  | Toronto, Ont.           |
| Ethel Cochrane                | Newfoundland             | Port-au-Port, Nfld.     |
| Eileen Rossiter               | Prince Edward Island     | Charlottetown, P.E.I.   |
| Mira Spivak                   | Manitoba                 | Winnipeg, Man.          |
| Roch Bolduc                   | Golfe                    | Ste-Foy, Qué.           |
| Gérald-A. Beaudoin            | Rigaud                   | Hull, Qué.              |
| Pat Carney, P.C.              | British Columbia         | Vancouver, B.C.         |
| Gerald J. Comeau              | Nova Scotia              | Church Point, N.S.      |
| Consiglio Di Nino             | Ontario                  | Downsview, Ont.         |
| Donald H. Oliver              | Nova Scotia              | Halifax, N.S.           |
| Noël A. Kinsella              | New Brunswick            | Fredericton, N.B.       |
| John Buchanan, P.C.           | Nova Scotia              | Halifax, N.S.           |
| Mabel Margaret DeWare         | New Brunswick            | Moncton, N.B.           |
| John Lynch-Staunton           | Grandville               | Georgeville, Qué.       |
| James Francis Kelleher, P.C.  | Ontario                  | Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.  |
| J. Trevor Eyton               | Ontario                  | Caledon, Ont.           |
| Wilbert Joseph Keon           | Ottawa                   | Ottawa, Ont.            |
| Michael Arthur Meighen        | St. Marys                | Toronto, Ont.           |
| Normand Grimard               | Québec                   | Noranda, Qué.           |

## ACCORDING TO SENIORITY

| Senator                              | Designation                 | Post Office Address               |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| THE HONOURABLE                       |                             |                                   |
| Thérèse Lavoie-Roux                  | Québec                      | Montréal, Qué.                    |
| J. Michael Forrestall                | Dartmouth and Eastern Shore | Dartmouth, N.S.                   |
| Janis Johnson                        | Winnipeg-Interlake          | Winnipeg, Man.                    |
| Eric Arthur Berntson                 | Saskatchewan                | Saskatoon, Sask.                  |
| A. Raynell Andreychuk                | Regina                      | Regina, Sask.                     |
| Jean-Claude Rivest                   | Stadacona                   | Québec, Qué.                      |
| Ronald D. Ghitter                    | Alberta                     | Calgary, Alta.                    |
| Terrance R. Stratton                 | Red River                   | St. Norbert, Man.                 |
| Marcel Prud'homme, P.C.              | La Salle                    | Montréal, Qué.                    |
| Fernand Roberge                      | Saurel                      | Ville St-Laurent, Qué.            |
| Leonard J. Gustafson                 | Saskatchewan                | Macoun, Sask.                     |
| Erminie Joy Cohen                    | New Brunswick               | Saint John, N.B.                  |
| David Tkachuk                        | Saskatchewan                | Saskatoon, Sask.                  |
| W. David Angus                       | Alma                        | Montréal, Qué.                    |
| Pierre Claude Nolin                  | De Salaberry                | Québec, Qué.                      |
| Marjory LeBreton                     | Ontario                     | Manotick, Ont.                    |
| Gerry St. Germain, P.C.              | Langley-Pemberton-Whistler  | Maple Ridge, B.C.                 |
| Lise Bacon                           | De la Durantaye             | Laval, Qué.                       |
| Sharon Carstairs                     | Manitoba                    | Victoria Beach, Man.              |
| Landon Pearson                       | Ontario                     | Ottawa, Ont.                      |
| Jean-Robert Gauthier                 | Ottawa-Vanier               | Ottawa, Ontario                   |
| John G. Bryden                       | New Brunswick               | Bayfield, N.B.                    |
| Rose-Marie Losier-Cool               | New Brunswick               | Bathurst, N.B.                    |
| Céline Hervieux-Payette, P.C.        | Bedford                     | Montréal, Qué.                    |
| William H. Rompkey, P.C.             | Newfoundland                | North West River, Labrador, Nfld. |
| Lorna Milne                          | Ontario                     | Brampton, Ont.                    |
| Marie-P. Poulin                      | Northern Ontario            | Ottawa, Ont.                      |
| Shirley Maheu                        | Rougement                   | Ville de Saint-Laurent, Qué.      |
| Nicholas William Taylor              | Sturgeon                    | Bon Accord, Alta.                 |
| Eugene Francis Whelan, P.C.          | Western Ontario             | Ottawa, Ont.                      |
| Léonce Mercier                       | Mille Isles                 | Saint-Élie d'Orford, Qué.         |
| Wilfred P. Moore                     | Stanhope St./Bluenose       | Chester, N.S.                     |
| Lucie Pépin                          | Shawinigan                  | Montréal, Qué.                    |
| Fernand Robichaud, P.C.              | New Brunswick               | Saint-Louis-de-Kent, N.B.         |
| Catherine S. Callbeck                | Prince Edward Island        | Central Bedeque, P.E.I.           |
| Marisa Ferretti Barth                | Repentigny                  | Pierrefonds, Qué.                 |
| Sister Mary Alice (Peggy) Butts      | Nova Scotia                 | Sydney, N.S.                      |
| Serge Joyal, P.C.                    | Kennebec                    | Montréal, Qué.                    |
| Thelma J. Chalifoux                  | Alberta                     | Morinville, Alta.                 |
| Joan Cook                            | Newfoundland                | St. John's, Nfld.                 |
| Archibald (Archie) Hynd Johnstone    | Prince Edward Island        | Kensington, P.E.I.                |
| Ross Fitzpatrick                     | Okanagan-Similkameen        | Kelowna, B.C.                     |
| The Very Reverend Dr. Lois M. Wilson | Toronto                     | Toronto, Ont.                     |
| Francis William Mahovlich            | Toronto                     | Toronto, Ont.                     |
| Calvin Woodrow Ruck                  | Dartmouth                   | Dartmouth, N.S.                   |
| Richard H. Kroft                     | Winnipeg                    | Winnipeg, Man.                    |
| Marian Maloney                       | Surprise Lake-Thunder Bay   | Etobicoke, Ont.                   |
| Douglas James Roche                  | Edmonton                    | Edmonton, Alta.                   |
| Joan Thorne Fraser                   | De Lorimier                 | Montréal, Qué.                    |
| Aurélien Gill                        | Wellington                  | Mashteuiatsh, Pointe-Bleue, Qué.  |
| Vivienne Poy                         | Toronto                     | Toronto, Ont.                     |

## SENATORS OF CANADA

## ALPHABETICAL LIST

(April 13, 1999)

| Senator                            | Designation                 | Post Office Address              |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| THE HONOURABLE                     |                             |                                  |
| Adams, Willie                      | Nunavut                     | Rankin Inlet, Nunavut            |
| Andreychuk, A. Raynell             | Regina                      | Regina, Sask.                    |
| Angus, W. David                    | Alma                        | Montréal, Qué.                   |
| Atkins, Norman K.                  | Markham                     | Toronto, Ont.                    |
| Austin, Jack, P.C.                 | Vancouver South             | Vancouver, B.C.                  |
| Bacon, Lise                        | De la Durantaye             | Laval, Qué.                      |
| Balfour, Reginald James            | Regina                      | Regina, Sask.                    |
| Beaudoin, Gérald-A.                | Rigaud                      | Hull, Qué.                       |
| Berntson, Eric Arthur              | Saskatchewan                | Saskatoon, Sask.                 |
| Bolduc, Roch                       | Golfe                       | Ste-Foy, Qué.                    |
| Bryden, John G.                    | New Brunswick               | Bayfield, N.B.                   |
| Buchanan, John, P.C.               | Nova Scotia                 | Halifax, N.S.                    |
| Butts, Sister Mary Alice (Peggy)   | Nova Scotia                 | Sydney, N.S.                     |
| Callbeck, Catherine S.             | Prince Edward Island        | Central Bedeque, P.E.I.          |
| Carney, Pat, P.C.                  | British Columbia            | Vancouver, B.C.                  |
| Carstairs, Sharon                  | Manitoba                    | Victoria Beach, Man.             |
| Chalifoux, Thelma J.               | Alberta                     | Morinville, Alta.                |
| Cochrane, Ethel                    | Newfoundland                | Port-au-Port, Nfld.              |
| Cogger, Michel                     | Lauzon                      | Knowlton, Qué.                   |
| Cohen, Erminie Joy                 | New Brunswick               | Saint John, N.B.                 |
| Comeau, Gerald J.                  | Nova Scotia                 | Church Point, N.S.               |
| Cook, Joan                         | Newfoundland                | St. John's, Nfld.                |
| Cools, Anne C.                     | Toronto Centre              | Toronto, Ont.                    |
| Corbin, Eymard Georges             | Grand-Sault                 | Grand-Sault, N.B.                |
| De Bané, Pierre, P.C.              | De la Vallière              | Montréal, Qué.                   |
| DeWare, Mabel Margaret             | New Brunswick               | Moncton, N.B.                    |
| Di Nino, Consiglio                 | Ontario                     | Downsview, Ont.                  |
| Doody, C. William                  | Harbour Main-Bell Island    | St. John's, Nfld.                |
| Eyton, J. Trevor                   | Ontario                     | Caledon, Ont.                    |
| Fairbairn, Joyce, P.C.             | Lethbridge                  | Lethbridge, Alta.                |
| Ferretti Barth, Marisa             | Repentigny                  | Pierrefonds, Qué.                |
| Fitzpatrick, Ross                  | Okanagan-Similkameen        | Kelowna, B.C.                    |
| Forrestall, J. Michael             | Dartmouth and Eastern Shore | Dartmouth, N.S.                  |
| Fraser, Joan Thorne                | De Lorimier                 | Montréal, Qué.                   |
| Gauthier, Jean-Robert              | Ottawa-Vanier               | Ottawa, Ont.                     |
| Ghitter, Ronald D.                 | Alberta                     | Calgary, Alta.                   |
| Gill, Aurélien                     | Wellington                  | Mashteuiatsh, Pointe-Bleue, Qué. |
| Grafstein, Jerahmiel S.            | Metro Toronto               | Toronto, Ont.                    |
| Graham, Bernard Alasdair, P.C.     | The Highlands               | Sydney, N.S.                     |
| Grimard, Normand                   | Québec                      | Noranda, Qué.                    |
| Gustafson Leonard J.               | Saskatchewan                | Macoun, Sask.                    |
| Hays, Daniel Phillip               | Calgary                     | Calgary, Alta.                   |
| Hervieux-Payette, Céline, P.C.     | Bedford                     | Montréal, Qué.                   |
| Johnson, Janis                     | Winnipeg-Interlake          | Winnipeg, Man.                   |
| Johnstone, Archibald (Archie) Hynd | Prince Edward Island        | Kensington, P.E.I.               |
| Joyal, Serge, P.C.                 | Kennebec                    | Montréal, Qué.                   |
| Kelleher, James Francis, P.C.      | Ontario                     | Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.           |
| Kelly, William McDonough           | Port Severn                 | Mississauga, Ont.                |
| Kenny, Colin                       | Rideau                      | Ottawa, Ont.                     |
| Keon, Wilbert Joseph               | Ottawa                      | Ottawa, Ont.                     |



| Senator                               | Designation                | Post Office Address          |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| THE HONOURABLE                        |                            |                              |
| Kinsella, Noël A.                     | New Brunswick              | Fredericton, N.B.            |
| Kirby, Michael                        | South Shore                | Halifax, N.S.                |
| Kolber, Leo E.                        | Victoria                   | Westmount, Qué.              |
| Kroft, Richard H.                     | Winnipeg                   | Winnipeg, Man.               |
| Lavoie-Roux, Thérèse                  | Québec                     | Montréal, Qué.               |
| Lawson, Edward M.                     | Vancouver                  | Vancouver, B.C.              |
| LeBreton, Marjory                     | Ontario                    | Manotick, Ont.               |
| Lewis, Philip Derek                   | St. John's                 | St. John's, Nfld.            |
| Losier-Cool, Rose-Marie               | New Brunswick              | Bathurst, N.B.               |
| Lucier, Paul                          | Yukon                      | Whitehorse, Yukon            |
| Lynch-Staunton, John                  | Grandville                 | Georgeville, Qué.            |
| Maheu, Shirley                        | Rougemont                  | Ville de Saint-Laurent, Qué. |
| Mahovich, Francis William             | Toronto                    | Toronto, Ont.                |
| Maloney, Marian                       | Surprise Lake-Thunder Bay  | Etobicoke, Ont.              |
| Meighen, Michael Arthur               | St. Marys                  | Toronto, Ont.                |
| Mercier, Léonce                       | Mille Isles                | Saint-Élie d'Orford, Qué.    |
| Milne, Lorna                          | Ontario                    | Brampton, Ont.               |
| Molgat, Gildas L. Speaker             | Ste-Rose                   | Winnipeg, Man.               |
| Moore, Wilfred P.                     | Stanhope St./Bluenose      | Chester, N.S.                |
| Murray, Lowell, P.C.                  | Pakenham                   | Ottawa, Ont.                 |
| Nolin, Pierre Claude                  | De Salaberry               | Québec, Qué.                 |
| Oliver, Donald H.                     | Nova Scotia                | Halifax, N.S.                |
| Pearson, Landon                       | Ontario                    | Ottawa, Ontario              |
| Pépin, Lucie                          | Shawinigan                 | Montréal, Qué.               |
| Perrault, Raymond J., P.C.            | North Shore-Burnaby        | North Vancouver, B.C.        |
| Pitfield, Peter Michael, P.C.         | Ontario                    | Ottawa, Ont.                 |
| Poulin, Marie-P.                      | Northern Ontario           | Ottawa, Ont.                 |
| Poy, Vivienne                         | Toronto                    | Toronto, Ont.                |
| Prud'homme, Marcel, P.C.              | La Salle                   | Montréal, Qué.               |
| Rivest, Jean-Claude                   | Stadacona                  | Québec, Qué.                 |
| Roberge, Fernand                      | Saurel                     | Ville St-Laurent, Qué.       |
| Robertson, Brenda Mary                | Riverview                  | Shediac, N.B.                |
| Robichaud, Fernand, P.C.              | New Brunswick              | Saint-Louis-de-Kent, N.B.    |
| Robichaud, Louis-J., P.C.             | L'Acadie-Acadia            | Saint-Antoine, N.B.          |
| Roche, Douglas James                  | Edmonton                   | Edmonton, Alta.              |
| Rompkey, William H., P.C.             | Newfoundland               | North West River, Labrador   |
| Rossiter, Eileen                      | Prince Edward Island       | Charlottetown, P.E.I.        |
| Ruck, Calvin Woodrow                  | Dartmouth                  | Dartmouth, N.S.              |
| St. Germain, Gerry, P.C.              | Langley-Pemberton-Whistler | Maple Ridge, B.C.            |
| Simard, Jean-Maurice                  | Edmundston                 | Edmundston, N.B.             |
| Sparrow, Herbert O.                   | Saskatchewan               | North Battleford, Sask.      |
| Spivak, Mira                          | Manitoba                   | Winnipeg, Man.               |
| Stewart, John B.                      | Antigonish-Guysborough     | Bayfield, N.S.               |
| Stollery, Peter Alan                  | Bloor and Yonge            | Toronto, Ont.                |
| Stratton, Terrance R.                 | Red River                  | St. Norbert, Man.            |
| Taylor, Nicholas William              | Sturgeon                   | Bon Accord, Alta.            |
| Tkachuk, David                        | Saskatchewan               | Saskatoon, Sask.             |
| Watt, Charlie                         | Inkerman                   | Kuujuuaq, Qué.               |
| Whelan, Eugene Francis, P.C.          | Western Ontario            | Ottawa, Ont.                 |
| Wilson, The Very Reverend Dr. Lois M. | Toronto                    | Toronto, Ont.                |

**SENATORS OF CANADA**  
**BY PROVINCE AND TERRITORY**

(April 13, 1999)

---



---

**ONTARIO—24**

---



---

| Senator        | Designation  | Post Office Address |
|----------------|--|---------------------|
| THE HONOURABLE |  |                     |
| 1              | Lowell Murray, P.C. . . . . Pakenham . . . . .                   | Ottawa              |
| 2              | Peter Alan Stollery . . . . . Bloor and Yonge . . . . .          | Toronto             |
| 3              | Peter Michael Pitfield, P.C. . . . . Ontario . . . . .           | Ottawa              |
| 4              | William McDonough Kelly . . . . . Port Severn . . . . .          | Missassauga         |
| 5              | Jerahmiel S. Grafstein . . . . . Metro Toronto . . . . .         | Toronto             |
| 6              | Anne C. Cools . . . . . Toronto Centre . . . . .                 | Toronto             |
| 7              | Colin Kenny . . . . . Rideau . . . . .                           | Ottawa              |
| 8              | Norman K. Atkins . . . . . Markham . . . . .                     | Toronto             |
| 9              | Consiglio Di Nino . . . . . Ontario . . . . .                    | Downsview           |
| 10             | James Francis Kelleher P.C. . . . . Ontario . . . . .            | Sault Ste. Marie    |
| 11             | John Trevor Eyton . . . . . Ontario . . . . .                    | Caledon             |
| 12             | Wilbert Joseph Keon . . . . . Ottawa . . . . .                   | Ottawa              |
| 13             | Michael Arthur Meighen . . . . . St. Marys . . . . .             | Toronto             |
| 14             | Marjory LeBreton . . . . . Ontario . . . . .                     | Manotick            |
| 15             | Landon Pearson . . . . . Ontario . . . . .                       | Ottawa              |
| 16             | Jean-Robert Gauthier . . . . . Ottawa-Vanier . . . . .           | Ottawa              |
| 17             | Lorna Milne . . . . . Ontario . . . . .                          | Brampton            |
| 18             | Marie-P. Poulin . . . . . Northern Ontario . . . . .             | Ottawa              |
| 19             | Eugene Francis Whelan, P.C. . . . . Western Ontario . . . . .    | Ottawa              |
| 20             | The Very Reverend Dr. Lois M. Wilson . . . . . Toronto . . . . . | Toronto             |
| 21             | Francis William Mahovlich . . . . . Toronto . . . . .            | Toronto             |
| 22             | Marian Maloney . . . . . Surprise-Lake-Thunder Bay . . . . .     | Etobicoke           |
| 23             | Vivienne Poy . . . . . Toronto . . . . .                         | Toronto             |
| 24             | . . . . .  |                     |

---

SENATORS BY PROVINCE AND TERRITORY

QUÉBEC—24

| Senator                          | Designation     | Post Office Address              |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|
| THE HONOURABLE                   |                 |                                  |
| 1 Leo E. Kolber                  | Victoria        | Westmount                        |
| 2 Charlie Watt                   | Inkerman        | Kuujuuaq                         |
| 3 Pierre De Bané, P.C.           | De la Vallière  | Montréal                         |
| 4 Michel Cogger                  | Lauzon          | Knowlton                         |
| 5 Roch Bolduc                    | Golfe           | Ste-Foy                          |
| 6 Gérald-A. Beaudoin             | Rigaud          | Hull                             |
| 7 John Lynch-Staunton            | Grandville      | Georgeville                      |
| 8 Jean-Claude Rivest             | Stadacona       | Québec                           |
| 9 Marcel Prud'homme, P.C.        | La Salle        | Montréal                         |
| 10 Fernand Roberge               | Saurel          | Ville de Saint-Laurent           |
| 11 W. David Angus                | Alma            | Montréal                         |
| 12 Pierre Claude Nolin           | De Salaberry    | Québec                           |
| 13 Lise Bacon                    | De la Durantaye | Laval                            |
| 14 Céline Hervieux-Payette, P.C. | Bedford         | Montréal                         |
| 15 Shirley Maheu                 | Rougemont       | Ville de Saint-Laurent           |
| 16 Léonce Mercier                | Mille Isles     | Saint-Élie d'Orford              |
| 17 Lucie Pépin                   | Shawinegan      | Montréal                         |
| 18 Marisa Ferretti Barth         | Repentigny      | Pierrefonds                      |
| 19 Serge Joyal, P.C.             | Kennebec        | Montréal                         |
| 20 Joan Thorne Fraser            | De Lorimier     | Montréal, Qué.                   |
| 21 Aurélien Gill                 | Wellington      | Mashteuiatsh, Pointe-Bleue, Qué. |
| 22                               |                 |                                  |
| 23                               |                 |                                  |
| 24                               |                 |                                  |

## SENATORS BY PROVINCE—MARITIME DIVISION

## NOVA SCOTIA—10

| Senator                           | Designation                 | Post Office Address |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|
| THE HONOURABLE                    |                             |                     |
| 1 Bernard Alasdair Graham, P.C.   | The Highlands               | Sydney              |
| 2 John B. Stewart                 | Antigonish-Guysborough      | Bayfield            |
| 3 Michael Kirby                   | South Shore                 | Halifax             |
| 4 Gerald J. Comeau                | Nova Scotia                 | Church Point        |
| 5 Donald H. Oliver                | Nova Scotia                 | Halifax             |
| 6 John Buchanan, P.C.             | Nova Scotia                 | Halifax             |
| 7 J. Michael Forrestall           | Dartmouth and Eastern Shore | Dartmouth           |
| 8 Wilfred P. Moore                | Stanhope St./Bluenose       | Chester             |
| 9 Sister Mary Alice (Peggy) Butts | Nova Scotia                 | Sydney              |
| 10 Calvin Woodrow Ruck            | Dartmouth                   | Dartmouth           |

## NEW BRUNSWICK—10

|                            |                 |                     |
|----------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| THE HONOURABLE             |                 |                     |
| 1 Louis-J. Robichaud, P.C. | L'Acadie-Acadia | Saint-Antoine       |
| 2 Eymard Georges Corbin    | Grand-Sault     | Grand-Sault         |
| 3 Brenda Mary Robertson    | Riverview       | Shediac             |
| 4 Jean-Maurice Simard      | Edmundston      | Edmundston          |
| 5 Noël A. Kinsella         | New Brunswick   | Fredericton         |
| 6 Mabel Margaret DeWare    | New Brunswick   | Moncton             |
| 7 Erminie Joy Cohen        | New Brunswick   | Saint John          |
| 8 John G. Bryden           | New Brunswick   | Bayfield            |
| 9 Rose-Marie Losier-Cool   | New Brunswick   | Bathurst            |
| 10 Fernand Robichaud, P.C. | New Brunswick   | Saint-Louis-de-Kent |

## PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—4

|                                     |                      |                 |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| THE HONOURABLE                      |                      |                 |
| 1 Eileen Rossiter                   | Prince Edward Island | Charlottetown   |
| 2 Catherine S. Callbeck             | Prince Edward Island | Central Bedeque |
| 3 Archibald (Archie) Hynd Johnstone | Prince Edward Island | Kensington      |
| 4                                   |                      |                 |

## SENATORS BY PROVINCE—WESTERN DIVISION

**MANITOBA—6**

| Senator                     | Designation        | Post Office Address |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| THE HONOURABLE              |                    |                     |
| 1 Gildas L. Molgat, Speaker | Ste-Rose           | Winnipeg            |
| 2 Mira Spivak               | Manitoba           | Winnipeg            |
| 3 Janis Johnson             | Winnipeg-Interlake | Winnipeg            |
| 4 Terrance R. Stratton      | Red River          | St. Norbert         |
| 5 Sharon Carstairs          | Manitoba           | Victoria Beach      |
| 6 Richard H. Kroft          | Manitoba           | Winnipeg            |

**BRITISH COLUMBIA—6**

| Senator                     | Designation                | Post Office Address |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| THE HONOURABLE              |                            |                     |
| 1 Edward M. Lawson          | Vancouver                  | Vancouver           |
| 2 Raymond J. Perrault, P.C. | North Shore-Burnaby        | North Vancouver     |
| 3 Jack Austin, P.C.         | Vancouver South            | Vancouver           |
| 4 Pat Carney, P.C.          | British Columbia           | Vancouver           |
| 5 Gerry St. Germain, P.C.   | Langley-Pemberton-Whistler | Maple Ridge         |
| 6 Ross Fitzpatrick          | Okanagan-Similkameen       | Kamloops            |

**SASKATCHEWAN—6**

| Senator                  | Designation  | Post Office Address |
|--------------------------|--------------|---------------------|
| THE HONOURABLE           |              |                     |
| 1 Herbert O. Sparrow     | Saskatchewan | North Battleford    |
| 2 Reginald James Balfour | Regina       | Regina              |
| 3 Eric Arthur Berntson   | Saskatchewan | Saskatoon           |
| 4 A. Raynell Andreychuk  | Regina       | Regina              |
| 5 Leonard J. Gustafson   | Saskatchewan | Macoun              |
| 6 David Tkachuk          | Saskatchewan | Saskatoon           |

**ALBERTA—6**

| Senator                   | Designation | Post Office Address |
|---------------------------|-------------|---------------------|
| THE HONOURABLE            |             |                     |
| 1 Daniel Phillip Hays     | Calgary     | Calgary             |
| 2 Joyce Fairbairn, P.C.   | Lethbridge  | Lethbridge          |
| 3 Ronald D. Ghitter       | Alberta     | Calgary             |
| 4 Nicholas William Taylor | Sturgeon    | Bon Accord          |
| 5 Thelma J. Chalifoux     | Alberta     | Morinville          |
| 6 Douglas James Roche     | Edmonton    | Edmonton            |

---



---

**SENATORS BY PROVINCE AND TERRITORY**


---



---



---



---

**NEWFOUNDLAND—6**


---



---

| Senator                         | Designation                    | Post Office Address        |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|
| THE HONOURABLE                  |                                |                            |
| 1 Philip Derek Lewis .....      | St. John's .....               | St. John's                 |
| 2 C. William Doody .....        | Harbour Main-Bell Island ..... | St. John's                 |
| 3 Ethel Cochrane .....          | Newfoundland .....             | Port-au-Port               |
| 4 William H. Rompkey, P.C. .... | Newfoundland .....             | North West River, Labrador |
| 5 Joan Cook .....               | Newfoundland .....             | St. John's                 |
| 6 .....                         | .....                          | .....                      |

---



---



---

**NORTHWEST TERRITORIES—1**


---



---

|                |       |       |
|----------------|-------|-------|
| THE HONOURABLE |       |       |
| 1 .....        | ..... | ..... |

---



---



---

**NUNAVUT—1**


---



---

|                      |               |              |
|----------------------|---------------|--------------|
| THE HONOURABLE       |               |              |
| 1 Willie Adams ..... | Nunavut ..... | Rankin Inlet |

---



---



---

**YUKON TERRITORY—1**


---



---

|                     |             |            |
|---------------------|-------------|------------|
| THE HONOURABLE      |             |            |
| 1 Paul Lucier ..... | Yukon ..... | Whitehorse |

---

**DIVISIONAL SENATORS**

---

---

| Senator                     | Designation  | Post Office Address |
|-----------------------------|--------------|---------------------|
| THE HONOURABLE              |              |                     |
| 1 Normand Grimard .....     | Québec ..... | Noranda, Qué.       |
| 2 Thérèse Lavoie-Roux ..... | Québec ..... | Montréal, Qué.      |

---

**ALPHABETICAL LIST OF STANDING, SPECIAL AND JOINT COMMITTEES**

(As of April 13, 1999)

\*Ex Officio Member

**ABORIGINAL PEOPLES**

|                      |                                |                         |                                   |
|----------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>Chairman:</b>     | <b>Honourable Senator Watt</b> | <b>Deputy Chairman:</b> | <b>Honourable Senator Johnson</b> |
| Honourable Senators: |                                |                         |                                   |
| Adams,               | Cochrane,                      | Johnson,                | Pearson,                          |
| Andreychuk,          | Gill,                          | *Lynch-Staunton,        | Robertson,                        |
| Austin,              | Graham,                        | (or Kinsella)           | St. Germain,                      |
| Chalifoux,           | (or Carstairs)                 | Mahovlich,              | Watt.                             |

*Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection*

*Adams, Andreychuk, Austin, Beaudoin, Doody, Forest, \*Graham (or Carstairs), Johnson  
\*Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella, acting), Marchand, Pearson, Taylor, Twinn, Watt.*

**AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY**

|                      |                                     |                                |                                  |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <b>Chairman:</b>     | <b>Honourable Senator Gustafson</b> | <b>Deputy Chairman:</b>        | <b>Honourable Senator Whelan</b> |
| Honourable Senators: |                                     |                                |                                  |
| Chalifoux,           | Gustafson,                          | Rivest,                        | Spivak,                          |
| Fairbairn,           | Hays,                               | Robichaud,                     | Stratton,                        |
| *Graham,             | Hervieux-Payette,                   | ( <i>Saint-Louis-de-Kent</i> ) | Taylor,                          |
| (or Carstairs)       | *Lynch-Staunton,                    | Rossiter,                      | Whelan.                          |
|                      | (or Kinsella)                       |                                |                                  |

*Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection*

*Bryden, Callbeck, \*Graham (or Carstairs), Gustafson, Hays, \*Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella, acting),  
Rivest, Robichaud (Saint-Louis-de-Kent), Rossiter, Sparrow, Spivak, Stratton, Taylor, Whelan.*

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON BOREAL FOREST**  
(Agriculture and Forestry)

|                      |                                  |                                |                                  |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <b>Chairman:</b>     | <b>Honourable Senator Taylor</b> | <b>Deputy Chairman:</b>        | <b>Honourable Senator Spivak</b> |
| Honourable Senators: |                                  |                                |                                  |
| Chalifoux,           | *Lynch-Staunton,                 | Robichaud,                     | Stratton,                        |
| *Graham,             | (or Kinsella)                    | ( <i>Saint-Louis-de-Kent</i> ) | Taylor.                          |
| (or Carstairs)       |                                  | Spivak,                        |                                  |



**BANKING, TRADE AND COMMERCE**

|                      |                                 |                         |                                   |
|----------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>Chairman:</b>     | <b>Honourable Senator Kirby</b> | <b>Deputy Chairman:</b> | <b>Honourable Senator Tkachuk</b> |
| Honourable Senators: |                                 |                         |                                   |
| Angus,               | Hervieux-Payette,               | Kolber,                 | Meighen,                          |
| Austin,              | Kelleher,                       | Kroft,                  | Oliver,                           |
| Callbeck,            | Kenny,                          | *Lynch-Staunton,        | Tkachuk.                          |
| *Graham,             | Kirby,                          | (or Kinsella)           |                                   |
| (or Carstairs)       |                                 |                         |                                   |

***Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection***

*Angus, Austin, Callbeck, \*Graham (or Carstairs), Hervieux-Payette, Kelleher, Kirby, Kolber, \*Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella, acting), Meighen, Oliver, Stanbury, Stewart, Tkachuk.*

---

**ENERGY, THE ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES**

|                      |                                   |                         |                                  |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <b>Chairman:</b>     | <b>Honourable Senator Ghitter</b> | <b>Deputy Chairman:</b> | <b>Honourable Senator Taylor</b> |
| Honourable Senators: |                                   |                         |                                  |
| Adams,               | Ghitter,                          | Hays,                   | Lynch-Staunton,                  |
| Buchanan,            | Gustafson,                        | Kenny,                  | (or Kinsella)                    |
| Cochrane,            | *Graham,                          | Kroft,                  | Spivak,                          |
| Fitzpatrick,         | (or Carstairs)                    |                         | Taylor.                          |

***Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection***

*Buchanan, Butts, Cochrane, Ghitter, \*Graham (or Carstairs), Gustafson, Hays, Kirby, \*Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella, acting), Spivak, Stanbury, Rompkey, Taylor, Watt.*

---

**FISHERIES**

|                      |                                  |                         |                                    |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <b>Chairman:</b>     | <b>Honourable Senator Comeau</b> | <b>Deputy Chairman:</b> | <b>Honourable Senator Perrault</b> |
| Honourable Senators: |                                  |                         |                                    |
| Adams,               | *Graham,                         | Meighen,                | Robichaud,                         |
| Butts,               | (or Carstairs)                   | Perrault,               | ( <i>Saint-Louis-de-Kent</i> )     |
| Comeau,              | *Lynch-Staunton,                 | Robertson,              | Stewart.                           |
| Cook,                | (or Kinsella)                    |                         |                                    |
|                      | Mahovlich,                       |                         |                                    |

***Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection***

*Adams, Butts, Carney, Comeau, \*Graham (or Carstairs), Jessiman, Losier-Cool, \*Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella, acting), Meighen, Perrault, Petten, Robichaud (Saint-Louis-de-Kent), Rossiter, Stewart.*

---

### FOREIGN AFFAIRS

**Chairman: Honourable Senator Stewart**

Honourable Senators:

|             |            |
|-------------|------------|
| Andreychuk, | De Bané,   |
| Bolduc,     | Di Nino,   |
| Carney,     | Grafstein, |
| Corbin,     |            |

**Deputy Chairman: Honourable Senator Andreychuk**

|                                   |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| *Graham,<br>(or Carstairs)        | Robichaud<br>( <i>Saint-Louis-de-Kent</i> ), |
| *Lynch-Staunton,<br>(or Kinsella) | Stewart,                                     |
|                                   | Stollery,                                    |
|                                   | Whelan.                                      |

*Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection*

*Andreychuk, Bacon, Bolduc, Carney, Corbin, De Bané, Doody, Grafstein, \*Graham (or Carstairs), \*Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella, acting), MacDonald, Stewart, Stollery, Whelan.*

### INTERNAL ECONOMY, BUDGETS AND ADMINISTRATION

**Chairman: Honourable Senator Rompkey**

Honourable Senators:

|             |                                   |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|
| Bryden,     | *Graham,<br>(or Carstairs)        |
| De Bané,    | Kinsella,                         |
| DeWare,     | LeBreton,                         |
| Di Nino,    | *Lynch-Staunton,<br>(or Kinsella) |
| Forrestall, |                                   |

**Deputy Chairman: Honourable Senator Nolin**

|         |  |
|---------|--|
| Maheu,  | Robichaud,<br>( <i>Saint-Louis-de-Kent</i> ) |
| Milne,  | Rompkey,                                     |
| Nolin,  | Stollery,                                    |
| Poulin, | Taylor.                                      |

*Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection*

*Atkins, Callbeck, De Bané, DeWare, Di Nino, \*Graham (or Carstairs), Kinsella, LeBreton, \*Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella, acting), Maheu, Nolin, Poulin, Robichaud (Saint-Louis-de-Kent), Rompkey, Stollery, Taylor, Wood.*

### LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS

**Chairman: Honourable Senator Milne**

Honourable Senators:

|             |                             |
|-------------|-----------------------------|
| Andreychuk, | Eyton,                      |
| Beaudoin,   | Fraser,                     |
| Bryden,     | Grafstein,                  |
| Buchanan,   | *Graham,<br>(or Carstairs), |

**Acting Deputy Chairman: Honourable Senator Nolin**

|                                   |          |
|-----------------------------------|----------|
| Joyal,                            | Moore,   |
| *Lynch-Staunton,<br>(or Kinsella) | Nolin,   |
| Milne,                            | Pearson. |

*Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection*

*Beaudoin, Cogger, Doyle, Gigantès, \*Graham (or Carstairs), Jessiman, Lewis, Losier-Cool, \*Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella, acting), Milne, Moore, Nolin, Pearson, Watt.*

**LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT (Joint)**

**Chairman: Honourable Senator Corbin**

**Deputy Chairman:**

Honourable Senators:

|         |          |      |                           |
|---------|----------|------|---------------------------|
| Bolduc, | Grimard, | Poy, | Robichaud,                |
| Corbin, | Kroft,   |      | <i>(L'Acadie-Acadia).</i> |

***Original Members agreed to by Motion of the Senate***

*Bolduc, Corbin, DeWare, Doyle, Gigantès, Grafstein, Robichaud (L'Acadie-Acadia).*

---

**NATIONAL FINANCE**

**Chairman: Honourable Senator Stratton**

**Deputy Chairman: Honourable Senator Cools**

Honourable Senators:

|         |                 |                  |              |
|---------|-----------------|------------------|--------------|
| Bolduc, | Ferretti Barth, | Johnstone,       | Mahovlich,   |
| Cook,   | Fraser,         | Lavoie-Roux,     | Moore,       |
| Cools,  | *Graham,        | *Lynch-Staunton, | St. Germain, |
| Eyton,  | (or Carstairs)  | (or Kinsella)    | Stratton.    |

***Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection***

*Bolduc, Cools, Eyton, Ferretti Barth, Forest, \*Graham (or Carstairs), Lavoie-Roux, \*Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella, acting), Mercier, Moore, Poulin, St. Germain, Sparrow, Stratton.*

---

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON CANADA'S EMERGENCY AND DISASTER PREPAREDNESS  
(National Finance)**

**Chairman: Honourable Senator Stratton**

**Deputy Chairman: Honourable Senator Fraser**

Honourable Senators:

|         |                 |                |                  |
|---------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|
| Bolduc, | Ferretti Barth, | *Graham,       | *Lynch-Staunton, |
| Cook,   | Fraser,         | (or Carstairs) | (or Kinsella)    |
|         |                 |                | Stratton.        |

---

**OFFICIAL LANGUAGES (Joint)**

**Chairman: Honourable Senator Losier-Cool**

**Deputy Chairman:**

Honourable Senators:

|           |           |              |                    |
|-----------|-----------|--------------|--------------------|
| Beaudoin, | Gauthier, | Losier-Cool, | Robichaud,         |
| Fraser,   | Kinsella, | Rivest,      | (L'Acadie-Acadia). |

***Original Members agreed to by Motion of the Senate***

*Beaudoin, Gauthier, Kinsella, Losier-Cool, Pépin, Rivest, Robichaud (L'Acadie-Acadia)  
Robichaud (Saint-Louis-de-Kent), Simard.*

---

**PRIVILEGES, STANDING RULES AND ORDERS**

**Chairman: Honourable Senator Maheu**

**Deputy Chairman: Honourable Senator Robertson**

Honourable Senators:

|           |                            |                                   |           |
|-----------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------|
| Atkins,   | DeWare,                    | Kelly,                            | Rossiter, |
| Bacon,    | Grafstein,                 | Kenny,                            | Sparrow,  |
| Beaudoin, | *Graham,<br>(or Carstairs) | *Lynch-Staunton,<br>(or Kinsella) | Stollery. |
| Cook,     | Joyal,                     | Maheu,                            |           |
| Cools,    |                            |                                   |           |

***Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection***

*Bosa, Corbin, Doyle, Grafstein, \*Graham (or Carstairs), Grimard, Kelly, Lewis,  
\*Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella, acting), Maheu, Marchand,  
Milne, Pearson, Petten, Robertson, Rossiter.*

---

**SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS (Joint)**

**Chairman: Honourable Senator Hervieux-Payette**

**Deputy Chairman:**

Honourable Senators:

|          |                   |        |        |
|----------|-------------------|--------|--------|
| Grimard, | Hervieux-Payette, | Kelly, | Moore. |
|----------|-------------------|--------|--------|

***Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection***

*Cogger, Ferretti Barth, Grimard, Hervieux-Payette, Kelly, Lewis, Mercier, Moore.*

---

## SELECTION

| <b>Chairman:</b>     | <b>Honourable Senator</b> |                  | <b>Deputy Chairman:</b>     |
|----------------------|---------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| Honourable Senators: |                           |                  |                             |
| Atkins,              | Grafstein,                | *Lynch-Staunton, | Pépin,                      |
| DeWare,              | *Graham,                  | (or Kinsella)    | Robichaud,                  |
| Fairbairn,           | (or Carstairs)            | Mercier,         | ( <i>L'Acadie-Acadia</i> ). |
|                      | Kinsella,                 |                  |                             |

*Original Members agreed to by Motion of the Senate*  
*Atkins, Corbin, DeWare, Fairbairn, \*Graham (or Carstairs), Hébert, Kinsella,*  
*\*Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella, acting) Lewis, Phillips, Stanbury.*

---

## SOCIAL AFFAIRS, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

| <b>Chairman:</b>     | <b>Honourable Senator Murray</b> | <b>Deputy Chairman:</b> | <b>Honourable Senator Butts</b> |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Honourable Senators: |                                  |                         |                                 |
| Butts,               | Gill,                            | Lavoie-Roux,            | Maloney,                        |
| Cohen,               | *Graham,                         | LeBreton,               | Murray,                         |
| Cools,               | (or Carstairs)                   | *Lynch-Staunton,        | Ruck.                           |
| Ferretti Barth,      | Johnstone,                       | (or Kinsella)           |                                 |

*Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection*  
*Bonnell, Bosa, Cohen, Cools, Forest, \*Graham (or Carstairs), Haidasz, Lavoie-Roux, LeBreton,*  
*\*Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella, acting), Maheu, Murray, Pépin, Phillips.*

---

SUBCOMMITTEE ON VETERANS AFFAIRS  
(Social Affairs, Science and Technology)

| <b>Chairman:</b>     | <b>Honourable Senator</b> | <b>Deputy Chairman:</b> | <b>Honourable Senator Johnstone</b> |
|----------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Honourable Senators: |                           |                         |                                     |
| Cohen,               | *Graham,                  | *Lynch-Staunton,        | Ruck.                               |
| Cools,               | (or Carstairs)            | (or Kinsella)           |                                     |
|                      | Johnstone,                |                         |                                     |

---

### TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

**Chairman: Honourable Senator Bacon**

Honourable Senators:

|              |                            |
|--------------|----------------------------|
| Adams,       | Forrestall,                |
| Bacon,       | *Graham,<br>(or Carstairs) |
| Buchanan,    | Joyal,                     |
| Bryden,      | Johnson,                   |
| Fitzpatrick, |                            |

**Deputy Chairman: Honourable Senator Forrestall**

|                                   |          |
|-----------------------------------|----------|
| *Lynch-Staunton,<br>(or Kinsella) | Poulin,  |
| Maheu,                            | Roberge, |
| Perrault,                         | Spivak.  |

*Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection*

*Adams, Atkins, Bacon, Buchanan, De Bané, Forrestall, \*Graham (or Carstairs), Johnson,  
\*Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella, acting), Mercier, Perrault, Poulin, Roberge, Rompkey*

---

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS (Transport and Communications)

**Chairman: Honourable Senator Poulin**

Honourable Senators:

|                            |                                   |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Bacon,                     | Johnson,                          |
| *Graham,<br>(or Carstairs) | *Lynch-Staunton,<br>(or Kinsella) |

**Deputy Chairman: Honourable Senator Spivak**

|         |         |
|---------|---------|
| Maheu,  | Spivak. |
| Poulin, |         |

---

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION SAFETY (Special)

**Chairman: Honourable Senator Forrestall**

Honourable Senators:

|             |                            |
|-------------|----------------------------|
| Adams,      | *Graham,<br>(or Carstairs) |
| Forrestall, | Johnstone,                 |

**Deputy Chairman: Honourable Senator Adams**

|                                   |           |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|
| *Lynch-Staunton,<br>(or Kinsella) | Perrault, |
| Maloney,                          | Roberge,  |
|                                   | Spivak.   |

---

## CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

|  | PAGE |   | PAGE |
|--|------|---|------|
| <b>The Late Honourable Paul David</b>                          |      | <b>QUESTION PERIOD</b>  |      |
| Tributes. Senator Lynch-Staunton .....                         | 2996 | <b>Foreign Affairs</b>  |      |
| <b>Business of the Senate</b>                                  |      | Effects of Events in Former Yugoslavia—Criteria for Canadian    |      |
| The Hon. the Speaker .....                                     | 2996 | Military Intervention Outside of NATO Involvement—              |      |
| <b>Visitors in the Gallery</b>                                 |      | Government Position. Senator Kinsella .....                     | 3002 |
| The Hon. the Speaker .....                                     | 2996 | Senator Graham .....  | 3002 |
| <b>The Late Honourable Paul David</b>                          |      | <b>United Nations</b>   |      |
| Tributes. Senator Lynch-Staunton .....                         | 2996 | Effects of Events in Former Yugoslavia—Possibility of Proposal  |      |
| Senator Bacon .....  | 2997 | of Resolution to Security Council—Government Position.          |      |
| Senator Beaudoin .....   | 2997 | Senator Kinsella .....  | 3003 |
| Senator Lavoie-Roux .....                                      | 2997 | Senator Graham .....  | 3003 |
| Senator Keon .....   | 2998 | <b>Foreign Affairs</b>  |      |
| Senator Mercier .....  | 2998 | Diplomatic Efforts Surrounding Events in Former Yugoslavia—     |      |
| <b>SENATORS' STATEMENTS</b>                                    |      | Request for Information. Senator Andreychuk .....               | 3003 |
| <b>Yugoslavia</b>  |      | Senator Graham .....  | 3003 |
| Kosovo—Problems of War. Senator Taylor .....                   | 2999 | <b>National Defence</b>   |      |
| <b>Commemoration of the Holocaust</b>                          |      | NATO Forces in Former Yugoslavia—Deployment of Ground           |      |
| Senator Grafstein .....  | 3000 | Troops to Alleviate Plight of Kosovar Refugees—                 |      |
| <b>International Policy Conference on Children and Tobacco</b> |      | Government Position. Senator St. Germain .....                  | 3003 |
| Senator Kenny .....  | 3001 | Senator Graham .....  | 3004 |
| <b>Human Rights</b>  |      | United Nations Air Strikes by NATO Forces in Former Yugoslavia— |      |
| United Kingdom Report on Racism of Police Officers.            |      | Possible Solution to Conflict—Statement by Secretary General—   |      |
| Senator Oliver .....   | 3001 | Government Position. Senator Roche .....                        | 3004 |
| <b>ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS</b>                                     |      | Senator Graham .....  | 3004 |
| <b>Adjournment</b>   |      | <b>Foreign Affairs</b>  |      |
| Senator Carstairs .....  | 3002 | Air Strikes by NATO Forces in Former Yugoslavia—Immediate       |      |
| <b>Transportation Safety</b>                                   |      | and Long-Term Goals Behind Bombing Campaign—                    |      |
| Notice of Motion to Authorize Special Committee to Extend Date |      | Government Position. Senator Forrestall .....                   | 3005 |
| of Final Report. Senator Forrestall .....                      | 3002 | Senator Graham .....  | 3005 |
| <b>Private Bill (Bill S-18)</b>                                |      | NATO Forces in Former Yugoslavia—Plight of Kosovars.            |      |
| Alliance of Manufacturers & Exporters Canada—Notice of         |      | Senator St. Germain .....                                       | 3005 |
| Motion to Reinstate to Order Paper. Senator Kelleher .....     | 3002 | Senator Graham .....  | 3006 |
| <b>Health Care in Canada</b>                                   |      | <b>Industry</b>   |      |
| Notice of Inquiry. Senator Keon .....                          | 3002 | Resolution of Interprovincial Dispute involving Construction    |      |
| <b>North Atlantic Treaty Organization</b>                      |      | Industry—Absence of Dispute Settlement Mechanism in             |      |
| Involvement in Yugoslavia—Relationship to International        |      | Agreement on Internal Trade—Government Position.                |      |
| Law—Notice of Inquiry. Senator Grafstein .....                 | 3002 | Senator Kelleher .....  | 3006 |
|  |      | Senator Graham .....  | 3006 |
|  |      | <b>Answers to Order Paper Questions Tabled</b>                  |      |
|  |      | National Defence—Land Forces Command Budget Shortfall.          |      |
|  |      | Senator Carstairs .....   | 3007 |
|  |      | National Defence—Land Forces Command Budget Shortfall—          |      |
|  |      | Plans for Further Personnel Reductions. Senator Carstairs ...   | 3007 |

**ORDERS OF THE DAY****First Nations Land Management Bill (Bill C-49)**

|   |      |
|---|------|
| Second Reading. Senator St. Germain ..... | 3007 |
| Senator Kinsella .....                    | 3009 |
| Senator Whelan .....                      | 3010 |
| Referred to Committee. ....               | 3011 |

**Preclearance Bill (Bill S-22)**

|   |      |
|---|------|
| Report of Committee—Debate Adjourned. Senator Stewart ..... | 3011 |
| Senator Andreychuk .....                                    | 3011 |
| Senator Grimard .....                                       | 3014 |

**Canada Elections Act (Bill S-27)**

|  |      |
|--|------|
| Bill to Amend—Second Reading—Debate Adjourned.<br>Senator Lynch-Staunton ..... | 3014 |
|--|------|

**Merchant Navy War Service Recognition Bill (Bill S-19)**

|   |      |
|---|------|
| Second Reading—Order Stands. Senator Kinsella ..... | 3015 |
| Senator Carstairs .....                             | 3015 |

**Review of Nuclear Weapons Policies**

|                                     |      |
|-------------------------------------|------|
| Motion Adopted. Senator Roche ..... | 3015 |
| Senator Kinsella .....              | 3015 |

**Business of the Senate**

|                        |      |
|------------------------|------|
| Senator Graham .....   | 3016 |
| Senator Kinsella ..... | 3016 |

**The Budget 1999**

|  |      |
|--|------|
| Statement of Minister of Finance—Inquiry—Debate Continued.<br>Senator Graham ..... | 3016 |
| Senator Kinsella .....   | 3017 |

**Income Tax Act**

|   |      |
|---|------|
| Increase in Foreign Property Component of Deferred Income Plans—<br>Motion Proposing an Amendment—Debate Continued.<br>Senator Kinsella ..... | 3019 |
|---|------|

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| <b>Appendix</b> ..... | i |
|-----------------------|---|





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