



Debates of the Senate

2nd SESSION

•

36th PARLIAMENT

•

VOLUME 138

•

NUMBER 4

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Tuesday, November 2, 1999

**THE HONOURABLE GILDAS L. MOLGAT
SPEAKER**

This issue contains the latest listing of Senators, Officers of the Senate, the Ministry, and Senators serving on Standing, Special and Joint Committees.

CONTENTS

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

Debates: Chambers Building, Room 943, Tel. 996-0193

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, November 2, 1999

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

Prayers.

VISITORS IN THE GALLERY

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, before I call Senators' Statements, I wish to draw your attention to distinguished visitors in the gallery. We have with us a delegation from the National Assembly of the Republic of Slovenia, led by Dr. Janez Podobnik, Speaker of the National Assembly, and accompanied by His Excellency Dr. Bozo Cerar, Ambassador of the Republic of Slovenia to Canada.

On behalf of all honourable senators, I wish you welcome here in the Senate of Canada.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, our other distinguished visitor in the gallery today is Senator John Watson of Australia, Chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Superannuation.

Welcome to the Senate of Canada, Senator Watson.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

• (1410)

SENATORS' STATEMENTS

THE LATE GREG MOORE

TRIBUTE

Hon. Ross Fitzpatrick: Honourable senators, I rise today to pay tribute to Greg Moore, the 24-year-old race car driver who died Sunday after his car crashed during a race in California.

Greg was born and raised in Maple Ridge, British Columbia, and was one of the leading motorists on the CART or Indy car circuit. In 1997, at the age of 22, he became the youngest person ever to win a CART race. Sadly, he had much more ahead of him.

Greg offered more than his accomplishments on the track by giving back to his community. He participated in numerous charitable events and was a bright and articulate spokesman for various causes. His enthusiasm for helping others was genuine. A fund established in his name will continue to lend support to charities he supported.

In 1996, my wife, Linda, and I had the pleasure of participating with Greg at the Molson Indy fundraising ball to benefit the Alzheimer's Society of British Columbia. Sadly, but fittingly, the event was called "Forget me not." Honourable senators, Canadians will not soon forget Greg Moore.

THE LATE MWALIMU JULIUS K. NYERERE FORMER PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA

TRIBUTE

Hon. Donald H. Oliver: Honourable senators, in 1966, I was offered a position as assistant dean at the law school in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. I declined the offer and opted to remain in Canada and subsequently became a partner in the largest law firm in Atlantic Canada. Had I taken that position and gone to Tanzania, I would have witnessed the democratic miracle orchestrated by Julius Nyerere, who led his country to independence from Britain in 1961 and served as the first president of Tanzania from 1962 to 1985.

Mr. Nyerere died of a stroke at the age of 77 on Thursday, October 14, while at a London hospital where he was receiving treatment for leukemia. He was loved and revered the world over for his integrity, modesty and intelligence. He was considered to be one of Africa's greatest statesmen, on a par with Nelson Mandela, and ranks among the most eminent leaders of the 20th century.

Julius Nyerere was educated as a teacher. He entered politics in 1954 and founded the Tanganyika African National Union. He became the colony's chief minister when TANU won the elections in 1960. Nyerere continued as prime minister when Tanganyika became independent in 1961, but he resigned early in 1962 to concentrate on restructuring TANU for its post-independence role. Elections in 1962 brought him back as president of a republic.

In 1964, following a revolution on the Arab-dominated island of Zanzibar and a mutiny in his army, Nyerere formed a union of the two countries, with himself as president. He was committed to African liberation, and he offered sanctuary in Tanzania to members of the African National Congress and numerous other rebel-led groups from Zimbabwe, Mozambique, Angola and Uganda. In 1978, under Nyerere's leadership, Tanzanian troops entered Uganda, deposing dictator Idi Amin.

A strong supporter of indigenous African culture, Nyerere's most miraculous achievement was bringing ethnic union to Tanzania. In a tribute to Nyerere on CBC Radio's *As It Happens*, Stephen Lewis, who served with the United Nations in Africa and was a friend of the former president, marvelled at how Nyerere "took a country divided on tribal lines and turned everyone into a 'Tanzanian'."

He achieved this by establishing strong systems of education and health and through the implementation of a common language.

“Rwanda broke his heart,” stated Mr. Lewis in the *As It Happens* tribute. He was referring to what ethnic division could do — the mass killings and destruction of a people and a country. When Nyerere spoke about Rwanda and offered assistance to its people, he did so with “immense feeling, pain and understanding.” Were it not for his vision and leadership, Tanzania could have been the site of similar horrors.

On October 20, hundreds of thousands of Tanzanians began gathering at dawn and soon filled the streets of the capital Dar es Salaam to pay their last respects to a man known throughout Tanzania as “teacher”. Huge yet peaceful crowds lined the road from the airport to Mr. Nyerere’s home in the suburbs, wailing as his coffin was driven past.

Julius Nyerere was given a state funeral ceremony in Tanzania on Thursday, October 21. He was a man of tremendous vision and principle who will be missed by many.

Honourable senators, Mary Lou Findley summed it up nicely at the end of the CBC tribute by saying that Nyerere may have been from a small country, but he was not a small man. I second Stephen Lewis’ final words that Julius Nyerere was “a lovely, lovely man.”

[Translation]

WOMEN’S HISTORY MONTH

Hon. Lucie Pépin: Honourable senators, October is Women’s History Month. It is an excellent opportunity to pay tribute to the progress that has been made so far, and to look at the obstacles that still lie ahead of us.

[English]

October was chosen to celebrate the judgment in October 1929 of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, which declared that the word “persons” in the BNA Act included women and that women were eligible to become members of the Senate. We owe a great deal to the Famous Five who fought long and hard to make our presence in this chamber possible.

Honourable senators, we take the presence of women for granted in both this chamber and the other place, and yet our representation here has only recently topped 30 per cent. That is in large part thanks to strong political will.

It has been 70 years since we won the right to be considered persons. While I try not to think of what it was we were considered before becoming persons, I do know that being a person is still not as good as being a man.

[Translation]

The number of women in this chamber and elsewhere is a source of encouragement to me. Their drive, their determination,

[Senator Oliver]

their intelligence, their spirit, are a huge contribution to our country. Yet we cannot forget that we are still so few in numbers. In this chamber, we are outnumbered two to one. While rejoicing in the fact that the Canadian Senate ranks fifth in the world as far as female representation is concerned, we can certainly not settle for the status quo.

There are still many obstacles to women’s participation in so many aspects of our economic and political life. I have made reference here and elsewhere on numerous occasions to the difficulties women face when they enter politics. Yet without sufficient representation by women and other groups in our political institutions, how can we boast that we are a democracy?

As we commemorate the Persons Case, and celebrate all that it has meant to generations of Canadians, we must be aware that our goal has not yet been attained. If the Famous Five were with us now, they would still be battling for equality. Today distinctions are still being made between people: men and women, rich and poor, young and old, majority and minority. The figures on representation in this place and the other will continue to reflect these distinctions until such time as there is acceptance of the fact that a person is a person and nothing else, nothing more and nothing less.

[English]

INCOME TAX POLICY FOR WOODLOT OWNERS

Hon. Erminie J. Cohen: Honourable senators, I wish to bring to your attention the concerns of Canadian woodlot owners with the present income tax policy and their need for prompt and appropriate changes to the act.

In my home province of New Brunswick, one family in six owns a woodlot. There are approximately 425,000 family-owned woodlots in Canada. In many provinces they provide an essential part of the raw material needed to operate sawmills and pulpmills.

Most woodlot owners respect and care for their land so that it contributes not only to pleasant roadside scenery and habitat for wildlife, but as timber for industry and employment in Canada’s many small rural communities.

Caring for woodlots in this way is a mammoth undertaking. Growing a tree from a seedling to maturity takes a long time, at least 40 years in most parts of the country. One way in which the federal government can encourage the promotion and enhancement of forest management activities is through sound income tax policies.

When Canadians spend money to start a new business, they are able to deduct losses in the early years against other sources of income as long as they can demonstrate to Revenue Canada that they are building their new business with “a reasonable expectation of profit.” This is not the case with woodlot owners.

When a family farm is passed on from one generation to another, the capital gains tax is deferred as long as the family is actively managing the farm. When a woodlot is passed on, a substantial tax bill often goes with it. If the new owners do not have a ready source of cash with which to pay the bill, they may be forced to get the cash from the woodlot, and often that may mean clearing the land.

Why are woodlot owners being treated differently from other Canadians? The reason seems to be that the Income Tax Act is written in such a way that a business which may take up to 40 years to produce a profit simply falls through the cracks. The Income Tax Act is not equipped to recognize the realities of forest management practices and the time frames that are involved in profitable woodlot businesses.

Woodlot owner organizations have been working on this issue since 1988. They now report that the resistance to change they experienced in the early years has been replaced by a reasonable understanding of the issues within the Department of Finance and the Department of National Revenue. The issue has been thoroughly reviewed by a number of House of Commons committees, the National Round Table on Environment and Economy and, most recently, our own subcommittee studying the boreal forest.

Honourable senators, we need the cooperation of woodlot owners to meet our nation's commitment to the Kyoto Protocol and to the announced endangered species legislation, and the woodlot owners need a sound tax policy as one of the tools available to help them plant more trees and increase their efforts to manage their land.

Surely, it is time this problem was fixed. I urge the Minister of Finance to complete this job.

[Translation]

THE LATE CLAUDE MASSON

TRIBUTE

Hon. Fernand Roberge: Honourable senators, I would like to offer my condolences to the family and colleagues of Claude Masson and his wife, Jeannine Bourdages, who died in the terrible EgyptAir accident. Claude was a simple man, at ease with himself, a man of equanimity, respected by his peers. He was also a man of faith, socially committed, a professional, in short, an exemplary individual. His death is a great loss for *La Presse* and the journalistic community in Quebec, and for society as a whole. We offer our condolences to his family and to the families of the others lost in this terrible accident.

[English]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

RECOGNITION OF PEACEKEEPING EFFORTS ABROAD

Hon. Douglas Roche: Honourable senators, I found it strange that on his first official visit to Canada, Lord George Robertson,

the new Secretary-General of NATO, criticized Canada's military spending while apparently ignoring the fact that Canada now has more troops serving the interests of peace across the world than at any other time since the Korean War.

Canadian peacekeeping is one of the world's most pre-eminent and effective conflict management agencies. With less than 1 per cent of the world's population, Canada does over 10 per cent of its peacekeeping. Canadians are grateful to the 4,410 men and women now deployed overseas in 22 separate missions for peace.

In this month of November, let us especially honour the dedication and achievements of the 108 Canadian peacekeepers who have lost their lives in the service of international peace and security over the past four decades. They have made a priceless contribution to the alleviation of human suffering.

Canadians understand that peacekeeping upholds who and what we are as a nation. We must appreciate the role of our forces in advancing our interests abroad, however we choose to define them. Stretched beyond belief, away from their families for prolonged periods of time, Canada's peacekeeping forces are deployed in order to effect real change and to ensure the promotion and maintenance of real human security.

Canadians have fought and died in defence of human security and freedom. Our ongoing pursuit of human security honours their sacrifice and is confirmation of a noble tradition. Our peacekeepers deserve nothing less.

Honourable senators, in spending money for reconstruction in the war-torn Balkans, and for other world efforts to rebuild societies from the consequences of war, Canada takes a back seat to no one. In combat operations, it is not that Canada is spending too little; it is that other countries, including NATO leaders, are spending too much.

[Translation]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

CHANGE TO TABLING DATE OF COMMISSIONER'S ANNUAL REPORT

Hon. Jean-Robert Gauthier: Honourable senators, on October 4, the Commissioner of Official Languages, in a letter to our Speaker, expressed his intention to delay the tabling of his annual report so as to cover the fiscal year from now on rather than the calendar year.

The Official Languages Act is not clear on the terms of tabling the annual report. However, section 37 of the Interpretation Act provides that a year cover a full 12-month period. The report of the Commissioner of Official Languages for the 12 months of 1999 will not be published as usual. The next report by the Commissioner will cover a period of 15 months or more and will be released only in September 2000.

This decision will deprive minority language communities and the Standing Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons on Official Languages of a report that is a valuable and vital tool.

[*English*]

THE CRIME OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING

Hon. A. Raynell Andreychuk: Honourable senators, throughout the world people are being abducted, coerced, tricked and sold into what is popularly being termed “the global slave trade.” Victims are usually women, girls and boys who are forced into sexually and economically exploitive situations for the profit of recruiters, traffickers and crime syndicates. In 1997, the United Nations estimated that 4 million people were trafficked worldwide — the net profit: up to \$7 billion annually. Canada is not immune from such activities. Last fall, a sex ring made up of Asian women was discovered in Toronto, amongst others.

Human trafficking, along with the many activities that surround this type of crime, such as prostitution, forcible confinement and assault, are all illegal activities within Canada. Despite international conventions outlawing the human slave trade, this type of criminal activity is increasing. Part of the increase is explained by the relative ease of human trafficking. Often, the people being trafficked do not realize they are in danger and voluntarily cross the border into another country. Law enforcement officials are less likely to make arrests in instances of human trafficking as compared to cases of drugs and arms smuggling. Tragically, the premium that is placed on youth ensures that there is a constant demand to recruit new and younger women and children.

Human trafficking is a security risk because the profits made from human exploitation are frequently used to fund crime syndicates. In the Mekong region of Asia, human trafficking now rivals the drug trade for the attention of organized crime. Likewise, in other unstable areas, such as in the former Soviet Union, women and children are particularly vulnerable to being trafficked. Canada must work to prevent organizations from using Canada as a fundraising locale for criminal activity.

In 1949, the United Nations General Assembly approved the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others. Canada has not yet ratified this convention, despite it coming into play in 1949.

June 2000 will mark the fifth anniversary of the Beijing Declaration. One of the strategic objects of the Beijing Platform of Action is to eliminate trafficking in women and assist victims of violence due to prostitution and trafficking. It is essential for Canada to consider the ratification and enforcement of this international convention. To do otherwise would be to fail in our support of the United Nations and, more important, to fail in our support of those millions at risk. I urge the Government of Canada and members of the Senate to ensure that Canada ratifies this treaty before the fifth anniversary of the Beijing Declaration.

[Senator Gauthier]

• (1430)

OSTEOPOROSIS MONTH

Hon. Vivienne Poy: Honourable senators, November is Osteoporosis Month in Canada. Osteoporosis is a debilitating condition that causes bones to thin and weaken, leaving them vulnerable to fracture. The prevalence of the disease among our citizens is a matter of great consequence and importance to this country. Approximately 1.4 million Canadians currently suffer from osteoporosis, and another 2 million are at risk of developing the disease. It afflicts one in four women over the age of 50 and one in eight men in the same age group. Treating osteoporosis costs Canada \$1.3 billion a year.

Osteoporosis is a disease in which education and prevention can make a profound difference. Because of a lack of public awareness and education, many people do not know they have the disease until it is too late. Loss of bone density can occur silently over many years before it becomes evident. By the time bone fractures occur, the damage is already severe and can result in serious spine, hip and wrist injuries. Much of the damage is irreversible. Osteoporosis-related injuries are commonly disabling and diminish the quality of life significantly among those afflicted.

Today, we know more than ever about preventing osteoporosis, and the disease is internationally recognized as a significant health issue. Building strong bones early in life is one of the most important things we can do. Ensuring that we have enough calcium in our diets is also important, as well as regular exercise, especially weight-bearing sports like walking, running, tennis and badminton. There are now tests available for early detection for those at risk. We can significantly reduce the number of people who will develop osteoporosis if preventive measures and public education are undertaken.

Canada needs to show leadership by developing a comprehensive framework for the prevention, diagnosis and treatment of this debilitating disease. The kind of leadership I am talking about is consistent with the strategy outlined in the Throne Speech last month calling for the establishment of the Canadian Institutes of Health Research. These institutes are to bring together researchers who have an impact on health and to undertake shared research priorities.

Osteoporosis needs to be among our health research priorities if we are to improve the quality of life of Canadians, especially in the face of an ageing population in the coming decades. The incidence of osteoporosis can be greatly reduced if we take a long-term view of prevention.

Honourable senators, in the spirit of raising awareness of this important health issue, I invite all of you, along with our colleagues in the other place, to join me and the Osteoporosis Society of Canada tomorrow afternoon between 4 and 6 p.m. in Room 237-C here in the Centre Block for a bone china tea.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRIVACY COMMISSIONER

ANNUAL REPORT TABLED

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I have the honour to table the annual report of the Privacy Commissioner for the period ended March 31, 1999.

CLERK OF THE SENATE

ANNUAL ACCOUNTS TABLED

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I have the honour to inform the Senate that, pursuant to rule 133 of the *Rules of the Senate*, the Clerk of the Senate has laid on the Table a detailed statement of his receipts and disbursements for the fiscal year 1998-99.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

FIRST REPORT OF COMMITTEE TABLED

Hon. John B. Stewart: Honourable senators, pursuant to rule 104 of the *Rules of the Senate of Canada*, I have the honour to table the first report of the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, which report deals with the expenses incurred by the committee during the First Session of the Thirty-sixth Parliament.

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

CONSEQUENCES OF EUROPEAN MONETARY UNION

REPORT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE REQUESTING AUTHORITY TO ENGAGE SERVICES PRESENTED

Hon. John B. Stewart, Chairman of the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, presented the following report:

Tuesday, November 2, 1999

The Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs has the honour to present its

SECOND REPORT

Your Committee, which was authorized by the Senate on Thursday, October 14, 1999, in accordance with rule 86(1)(h) to examine and report on the consequences for Canada of the emerging European Monetary Union and on other related trade and investment matters respectfully requests that it be empowered to engage the services of such counsel and technical, clerical and other personnel as may be necessary for the purpose of such study.

Pursuant to Section 2:07 of the *Procedural Guidelines for the Financial Operation of Senate Committees*, the budget submitted to the Standing Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration and the report thereon of that Committee are appended to this report,

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN B. STEWART
Chairman

(For text of Appendix, see today's Journals of the Senate, Appendix "A" p. 72.)

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, when shall this report be taken into consideration?

On motion of Senator Stewart, report placed on the Orders of the Day for consideration at the next sitting of the Senate.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

CHANGING MANDATE OF NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION—BUDGET REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON STUDY PRESENTED

Hon. John B. Stewart, Chairman of the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, presented the following report:

Tuesday, November 2, 1999

The Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs has the honour to present its

THIRD REPORT

Your Committee, which was authorized by the Senate on Thursday, October 14, 1999, in accordance with rule 86 (1)(h) to examine and report upon the ramifications to Canada:

1. of the changed mandate of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and Canada's role in NATO since the demise of the Warsaw Pact, the end of the Cold War and the recent addition to membership in NATO of Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic; and

2. of peacekeeping, with particular reference to Canada's ability to participate in it under the auspices of any international body of which Canada is a member, respectfully requests that it be empowered to engage the services of such counsel and technical, clerical and other personnel as may be necessary, and to adjourn from place to place within and outside Canada for the purpose of such study.

Pursuant to Section 2:07 of the *Procedural Guidelines for the Financial Operation of Senate Committees*, the budget submitted to the Standing Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration and the report thereon of that Committee are appended to this report. [English]

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN B. STEWART
Chairman

(For text of Appendix, see today's Journals of the Senate, Appendix "B" p. 78.)

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, when shall this report be taken into consideration?

On motion of Senator Stewart, report placed on the Orders of the Day for consideration at the next sitting of the Senate.

[Translation]

COMMITTEE OF SELECTION

THIRD REPORT PRESENTED

Hon. Léonce Mercier, Chairman of the Committee of Selection, presented the following report:

Tuesday, November 2, 1999

The Committee of Selection has the honour to present its

THIRD REPORT

Pursuant to rule 85(1)(a) and 85(2) of the *Rules of the Senate*, your Committee wishes to inform the Senate that it has met on the issue of nominating a senator to preside as Speaker *pro tempore*.

Your Committee has not decided on a nomination and will report to the Senate at a later time.

Respectfully submitted,

LÉONCE MERCIER
Chairman

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, when shall this report be taken into consideration?

On motion of Senator Mercier, report placed on the Orders of the Day for consideration at the next sitting of the Senate.

[Senator Stewart]

CLERK OF THE SENATE

ANNUAL ACCOUNTS REFERRED TO INTERNAL ECONOMY,
BUDGETS AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

Hon. Dan Hays (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I move, with leave of the Senate and notwithstanding rule 58(1)(f), that the Clerk's accounts be referred to the Standing Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration.

The Hon. the Speaker: Is leave granted?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That when the Senate adjourns today, it do stand adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 3, 1999 at 1:30 p.m.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

ADDRESS IN REPLY—TERMINATION OF DEBATE
ON EIGHTH SITTING DAY—NOTICE OF MOTION

Hon. Dan Hays (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I give notice that tomorrow, Wednesday, November 3, 1999, I will move:

That the proceedings on the Order of the Day for resuming the debate on the motion for an Address in reply to Her Excellency the Governor General's Speech from the Throne addressed to both Houses of Parliament be concluded on the eighth sitting day on which the order is debated.

CRIMINAL RECORDS ACT

BILL TO AMEND—FIRST READING

The Hon. the Speaker informed the Senate that a message had been received from the House of Commons with Bill C-7, to amend the Criminal Records Act and to amend another Act in consequence.

Bill read first time.

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

On motion of Senator Hays, bill placed on the Orders of the Day for second reading on Thursday next, November 4, 1999.

PERSONAL INFORMATION PROTECTION AND ELECTRONIC DOCUMENTS BILL

FIRST READING

The Hon. the Speaker informed the Senate that a message had been received from the House of Commons with Bill C-6, to support and promote electronic commerce by protecting personal information that is collected, used or disclosed in certain circumstances, by providing for the use of electronic means to communicate or record information or transactions and by amending the Canada Evidence Act, the Statutory Instruments Act and the Statute Revision Act.

Bill read first time.

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

On motion of Senator Hays, bill placed on the Orders of the Day for second reading on Thursday next, November 4, 1999.

INCOME TAX CONVENTIONS IMPLEMENTATION BILL, 1999

FIRST READING

Hon. Dan Hays (Deputy Leader of the Government) presented Bill S-3, to implement an agreement, conventions and protocols between Canada and Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Algeria, Bulgaria, Portugal, Uzbekistan, Jordan, Japan and Luxembourg for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income.

Bill read first time.

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

On motion of Senator Hays, bill placed on the Orders of the Day for second reading on Thursday next, November 4, 1999.

[*Translation*]

INTERNATIONAL SEARCH OR SEIZURE BILL

FIRST READING

Hon. Pierre Claude Nolin presented Bill S-4, to provide for judicial preauthorization of requests to be made to a foreign or international authority or organization for a search or seizure outside Canada.

Bill read first time.

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

On motion of Senator Nolin, bill placed on the Orders of the Day for second reading on Thursday, November 4, 1999.

[*English*]

PARLIAMENT OF CANADA ACT

BILL TO AMEND—FIRST READING

Hon. Jeremiah S. Grafstein presented Bill S-5, to amend the Parliament of Canada Act (Parliamentary Poet Laureate).

Bill read first time.

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

On motion of Senator Grafstein, bill placed on the Orders of the Day for second reading on Thursday next, November 4, 1999.

CRIMINAL CODE

BILL TO AMEND—FIRST READING

Hon. Donald H. Oliver: Honourable senators, I have the honour to introduce for first reading Bill S-6, to amend the Criminal Code respecting criminal harassment and other related matters. This was formerly Bill S-17, which died on the Order Paper at the termination of the previous session of Parliament.

Bill read first time.

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

Senator Oliver: Honourable senators, with leave of the Senate and notwithstanding rule 57(1)(f), I move that the bill be placed on the Orders of the Day for second reading at the next sitting of the Senate.

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

Hon. Anne C. Cools: No. Could I ask why leave is required?

The Hon. the Speaker: There is no agreement.

Senator Cools: Honourable senators, I am curious. I am prepared to give agreement if I can know why. When sponsors of a bill ask for leave of the Senate, senators should know for what reason leave is being requested.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable Senator Cools, I am sorry, but there can be no debate on the motion. However, if yours is a question of information, that is a legitimate point, if the Senate so agrees. We have experienced this problem before — a senator asking for leave and another honourable senator wanting to know why.

Honourable senators, is it your wish that the question be asked?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Senator Oliver: Honourable senators, this bill was on the Order Paper in the last session of Parliament. It was sent to the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs. A number of witnesses were heard and evidence was taken. I should like to be in a position to speak to whether that evidence can be accepted as having been heard already as part of the consideration on the bill I just presented. I should like to do that tomorrow.

Senator Cools: Agreed.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

On motion of Senator Oliver, with leave of the Senate and notwithstanding rule 57(1)(f), bill placed on the Orders of the Day for second reading at the next sitting of the Senate.

ROYAL ASSENT BILL

FIRST READING

Hon. John Lynch-Staunton (Leader of the Opposition) presented Bill S-7, respecting the declaration of Royal Assent by the Governor General in the Queen's name to bills passed by the Houses of Parliament.

Bill read first time.

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

On motion of Senator Lynch-Staunton, bill placed on the Orders of the Day for second reading on Thursday next, November 4, 1999.

IMMIGRATION ACT

BILL TO AMEND—FIRST READING

Hon. Ron Ghitter presented Bill S-8, to amend the Immigration Act.

Bill read first time.

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

On motion of Senator Ghitter, bill placed on the Orders of the Day for second reading on Thursday next, November 4, 1999.

CRIMINAL CODE CORRECTIONS AND CONDITIONAL RELEASE ACT

BILL TO AMEND—FIRST READING

The Hon. the Speaker informed the Senate that a message had been received from the House of Commons with Bill C-247, to amend the Criminal Code and the Corrections and Conditional Release Act (cumulative sentences).

Bill read first time.

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

On motion of Senator Cools, bill placed on the Orders of the Day for second reading on Tuesday next, November 9, 1999.

• (1450)

THE SENATE

REPORT OF VISITING DELEGATION TO THE KYRGYZ REPUBLIC TABLED

Hon. Nicholas W. Taylor: Honourable senators, I have the honour to table the report on the meeting of the Senate delegation that visited the Kyrgyz Republic in October 1998. The delegation was comprised of Senators Molgat, Andreychuk and Taylor.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE TO ENGAGE SERVICES

Hon. John B. Stewart: Honourable senators, I give notice that tomorrow, Wednesday, November 3, 1999, I will move:

That the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs have power to engage the services of such counsel and technical, clerical and other personnel as may be necessary for the purpose of its examination and consideration of such bills, subject matters of bills and estimates as are referred to it.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE TO PERMIT ELECTRONIC COVERAGE

Hon. John B. Stewart: Honourable senators, I give notice that tomorrow, Wednesday, November 3, 1999, I will move:

That the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs be empowered to permit coverage by electronic media of its public proceedings with the least possible disruption of its meetings.

[Translation]

REVIEW OF ANTI-DRUG POLICY

NOTICE OF MOTION TO FORM SPECIAL SENATE COMMITTEE

Hon. Pierre Claude Nolin: Honourable senators, I give notice that on Thursday, November 4, 1999, I will move:

That a Special Committee of the Senate be appointed to reassess Canada's anti-drug legislation and policies, to carry out a broad consultation of the Canadian public to determine the specific needs of various regions of the country, where social problems associated with the trafficking and use of illegal drugs are more in evidence, to develop proposals to disseminate information about Canada's anti-drug policy and, finally, to make recommendations for adoption of an anti-drug strategy developed by and for Canadians under which all levels of government will be encouraged to work closely together to reduce the harm associated with the use of illegal drugs.

That, without being limited in its mandate by the following, the Committee be authorized to:

- review the federal government's policy on illegal drugs in Canada, its effectiveness, and the extent to which it is fairly enforced;
- develop a national harm reduction policy in order to lessen the negative impact of illegal drugs in Canada, and make recommendations regarding the enforcement of this policy, specifically the possibility of focusing on use and abuse of drugs as a social and health problem;
- study harm reduction models adopted by other countries and determine if there is a need to implement them wholly or partially in Canada;
- examine Canada's international role and obligations under United Nations conventions on narcotics and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other related treaties in order to determine whether these treaties authorize it to take action other than laying criminal charges and explore various options available at the international level;
- explore the effects of cannabis on health and examine whether alternative policy on cannabis would lead to increased harm in the short and long term;
- examine the possibility of the government using its regulatory power under the Contraventions Act as an additional means of implementing a harm reduction policy, as is done in other jurisdictions;

- examine any other issue respecting Canada's anti-drug policy that the Committee considers appropriate to the completion of its mandate.

That the Special Committee be composed of five Senators and that three members constitute a quorum;

That the Committee have the power to send for persons, papers and records, to examine witnesses, to report from time to time and to print such papers, briefs and evidence from day to day as may be ordered by the Committee;

That the briefs received and testimony heard during consideration of Bill C-8, An Act respecting the control of certain drugs, their precursors and other substances, by the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs during the Second Session of the Thirty-fifth Parliament be referred to the Committee;

That the Committee have the power to authorize television, radio and electronic broadcasting, as it deems appropriate, of any or all of its proceedings;

That the Committee be granted leave to sit when the Senate has been adjourned pursuant to subsection 95 (2) of the Senate Rules; and

That the Committee submit its final report not later than three years from the date of its being constituted.

FEDERALISM AND GLOBALIZATION

NOTICE OF INQUIRY

Hon. Gérald-A. Beaudoin: Honourable senators, I give notice that on Tuesday next, November 9, 1999, I will call the attention of the Senate to the major principles of modern federalism, in light of the discussions that took place during the Forum of Federations. I will call this inquiry: Federalism and Globalization.

[English]

REVIEW OF CANADIAN ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACT

NOTICE OF MOTION

Hon. Mira Spivak: Honourable senators, I give notice that Thursday next, November 4, 1999, I will move:

That the Senate urge the government to begin immediately its review of the Canadian Environmental Protection Act and to designate the first phase of that review to the Standing Senate Committee on Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources.

OFFICE OF CHILDREN'S ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

NOTICE OF MOTION TO ESTABLISH

Hon. Mira Spivak: Honourable senators, I give notice that tomorrow, Wednesday, November 3, 1999, I will move:

That the Senate urge the government to establish an Office of Children's Environmental Health, an arm's-length agency to promote the protection of children from environmental hazards.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

NOTICE OF MOTION TO ESTABLISH SPECIAL SENATE COMMITTEE TO EXAMINE CONDUCT OF PERSONNEL IN RELATION TO THE SOMALIA DEPLOYMENT AND THE DESTRUCTION OF MEDICAL RECORDS OF PERSONNEL SERVING IN CROATIA

Hon. John Lynch-Staunton (Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, I give notice that on Tuesday, November 16, 1999, I will move:

That a Special Committee of the Senate be appointed to examine and report on two significant matters which involve the conduct of chain of command of the Canadian Forces, both in-theatre and at National Defence Headquarters and its response to operational, decision-making and administrative problems encountered during the Somalia deployment to the extent that these matters have not been examined by the Commission of Inquiry into the Deployment of Canadian Forces to Somalia and allegations that Canadian soldiers were exposed to toxic substances in Croatia between 1993 and 1995, and the alleged destruction of medical records of personnel serving in Croatia.

• (1500)

That the Committee in examining these issues may call witnesses from whom it believes it may obtain evidence relevant to these matters including but not limited to:

1. The present Minister of Defence in relation to both matters;
2. Former Ministers of National Defence in relation to both matters;
3. The then Deputy Minister of National Defence in relation to both matters;
4. The then Acting Chief of Staff of the Minister of National Defence in relation to the Somalia occurrence;
5. The then special advisor to the Minister of National Defence (M. Campbell) in relation to the Somalia occurrence;

6. The then special advisor to the Minister of National Defence (J. Dixon) in relation to the Somalia occurrence;

7. The persons occupying the position of Judge Advocate General during the relevant period in relation to the Somalia occurrence;

8. The then Deputy Judge Advocate General (litigation) in relation to the Somalia occurrence; and

9. The then Chief of Defence Staff and Deputy Chief of Defence Staff in relation to both occurrences.

That seven senators, nominated by the Committee of Selection, act as members of the Special Committee, and that three members constitute a quorum;

That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers and records, to examine witnesses under oath, to report from time to time and to print such papers and evidence from day to day as may be ordered by Committee;

That the Committee have power to authorize television and radio broadcasting, as it deems appropriate, of any or all of its proceedings;

That the Committee have the power to engage the services of such counsel and other professional, technical, clerical and other personnel as may be necessary for the purposes of its examination;

That the political parties represented on the Special Committee be granted allocations for expert assistance with the work of the Committee;

That it be empowered to adjourn from place to place within and outside Canada;

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

That the Committee submit its report not later than one year from the date of it being constituted, provided that, if the Senate is not sitting, the report will be deemed submitted on the day such report is deposited with the Clerk of the Senate.

FINANCING OF POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

NOTICE OF INQUIRY

Hon. Norman K. Atkins: Honourable senators, I give notice that on Thursday next, November 4, 1999, I shall call the attention of the Senate to the financing of post-secondary education in Canada, and particularly that portion of the financing that is borne by students, with a view to developing policies that will address and alleviate the debt load which post-secondary students are being burdened with in Canada.

CONFERENCE ON WOMEN'S EQUALITY AND PARTICIPATION IN PUBLIC LIFE

NOTICE OF INQUIRY

Hon. Lorna Milne: Honourable senators, I give notice that on Thursday next, November 4, 1999, I will call the attention of the Senate to my recent participation respecting the seventieth anniversary of the "Persons Case" at a conference on Women's Equality and Participation in Public Life in Canada and the United Kingdom, held on October 21 and 22, 1999, in London, England.

DISTINGUISHED CANADIANS AND THEIR INVOLVEMENT WITH THE UNITED KINGDOM

NOTICE OF INQUIRY

Hon. Anne C. Cools: Honourable senators, pursuant to rule 56(1), (2) and 57(2), of the *Rules of the Senate*, I give notice that Thursday next, November 4, 1999, I will call the attention of the Senate:

- (a) to persons of Canadian birth who sat as members of the House of Commons of the United Kingdom, including Ontario-born Edward Blake, Liberal Minister of Justice of Canada 1875-1877, also leader of the Liberal Party of Canada 1880-1887, and New Brunswick-born The Right Honourable Bonar Law, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom 1922-1923, and Ontario-born Sir Bryant Irvine, Deputy Speaker of House of Commons of the United Kingdom 1976-1982;
- (b) to persons of Canadian birth who sat as members of the House of Lords of the United Kingdom, including the Right Honourable Richard B. Bennett, Prime Minister of Canada 1930-1935, and Lord Beaverbrook, Cabinet Minister in the United Kingdom in 1918 and 1940-1942;
- (c) to persons of British birth born in the United Kingdom or the Dominions and Colonies, who have served in the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, including the Right Honourable John Turner, Prime Minister of Canada 1984, also Liberal Leader of the Opposition 1984-1990, and myself, a sitting black female senator born in the British West Indies;
- (d) to persons of Canadian citizenship who were members of the Privy Council of the United Kingdom, including the Prime Ministers of Canada, the Supreme Court of Canada Chief Justices, and some Cabinet Ministers of Canada, including the Leader of the Government in the Senate 1921-1930, and 1935-1940, the Right Honourable Senator Raoul Dandurand, appointed to the United Kingdom Privy Council in 1941;
- (e) to the 1919 Nickle Resolution, a motion of only the House of Commons of Canada for an address to His Majesty King George V and to Prime Minister Richard B. Bennett's 1934 words in the House of Commons characterizing this Resolution that:

That was as ineffective in law as it is possible for any group of words to be. It was not only ineffective, but I am sorry to say, it was an affront to the sovereign himself. Every constitutional lawyer, or anyone who has taken the trouble to study this matter realizes that that is what was done;
- (f) to the words of Prime Minister R.B. Bennett in a 1934 letter to J.R. MacNicol, MP, that:

So long as I remain a citizen of the British Empire and a loyal subject of the King, I do not propose to do otherwise than assume the prerogative rights of the Sovereign to recognize the services of his subjects.
- (g) to the many distinguished Canadians who have received honours since 1919 from the King or Queen of Canada, including the knighting in 1934 of Sir Lyman Duff, Supreme Court of Canada Chief Justice, and in 1935 of Sir Ernest MacMillan, musician, and in 1986, Sir Bryant Irvine, parliamentarian, and in 1994, Sir Neil Shaw, industrialist, and in 1994, Sir Conrad Swan, advisor to Prime Minister Lester Pearson on the National Flag of Canada;
- (h) to the many distinguished Canadians who have received 646 orders and distinctions from foreign non-British, non-Canadian sovereigns between 1919 and February 1929;
- (i) to the legal and constitutional position of persons of Canadian birth and citizenship, in respect of their ability and disability of their membership in the United Kingdom House of Lords and House of Commons, particularly Canadians domiciled in the United Kingdom holding dual citizenship of Canada and of the United Kingdom;
- (j) to the legal and constitutional position of Canadians at home and abroad in respect of entitlement to receive honours and distinctions from their own Sovereign, Queen Elizabeth II of Canada, and to the position in respect of their entitlement to receive honours and distinctions from sovereigns other than their own, including from the sovereign of France, the honour, the Ordre Royale de la Légion d'Honneur;

- (k) to those honours, distinctions, and awards that are not hereditary in character such as life peerages, knighthoods, military and chivalrous orders; and
- (l) to the recommendation by the United Kingdom Prime Minister Tony Blair to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II for the appointment to the House of Lords as a non-hereditary peer and lord of Mr. Conrad Black, a distinguished Canadian publisher, entrepreneur and also the Honorary Colonel of the Governor General's Foot Guards of Canada.

ACCESS TO CENSUS INFORMATION

PRESENTATION OF PETITION

Hon. Lorna Milne: Honourable senators, I have the honour to present a petition with 100 signatures from the Ontario Genealogical Society petitioning the following, in part:

...your petitioners call upon Parliament to enact legislation to preserve the post-1901 Census Records, remove them to the National Archives and make these, as well as future census records, available to the public after 92 years as is presently consistent with the many provisions of the privacy legislation and time limits now in force.

BUSINESS OF THE SENATE

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, later I will be making a statement on a point of order raised by Honourable Senator Lynch-Staunton the other day. However, I want to take this opportunity to point out one of the problems we have with our rules. Under the rules, there is only half an hour for Routine Proceedings. Therefore, I should now move immediately to the Orders of the Day. However, I do not believe that this is the wish of the Senate. I simply make the point that these anomalies in our rules must be corrected.

QUESTION PERIOD

CANADA CUSTOMS AND REVENUE AGENCY

CHANGES TO NATIONAL CHILD TAX BENEFIT— EFFECT ON RECIPIENTS

Hon. Donald H. Oliver: Honourable senators, my question is for the Leader of the Government in the Senate. Last spring I drew to the Senate's attention a flaw in the way that the National Child Tax Benefit is structured in the case of modest income families with more than three children. For the benefit of the government leader I will restate the problem.

[Senator Cools]

In 2001, the government will phase out the National Child Tax Benefit at a clawback rate of 11 per cent for one-child families, 19.7 per cent for two-child families and 27.6 per cent for families with three or more children. The idea is that that money should be gone by the time you hit the 26 per cent tax bracket at \$29,900 of income. However, if there are four or more children the National Child Tax Benefit has not yet fully been clawed back by the time you hit the 26 per cent bracket.

• (1510)

Let us consider what happens when a single mother in Halifax, Nova Scotia, with four children and earning \$30,000 of family income, is offered \$100 to work overtime after the latest changes are fully in effect in the year 2001.

Honourable senators, I will read you some figures. I have already given a copy to the honourable leader so he can follow along. First, the National Child Tax Benefit will be reduced by \$27.60. Then, unless you plan to make significant changes to tax brackets, federal income tax will take away an additional \$26. Provincial income taxes in Nova Scotia would take away \$14.95. Canada Pension Plan premiums of \$4.30 less the CPP tax credit would result in the loss of another \$3.15. If we make the very generous assumption that EI premiums dropped to \$2, the level actually needed to fund the program, then net of the EI tax credit would be another \$1.46. Then we have the income tested tax credits. From the GST credit, take off another \$5.00. From the basic Canada Child Tax Credit, deduct \$5. What does this add up to? It is \$83.16 out of \$100. Subtract that from the \$100, and this family of four with an income of \$30,000 receives \$16.84 out of the \$100.

Honourable senators, the Throne Speech announced a \$2 billion expansion of the National Child Benefit, with details to follow. Can the Leader of the Government advise us as to whether or not the government intends to take a serious look at the way the various taxes and clawbacks all add up before it comes out with a final package of changes to the National Child Benefit? Can the government leader assure the Senate that this serious inequality, particularly to the people of Nova Scotia, will be addressed?

Hon. J. Bernard Boudreau (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I appreciate Senator Oliver giving me a copy of his calculations shortly before I entered the chamber. I know that the honourable senator is very interested in addressing the specific example that he has presented.

I was happy to hear the senator mention that the Child Tax Benefit has been increased by \$2 billion annually in recent budgets and will provide close to \$7 billion annually in assistance to families by July 2000. The honourable senator acknowledged that, and he and I both agree that it is an important and substantial measure undertaken by the government. I might also add that for a two-child family, the maximum benefit of \$3,750 represents an increase of 48 per cent over the maximum benefit in 1996. I know the honourable senator is pleased with the progress we have made.

Honourable senators, I certainly will be interested in discussing the specific example. I am confident that the government will take into account all the factors he has mentioned. With relation to this particular example, I will seek information from the various parties, and I assure the senator that his concern will be relayed to the appropriate authorities.

Senator Oliver: The honourable minister certainly would agree with me that, with respect to the example of a mother of four children who tries to make an extra \$100 and is only left with \$16.84, something must be done by the government in the hope of eliminating some of the clawbacks.

Senator Boudreau: Honourable senators, I would agree with the honourable senator. We certainly do not want to discourage a single mother of four children in those circumstances from earning an additional \$100.

For all of the individual items that were mentioned, such as Canada Pension, I wonder if those deductions would apply at any income level or would there be a maximum beyond which they would not apply? I do not pretend to be an expert on this, and that is why I would like to have an opportunity to discuss it with those more knowledgeable. I can certainly agree with the spirit of what the honourable senator brings to the floor.

UNITED NATIONS

NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT—POLICY OF GOVERNMENT ON NEW AGENDA COALITION RESOLUTION

Hon. Douglas Roche: Honourable senators, I direct my question to the Leader of the Government in the Senate, to whom I extend congratulations on his appointment and best wishes.

On April 19 last, the Government of Canada, in its response to the report of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade, pledged to work with the New Agenda Coalition in pursuing nuclear disarmament goals and objectives. On October 26, the New Agenda Coalition introduced a resolution in the First Committee of the General Assembly of the United Nations which

...calls upon the nuclear-weapon States to make an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the speedy and total elimination of their nuclear arsenals and to engage without delay in an accelerated process of negotiations, thus achieving the nuclear disarmament, to which they are committed under Article VI of the NPT.

Last year, Canada abstained on a similar resolution, stating that the government had not yet heard from the parliamentary committee. Given the government's express desire to move forward on the nuclear disarmament agenda, and given the crisis in the non-proliferation regime that now exists, can the honourable leader confirm that Canada will vote "yes" on this year's New Agenda Coalition resolution?

Before the minister responds, honourable senators, if I have leave, I will table in both official languages a copy of the New

Agenda Coalition resolution, which was presented in the first committee of the United Nations General Assembly on October 22, 1999.

The Hon. the Speaker: Is leave granted for the tabling of the statement?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Hon. J. Bernard Boudreau (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I thank the honourable senator for that question. I certainly appreciate the comments made earlier by Senator Roche with respect to the role that Canada has played and continues to play in peacekeeping efforts around the world. I thought his comments were very timely.

With respect to the specific question that the honourable senator posed, I am sure that the Minister of Foreign Affairs and International Trade will, in the normal course of events, consider carefully the government's position and will, at the appropriate time, make it public. I would be happy to convey it at that time to the honourable senator.

Senator Roche: I thank the honourable leader for his answer, and I appreciate that the minister is considering this matter. Can the minister state what precise words or passages in the resolution are contrary to Canadian government policy? In my analysis of the text, I can find nothing that contravenes Canadian government policy.

Senator Boudreau: Honourable senators, I would certainly be happy to consider the material that was tabled by the honourable senator and to bring his representations to the appropriate ministers.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

REPLACEMENT OF SEA KING HELICOPTERS

Hon. J. Michael Forrestall: Honourable senators, I have several questions for the Leader of the Government in the Senate. Much as I will miss Senator Graham, I welcome you, sir, and wish you good luck.

It is now 1,196 days since Senator Graham promised me that "very, very soon", "imminently", "within the next few days", we would have an announcement about ship-borne helicopter replacement. Yesterday, the Minister of Foreign Affairs described calls for increased defence spending as "tiresome".

A very sick sailor, honourable senators, could not be evacuated from his ship off the East Coast of Nova Scotia because the HMCS *Frederickton's* Sea King was non-operational; nor was the Sea King aboard HMCS *Ville de Quebec* operable; nor was there any Sea King available at Shearwater.

Does the minister agree with the Minister of Foreign Affairs that defence spending is tiresome? Is he concerned with the welfare of our military personnel who are stuck with depending on unreliable and unsafe equipment? Indeed, it is almost immoral to allow those planes to fly.

• (1520)

Hon. J. Bernard Boudreau (Leader of the Government): Senator Forrestall raises the issue of a particular sailor who found himself in difficult circumstances. My information is that the sailor is now making a successful recovery in hospital.

However, that does not address the issue raised by the honourable senator. I have had some discussions with the Minister of National Defence, who has indicated to me that the replacement of the helicopters is an absolute top priority. I certainly share that view with the Minister of National Defence, and I will be working as diligently as possible to ensure that the appropriate mechanisms are in place for us to get on with the job of replacing those helicopters.

Senator Forrestall: Honourable senators, I gather we now have an undertaking from the Leader of the Government in the Senate to spend as much time in worrying about some of the problems that confront, in particular, the navy, as he will in trying to revive the Liberals' fortunes in our great province.

WEST NOVA SCOTIA REGIMENT—
APPOINTMENT OF HONORARY COLONEL

Hon. J. Michael Forrestall: Honourable senators, I should like to ask a question concerning a matter that is now almost three years old. For well over two years the West Nova Scotia Regiment has been waiting to hear about the appointment of a new honorary colonel. It is getting to be a long time for that very colourful regiment to be without an honorary colonel. If the minister has no information today, and that may well be the case, could he have his staff take a look at whether this appointment could be made sooner rather than later?

Hon. J. Bernard Boudreau (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I take seriously the admonition of the honourable senator in terms of improving the lot of the navy on the Atlantic coast. With respect to improving the fortunes of the Liberal Party, however, I suggest to him that the two may not be mutually exclusive.

With respect to the particular regiment about which the honourable senator asks, I do not have any specific knowledge. I shall take his question as notice and return with the relevant information. In the meantime, if the honourable senator has any suggestions about a new honorary colonel, I would be more than happy to convey them to those concerned.

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

FARM CRISIS IN MANITOBA AND SASKATCHEWAN—
VISIT TO OTTAWA BY DELEGATION—DISCREPANCY IN STATISTICS

Hon. Mira Spivak: Honourable senators, the Premiers of Manitoba and Saskatchewan came to Ottawa asking for help for farmers. The Prime Minister and the government indicated that there are statistics that show that the situation is not really that bad and that the government does not need to give additional help to farmers. However, that statistical information was not

conveyed to those who came asking for help. Can the Leader of the Government in the Senate use his good offices to ensure that the Minister of Agriculture will release those statistics so that we can examine them?

My reading of the statistics concerning Saskatchewan, and I am sure other people will have more to say on this, was unequivocal. As everyone knows, the costs of production are twice the selling price. Can the minister tell us whether we will see those phantom figures about which the Prime Minister is talking?

Hon. J. Bernard Boudreau (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, the Prime Minister and the Minister of Agriculture met with the Premiers of Saskatchewan and Manitoba and the delegation that accompanied them. There seemed to be some confusion, however, about the figures used by both parties. An effort is being made to rationalize them, and I can only presume that once rationalized the figures will be released publicly sooner rather than later.

However, I would not necessarily conclude from the fact that there was a difference of opinion with respect to some of the numbers involved that the government will not consider any further action. That would be a premature conclusion.

Senator Spivak: Honourable senators, the premier of my province came home bitterly disappointed. I know that a committee is looking at the figures. However, the amount asked for by Manitoba and Saskatchewan, as the minister is well aware, was \$1.3 billion. I have gathered from conversations with those who came to see the Prime Minister, as well as from news reports and leaked documents that have appeared in the *National Post*, which as we know is never wrong, that there does not seem to be an indication from the government that anything like what is needed to solve this emergency crisis is being considered. In fact, the answer is unequivocally no. Does the minister have anything to tell us today that suggests that that is not the attitude of the government?

Senator Boudreau: Honourable senators, the government placed some \$900 million into the AIDA program. The provinces provided \$600 million. In addition to this amount, the delegation's request was for another \$1.3 billion. I think everyone agrees on the amount requested.

The answer given was that the government felt that that \$1.3 billion of assistance would not be forthcoming. I do not think that view has changed. However, it would be premature to conclude from that that there was no assistance available.

FARM CRISIS IN MANITOBA AND SASKATCHEWAN—
REPRESENTATIONS TO PRIME MINISTER

Hon. Mira Spivak: Honourable senators, I am quite familiar with what the minister is saying. Farmers are very unhappy with the AIDA program and with the way this is being put forward. I am conveying to you their views. I have met personally, as have others, with several delegations. Thus, I am not giving you my interpretation of events. I am telling you what they really feel.

Canadians were happy to assist in the fishing crisis, as they were to assist in the misfortune which befell Quebec. They would like their Prime Minister to come to see the situation firsthand. They have asked for that. Thus far, we have not had an indication that that will happen.

Will the minister convey to the Prime Minister and cabinet what the morale is like in Manitoba? The people of my province believe that they are considered marginal and not worthy of the same attention received by every other region of the country. I do not want to share that view. Will the minister also convey that feeling, which is beginning to settle in? Western alienation, a term which I have not heard for a long time, is back and should not be in this particular case.

• (1530)

Hon. J. Bernard Boudreau (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I give the honourable senator my personal undertaking that her representations will be conveyed to the Prime Minister at the first opportunity.

While the AIDA program represents a substantial amount of money, some \$1.5 billion, and while there have been 36,000 applications under the program, there have been some complaints that the money has not flowed to meet the need in as efficient a fashion as it might have. There are also concerns that the amount of money may not be sufficient. All of these representations are being taken very seriously. The government is giving them due consideration.

FARM CRISIS IN MANITOBA AND SASKATCHEWAN—EFFICACY OF AGRICULTURAL INCOME DISASTER ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Hon. A. Raynell Andreychuk: Honourable senators, the Leader of the Government in the Senate has indicated that the AIDA program is working well. The message from Western Canada is that it may be working well elsewhere but that it does not suit Manitoba and Saskatchewan. That was conveyed personally by at least one premier to the Prime Minister. Why does the government continue to say that the AIDA program works well? If it works well elsewhere, perhaps it should be kept for others.

Why do Manitoba and Saskatchewan not receive any fair attention on a revamped AIDA program? Why were the premiers given hopes that there would be something forthcoming? Why would they be dragged to Ottawa only to be told yet again that the government would be investigating the matter? After months of delay, is this a way of stalling until there will be no more family farms? Is this the hidden agenda of the government?

Hon. J. Bernard Boudreau (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, to correct the honourable senator somewhat, I did not indicate that the AIDA program was working perfectly and needed no improvement. What I did say is that it is a substantial program of \$1.5 billion. Some 36,000 farmers have responded to it in the form of applications. At least, at some point they believed it was worthwhile.

I believe everyone has acknowledged that the money from the program has not flowed as efficiently as it might have. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Agriculture take this matter seriously. Their discussions with the premiers reinforced some of the impressions that they held. I am hopeful that some improvements can be made to existing programs and that, perhaps, other assistance might be considered.

Senator Andreychuk: Honourable senators, I have been receiving calls from farmers who have filed applications under the AIDA program. They tell me that it takes up to six months to receive a response. How does the government know when it is working well when the answers to farmers who desperately need it are being delayed by six months? Some of those who filed in April and May are only now being told that they do not qualify.

From where does the government's confidence in the AIDA program come? After some consultation, the premiers came to Ottawa fully expecting that the Saskatchewan-Manitoba issue would be taken seriously and not be restudied. They expected that the farms that are going under would be saved. Once they are gone, they will not come back. Farmers are not a renewable resource. When they leave their family farms, they leave Saskatchewan. That destroys the base. We do not have the diversity that other provinces have, including those in the province of the Leader of the Government. We are dependent on agriculture, at least at this point in time.

When will the AIDA program be looked at from the Saskatchewan-Manitoba perspective instead of from a global perspective? There is no time to wait. No more study needs to be done. The Prime Minister should come to hear from some of those farmers while they are still left on their farms, because the rest are gone. I wonder where they are going and what they are doing when their whole livelihoods were connected to farming. There is certainly a parallel to be made here with fishing, something which the minister should understand. The matter cannot wait. It is critical.

Senator Boudreau: Honourable senators, the honourable senator will be pleased if I can assure her that such a review is now taking place.

Senator Andreychuk: We do not need a review.

Senator Boudreau: According to the honourable senator, and I think she is probably not alone in this opinion, the program has not worked as well as it might have. The honourable senator talked about delays in dealing with applications. The government has taken that matter seriously. Hopefully, the product of that serious review will be made public very soon.

FARM CRISIS IN MANITOBA AND SASKATCHEWAN—VISIT TO OTTAWA BY DELEGATION—DISCREPANCY IN STATISTICS

Hon. David Tkachuk: Honourable senators, my question is for the Leader of the Government in the Senate. We have been talking about a great many things about which we do not know too much. However, one thing we do know is that farmers in Western Canada are among the most productive, efficient and innovative agricultural producers in the world. They produce

commodities that are of the highest quality. Yet, through no fault of their own, they are going broke. That is something we do know. They are facing bankruptcy and some are committing suicide. We also know that federal support for agriculture has been cut by 60 per cent since 1993. This is the same Liberal government that said in its Red Book that they would make farming in Canada more viable.

Senators Sparrow, Gustafson, Spivak and Andreychuk have been talking about this problem since the fall of 1998. We also talked about it in February of this year, as we did in March, April and June. The two premiers then came to pay the government a visit. What month is it now? It is November. They came here just before Hallowe'en, which is too bad. They received figures from the Prime Minister and the Minister of Agriculture. When they asked where the figures came from, they were told that they could not be told.

I am a slow boy from the Prairies. Perhaps the minister can tell me how his government can explain, in a reasonable fashion, to senators that a problem about which they have known for two years could be dealt with by a set of figures that were given to two premiers from Western Canada with the words, "Well, we are not sure, but we will release them." I do not think that is good enough. I think we need to know from the minister when these figures will be released and how this could have happened in the first place. Where did those numbers come from? An apology should be made to the two premiers.

Hon. J. Bernard Boudreau (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, obviously, there was a difference of opinion with respect to the figures relied upon by both the premiers and the Prime Minister. I do not know that that has been resolved to date. Every effort will be made to reconcile those figures and to indicate publicly how an agreement was reached.

The crisis in the agricultural sector in Saskatchewan and Manitoba has been given great attention and is the subject of serious concern by both the Prime Minister and the Minister of Agriculture. They continue to work toward a solution. It is a very large problem, as the honourable senator knows.

Senator Tkachuk: Honourable senators, the premiers said that all their numbers came from Statistics Canada, the federal Department of Agriculture, and those figures that the federal government was releasing to the public. When asked to explain the numbers of the federal government to the premiers, they could not explain. It is not good enough to say that there was a difference of opinion. There was no difference of opinion. Provincial premiers laid out a case. They used the statistics and the figures given to them by the Government of Canada. The Government of Canada then said, "We have these other numbers, but we are not going to tell you where they came from."

• (1540)

Roy Romanow was very upset, as was I. My politics are not the same as his, but, God bless his soul, he finally got angry at Mr. Chrétien, which has not happened since 1981. That was a big move for him.

[Senator Tkachuk]

I think the Government of Canada should apologize to the premiers and with due haste give us a date when those numbers and their source will be laid before the House of Commons and the Senate.

Senator Boudreau: Honourable senators, I will convey the senator's views to the Minister of Agriculture and to the Prime Minister. Specifically, I believe that the Minister of Agriculture will bring the explanation forward. From discussions I have had with him, I anticipate that he will do so directly.

FARM CRISIS IN MANITOBA AND SASKATCHEWAN—
ECONOMIC EFFECTS OF DECLINE IN FARM INCOME

Hon. Leonard J. Gustafson: Honourable senators, my question is directed to the Leader of the Government in the Senate. Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada's forecast for 1999 said that net farm income in Saskatchewan would be minus \$48 million, the lowest it has been since 1933, and that includes income from crop insurance, NISA and AIDA. The prediction for farm income in Manitoba was minus \$100 million, the lowest in this century, even lower than in the 1930s.

The disappointment of the farmers and the premiers of the two provinces is enormous. I am a farmer and I live among them. I have heard "Western separation". I have heard "Join the U.S.A.; they look after their farmers." There is no way out for us. Something must be done.

This will have very serious national implications for the whole of Canada. We are a very productive industry. There are no more efficient producers in the world than Western Canadian grain producers.

Do the Leader of the Government in the Senate, the cabinet, and the Prime Minister not realize that this will have serious national implications for Canada, not only in terms of separation or joining the U.S., but in economic terms? A great deal of our balance of trade comes from agricultural products produced by our farmers.

Hon. J. Bernard Boudreau (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I can assure the honourable senator that the Prime Minister understands how important the agricultural sector is to the overall economy of our country. Only a couple of weeks before I took up my appointment in this respected chamber, I had the opportunity to travel with the Bank of Canada to Saskatchewan to meet with farmers there, and to hear their representations. I paid an extended visit to a farming operation there and genuinely admire the operations, the efficiency, and the productivity of farmers on the Prairies.

On that visit, however, I came to realize that this is a very large problem. It is a problem that involves more than just short-term government assistance. It also involves farmers being on a level playing field with their competitors around the world and our efforts to achieve that level playing field for them. They have shown in the past, as they will in the future, that with anything close to a level playing field they can succeed very well.

I wish to indicate very clearly to the honourable senator, on behalf of the Prime Minister, the Minister of Agriculture, and myself, our appreciation of the significance of the agricultural sector in the West to the country as a whole.

FARM CRISIS IN MANITOBA AND SASKATCHEWAN—
POSSIBLE PROGRAM FOR FARM CREDIT

Hon. Leonard J. Gustafson: Honourable senators, would the Leader of the Government in the Senate consider presenting to cabinet some provision for relief of debt owed to the Farm Credit Corporation? That is something the government can do, because the farmers will pay their bills if they have the money.

As you know, there is a call for farmers not to pay their taxes. Nine municipalities have voted not to pay their taxes. I talked to the reeve of the Municipality of Wellington. He said it is not that the farmers do not want to pay their taxes but that they cannot pay their taxes. They cannot pay with something they do not have.

Would the Leader of the Government in the Senate consider taking to the cabinet and the Prime Minister the suggestion that they look seriously at what can be done in the area of debt to the Farm Credit Corporation to alleviate the problem somewhat?

Hon. J. Bernard Boudreau (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, without breaching cabinet confidentiality, I can indicate that this subject is on the cabinet agenda on an ongoing basis. That will come as no surprise to the honourable senator, who is very highly respected in the agricultural community and elsewhere. I will have no difficulty in taking those representations to my cabinet colleagues.

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT
OFFICIAL LANGUAGES
SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES—MESSAGE FROM COMMONS

The Hon. the Speaker informed the Senate that the following message had been received from the House of Commons:

Ordered,—That the Standing Joint Committees be composed of the Members listed below:

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Members: Assad, Bailey, Catterall, Clouthier, Finlay, Grey (Edmonton North), Harb, Karygiannis, Lavigne, Lill, Limoges, Mayfield, Mercier, Plamondon, Price, Redman.—(16)

Associate Members: Davies, Dumas, Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis).

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Members: Bélanger, Bellemare, Chamberlain, de Savoye, Folco, Godin (Acadie—Bathurst), Hill (MacLeod), Kilger,

Lavigne, Mark, McTeague, McWhinney, Meredith, Muise, Plamondon, Serré.—(16)

Associate Members: Dumas, Mercier, Nystrom, Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis), Turp.

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

Members: Assad, Bonwick, Bryden, Casey, Comuzzi, DeVillers, Epp, Grewal, Lebel, Murray, Nystrom, Pankiw, Pillitteri, Saada, Venne, Wappel, White (North Vancouver).—17

Associate Members: Bellehumeur, Dockrill, Guimond, Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis).

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours of the names of the Members to serve on behalf of this House on the Standing Joint Committees.

ATTEST:

ROBERT MARLEAU
The Clerk of the House of Commons

BUSINESS OF THE SENATE

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT ON THE EFFECT OF GRANTING LEAVE
DURING ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS AND
THE EVENT OF OCTOBER 14, 1999

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, is it agreed that I now proceed to make the statement I was requested to make by the Honourable Senator Lynch-Staunton the last time we met regarding the Routine of Business?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

The Hon. the Speaker: During the Routine of Business on October 14, Senator Hays sought leave under Government Notices of Motions to move a motion relating to an extensive adjournment of the Senate. Leave was granted, but as soon as the motion was under debate there was some confusion about the nature of the proceedings. One senator suggested the motion was still under notice. Others claimed that the motion was not debatable and that there was no debate allowed during Routine of Business. In the end, the motion on the two-week adjournment was adopted and the Senate proceeded to "Other Business". Nonetheless, when Orders of the Day were called, Senator Lynch-Staunton asked the Chair for a statement of clarification regarding this event so as to avoid the possibility of any confusion in the future.

[*Translation*]

I am most grateful to Senator Lynch-Staunton for raising this matter, which I think is an important one. Following this request, I studied the matter closely and I am now prepared to make a statement explaining my understanding of the way the rules and practices of the Senate operate.

In making this statement, I have attempted to summarize the possibilities with some thoroughness, but I am not certain that I have actually exhausted all possibilities. Moreover, I believe that this exercise has revealed some discrepancies and anomalies in the current rules that should be assessed by the Standing Committee on Privileges, Standing Rules and Orders.

[English]

The Routine of Business in its current form has been a feature of Senate practice since 1991. In that year, amendments were made to the Rules of the Senate setting out the order in which different items of routine business would be called after Senators' Statements. The sequence of Routine of Business is stated in rule 23(6). Other subsections of rule 23 stipulate that no point of order or question of privilege can be raised during Routine of Business and that any requested standing vote be deferred to 5:30 p.m. unless it is in relation to a non-debatable motion moved without notice.

Other provisions of rule 23 seek to fix the time when Question Period will take place and when Orders of the Day shall be called if the time for Routine of Business is extended.

[Translation]

The items of the Routine of Business include the presentation of reports from standing or special committees, government notices of motion, as well as notices for motions proposed by other senators. Normally, chairmen simply present their reports and senators just give notice of their motions. On occasion, however, leave will be sought to consider a committee report either immediately or later the same day.

Similarly, under Notices of Motion, a committee chairman will seek leave to move a motion allowing a committee to meet at a time when the Senate might still be sitting. And, in recent years, every Tuesday the Senate is sitting, the Deputy Leader of the Government almost invariably seeks leave to move a motion to have the Senate meet at 1:30 p.m. on Wednesday rather than at 2:00 p.m.

[English]

- (1550)

Every time leave is sought during Routine of Business, it is a request to suspend the notice normally applicable under rules 57 or 58. Leave is granted once it is determined that no senator present in the chamber disagrees with the request. If only one senator refuses leave, the affected item cannot be considered before the required notice period has lapsed. Furthermore, when leave is granted, the adoption of the report or motion is moved immediately, unless the leave request proposes to postpone consideration of the report or motion to later in the day.

[The Hon. the Speaker]

[Translation]

When the question on the report or motion is placed before the Senate, it is subject to debate. The fact that notice is required for these items makes it clear that they are debatable. No committee report or substantive motion presented to the Senate for adoption is exempt from the possibility of debate. That there is often little or no debate on motions moved with leave during the Routine of Business does not mean that they cannot be debated. Only motions that can be moved without notice are non-debatable.

[English]

Once debate has begun, all the rules relating to debate are applicable, including the possibility of raising a point of order. This is because in agreeing to grant leave and put the question, the Senate has, in effect, stepped out of Routine of Business for the duration of the debate until it is decided or adjourned. In my view, the restriction imposed by rule 23(1) preventing points of order or questions of privilege being raised during Routine of Business does not apply during the debate because the Senate is no longer in Routine of Business.

If, in addition, a standing vote is requested at the conclusion of any debate, rule 23(3) states that the vote will be deferred to 5:30 p.m. the same day unless, of course, there is leave to hold it at another time.

Another subsection of rule 23 remains pertinent even when there is a debate. Rule 23(7) provides that not later than 30 minutes after the first item of Routine of Business is called, the Senate will proceed to Question Period. It is possible, therefore, that proceedings on Routine of Business or a debate on an item during Routine of Business will be interrupted for the purposes of Question Period. In fact, this did happen on May 6, 1993, when debate on third reading of Bill C-114, amending the Canada Elections Act, was moved immediately following the presentation of the report on the bill by the Legal and Constitutional Affairs Committee without amendment. On that occasion, the bill received third reading before the 30-minute time limit for Routine of Business was reached to begin Question Period. This proceeding also included a standing vote which, according to my reading of rule 23(3), should have been delayed until 5:30 p.m. There is no indication that leave was given to take the vote immediately. Leave might have been implicit given the understanding that Royal Assent was scheduled later the same afternoon. Therefore, the Senate proceeded to Orders of the Day without reverting to Routine of Business.

[Translation]

This then is a summary of what can occur whenever leave is granted during Routine of Business. I hope that it is of some assistance to understanding this aspect of our procedures. What occurred on Thursday October 14 when Senator Hays asked for leave to move his motion for the extended adjournment of the Senate was consistent with our rules.

[English]

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

MOTION FOR ADDRESS IN REPLY—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Kroft, seconded by the Honourable Senator Furey, for an Address to Her Excellency the Governor General in reply to her Speech from the Throne at the Opening of the Second Session of the Thirty-sixth Parliament.—(*1st day of resuming debate*)

Hon. J. Bernard Boudreau (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I should like to begin today by thanking my predecessor, my friend and fellow Nova Scotian, Senator Graham, for his excellent leadership in this chamber over the past two years.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

Senator Boudreau: I am grateful for the generous help and support he has extended to me over the past several weeks since my appointment, in the course of a very steep learning curve. I intend to shamelessly abuse his generous offer of continuing assistance.

Honourable senators, I also wish to take this opportunity to thank Senator Carstairs for her excellent work over the past two years as deputy leader.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

Senator Boudreau: I look forward, as well, to taking advantage of her extensive knowledge and experience as we embark on this new session of Parliament.

Senator Hays has been very candid in his remarks to me about his challenge in meeting the high standards set by Senator Carstairs. We will both rely on her very much in the days ahead.

I should like to congratulate Senator Kroft and Senator Furey on their excellent speeches in moving and seconding the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

I would be remiss if I did not add my congratulations to those of many others to our newest Governor General. Her appointment demonstrates that the Canadian dream is not just a dream; it is a reality. It does not matter where you come from, how much money your family has, or who they know. If you have the talent, the determination and the perseverance, you can achieve your dream. You can rise to the highest positions in the

land and contribute in a very meaningful way to our collective vision of Canada.

What is that vision? The Prime Minister expressed it in his reply to the Speech from the Throne. He said:

Our vision of the Canada of the 21st century is clear: a society of excellence, with a commitment to success, a strong and united country, a dynamic economy, a creative and innovative population, a diverse and cohesive society where prosperity is not limited to the few, but is shared by many. It is a Canada where every child gets the right start in life, where young people have a chance to grow and be the best at whatever they want to do, where citizens have access to the skills and knowledge they need to excel. It is a Canada where citizens, regardless of income, receive quality health services, where families enjoy safe communities and a clean environment and where we work together with other countries to promote peace, cultural diversity and the human purpose and benefits of the new global economy.... It is a Canada that is a leader and an example to the world.

Skeptics may say that these are fine words, but what do they really mean? Fortunately, they mean a great deal. This vision is being realized through this government's strategy, set out in the Speech from the Throne, to work with provincial and territorial governments to develop the National Children's Agenda. It is being realized through the establishment of a national action plan on skills and learning for the 21st century. It is being realized through initiatives to provide better access to world markets for Canadian companies. The vision is being realized through programs to improve Canada's knowledge infrastructure, including the creation of the Canadian Institutes of Health Research, and through stronger support for advanced research. It is being realized through actions to make our information infrastructure second to none. The vision is being realized by initiatives to improve our environment.

Honourable senators, this vision of Canada is an exciting one, and it can become a reality.

• (1600)

Our nation has turned a corner. Our finances are in order, our budget is balanced and will continue to be balanced. As the Governor General told us in the Speech from the Throne:

The Government is committed to prudent fiscal management. It will never let the nation's finances get out of control again. It will keep the ratio of debt to GDP on a permanent downward track. It will deliver on the commitment it made at the beginning of this Parliament to devote half the budget surplus to debt repayment and tax relief, and the other half to investments that address the social and economic needs of Canadians.

However, honourable senators, there are other realities in our nation that demand our attention.

Senator Kroft spoke eloquently of the different perspectives held by Canadians who live outside the big business and media centres of Ontario and Quebec. I come from a small province which has known more than its share of economic troubles. I come from a region which has, for many years, felt its distance from the centre of this country's political and economic power. Canada is indeed thriving, with the promise of even better times ahead, but, honourable senators, this prosperity is not shared by all Canadians. Some regions feel themselves left behind.

Cape Breton, for example, is a region that must completely transform its economy. Because of the chance of geology, its economy for generations rested on the extraction of mineral deposits that are no longer economically extractable on a large scale, at least in the measure to which they have been in the past and on a steel industry which now seems to have lost its economic *raison d'être*. Because of the chance of geography, Cape Breton never developed a critical mass of manufacturing industries or sophisticated service industries to round out the dependence on these traditional mineral-based industries.

Most communities have had several decades to adjust to the new, emerging economic realities, but time is a luxury that Cape Breton does not have. It must transform itself radically. It must leap decades of economic development. It must somehow propel itself into this new, post-industrial age almost overnight.

I believe the Speech from the Throne carries a strong message of hope for Cape Breton and for the other regions across this great country that are very similar. I believe the course of this government is very clear: These are not and cannot become "orphan" communities. They belong to the Canadian family, just as much as does Quebec City, Metropolitan Toronto or Vancouver.

In his speech, Senator Furey spoke of the adjustment now in progress in his province of Newfoundland and Labrador. He said:

Today, Newfoundland and Labrador finds itself caught up in the sweeping economic and technological changes that are making their way throughout the world. Far from being swamped by these forces, however, the people of Newfoundland and Labrador are drawing on some long-standing skills and assets to deal with these fast-changing realities. Creativity, resilience, community solidarity, determination and hard work are enabling many to realize their dreams and to move their province and their country forward.

There are new opportunities today for everyone. The information age holds the promise of the ultimate age of equal opportunity. Computers and the Internet can truly level the playing field between urban and rural communities, Central and Atlantic Canadians, the rich and the poor. I recently learned of someone who lives in Mount Pearl, Newfoundland, and who "tele-works" for a Los Angeles animation company. Where he lives is not important to his employer. All that matters is his talent — and his Internet connections.

[Senator Boudreau]

The people of my province, Nova Scotia, know this very well. In every corner of the province, there are dozens of information technology businesses ready to leap on the information superhighway. Nova Scotians are already on that highway, some speeding to success.

The Prime Minister has set a goal: to make Canada a world leader in the smart use of electronic ways of doing business and to encourage the rapid use of e-commerce throughout the economy.

Honourable senators, Nova Scotians lead Canada in buying and selling products over the Internet. We saw the opportunity and we seized it early on. Let me give you an example.

In 1995, when the real estate market was taking a beating, the management of two twin office towers in downtown Halifax had a serious problem. The towers, which accounted for one-sixth of the office space in downtown Halifax, were severely underoccupied. Then management took a big risk. They wired the towers for high-speed, cutting-edge access to the Internet. In November 1998, these towers — Purdy's Wharf — made history when they became the first building complex in Canada to be its own Internet service provider.

This foresight, imagination and investment has paid off. Purdy's Wharf has grown from eight information technology firms occupying 35,000 square feet in 1995 to some 40 such firms occupying 120,000 square feet. The tenants include AT&T Canada, Clear Picture Corporation, Fonorola, Fundy Communications, IBM Canada, iStar Internet, Knowledge Navigators International, Nova Knowledge, Sprint Canada, and Xerox Canada, to name just a few. Linked by a fibre optic cable network, a powerful data circuit is made available to any tenant, providing 24-hour access to the Internet at roughly 100 times the speed of a conventional modem. The development also established an intranet to allow networking among the tenants. In other words, the landlord took a bad real estate market and turned it into an opportunity, one that itself has created a hub of exciting high technology in the heart of Halifax.

Initiatives such as these, both public and private, are working. The September unemployment rate in Halifax was 6.2 per cent, the lowest it has been since World War II. This was the same rate as in Toronto and lower than the national average of 7.5 per cent for that month.

We have the talent, honourable senators, and this government is working to make sure that all Canadians, wherever they live in Canada, have the tools they need to seize their potential. The Prime Minister was very clear in his speech in reply to the Speech from the Throne:

Getting Canadians connected, to each other, to schools and libraries, to our diverse stories and voices, to government, to the marketplace and to the world, is one of the key elements in establishing Canada as a world-leading economy and as a country of opportunity. We must aim to be the most connected country in the world.

Again, this government has set very concrete goals to achieve this:

By March 31, 2001, 6,000 new community access sites will be established in urban and rural Canada, to ensure that all Canadians, regardless of geographic location, have affordable access to the Internet. To ensure they have the skills required to use new information technology, we will recruit up to 10,000 young Canadians to train community members of all ages.

- (1610)

Honourable senators, skills and training are essential elements if we are to benefit from these new opportunities. The government announced that it will establish partnerships with other governments, public and private sector organizations, and individuals to establish a national action plan on skills and learning for the 21st century. The plan will focus on lifelong learning. It will address the problem of poor literacy among adults, and will provide citizens with the information they need to make good decisions about developing their skills.

This government is harnessing the power and opportunities of this new information age to extend the opportunities of the new, post-industrial industries throughout our vast and diverse country to Canadians everywhere. Let me read to you once again from the Speech from the Throne:

Our knowledge-based economy is more than high-tech companies. It is an economy in which all sectors strive to use leading technologies and processes. It is an economy in which old barriers to access or of distance matter less — where technology enables urban and rural communities from the Atlantic to the West to the North to compete globally, and where technology opens new doors to all Canadians. It is an economy in which rural Canada also benefits from value-added activity, environmentally astute land management, and new job skills and opportunities. It is an economy in which clusters of technology development already exist in smaller communities all over Canada. Indeed, it is an economy in which technology can lead to greater economic stability for the primarily rural regions in which cyclical resource industries — agriculture, fisheries, forestry, mining and tourism — are now the dominant sources of wealth. The government will encourage the development and adoption of new technologies in all sectors.

Let us come back to my own province. How will Nova Scotia benefit? Again, very concretely, honourable senators. The energy sector holds tremendous promise for Atlantic Canada. I am personally very hopeful that it will open up new, challenging areas of research and development for the region that could lead, in turn, to exciting possibilities and applications outside of Atlantic Canada. The new Centre of Excellence in Petroleum

Development and Petroleum Education, established at the University College of Cape Breton, could serve as a springboard for this research and development. I recently had the opportunity to announce the establishment of the Atlantic Canada Petroleum Institute at Dalhousie University in Halifax. These institutions are already working together and, indeed, forging alliances with leading petroleum engineering institutions elsewhere in the world. The technical and environmental challenges posed by the offshore energy project are mirrored by the opportunities presented. It is a very exciting time.

The world today is a very different place than even 20 years ago. Farms today often look like sophisticated intense manufacturing operations with large-scale manipulated growth and non-seasonal harvesting. Traditional resource industries, like forestry and mining, are being impacted by biotechnology research. It is commonplace to sit at a desk overlooking the shore in Lunenburg County and, with the click of a mouse, exchange information and ideas with people halfway across the world.

Honourable senators, it is not enough to teach our young people how to use a computer or how to program software. We must open their eyes and their minds to the potential of the world around us. This government recognizes that fact. In the Speech from the Throne, the government announced that it will enable young Canadians to apply their energy and talent overseas by participating in international apprenticeship programs and helping developing countries get connected to the Internet.

These experiences can be invaluable, such as the first-hand concrete training they provide; the insights into other countries and other peoples; the awareness that the world is a big place but that distance is not a barrier to working together. These are important lessons that will position our young people — our future leaders — to carry our communities and our country into the 21st century. These are initiatives that can help small communities, as well as large urban centres.

I have great confidence in the people of Canada, and they have a growing confidence in themselves. Whether they live in the midst of our great urban centres, or on a rocky outport in Atlantic Canada, or in the forested interior of British Columbia, the message of the Speech from the Throne is that distance today matters less than ever before in our history. This government will work to ensure that Canadians, wherever they live, have access to the tools they need to make it in this new, post-industrial age.

Will it be easy? It is never easy. Building this country certainly was not easy. Our forefathers and mothers founded this country against the odds of a very harsh climate, impossibly vast distances, and profound linguistic, cultural and religious differences. What were the odds? They did not allow themselves to be defeated by these difficulties. We owe it to these pioneers, who dreamed this country and then made it happen, to now ourselves dream a dream for the next century. The new pioneers are alive and well in Atlantic Canada, as they are in all parts of our country. These new pioneers who dream the dream of the 21st century will have no patience with the naysayers and the doomsday prophets.

Honourable senators, our Governor General gave an inspiring speech in this very chamber when she assumed her new position. She said:

We must not see ourselves as people who simply react to trends but as people who can initiate them. We must not see ourselves as people to whom things are done but as people who do things.

This government has declared its intention to see this country proud and prosperous, leading the world into the next millennium and beyond. All of us, as parliamentarians, should be honoured to be in a position to help make this come true.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

Hon. John Lynch-Staunton (Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, I, too, wish to congratulate the Governor General on her appointment and wish her well in her new role as representative of Canada's head of state. Madam Clarkson succeeds one of our former colleagues who brought special personal characteristics to a demanding and not always understood role. May Roméo LeBlanc, and his charming wife, Diana, have many happy years of a well-earned retirement on the shores of the Northumberland Strait.

Politics can be as cruel as it can be exhilarating, and not just following an election result. Relationships between its participants, too many times strained by personal ambition, frequently test one's mettle, sometimes to the breaking point. The success of a political party is intrinsically linked to its supporters' loyalty to it, not the least to its leader, no matter personal disappointment or setback.

Honourable senators, these reflections come to mind in the light of Senator Graham's sudden removal from the responsibilities of Leader of the Government in the Senate. During his term, Senator Graham's commitment to the Senate and to Nova Scotia was a total commitment to meet government and party objectives. His stature as a man of honour and principle was never more challenged than it was last month, and his conduct since reaffirms it as nothing else could. Let me borrow and paraphrase from Edmund Burke to summarize my reaction to Senator Graham being so cavalierly moved to the sidelines: Magnanimity in politics is often the truest wisdom, and a great political party and little minds do not go well together.

• (1620)

This being said, on behalf of my caucus colleagues and myself, I wish Senator Boudreau well as Leader of the Government. His admission, however, that he is here primarily to promote his party's fortunes in Nova Scotia — which I think he did extraordinarily well in his remarks a moment ago — is disturbing, as it raises questions as to the use of the appointed chamber to seek elective office. Senator Boudreau has stated quite clearly that he intends to be a candidate for a seat in the House of Commons come the next election. This, to me, is like a

player in the National Hockey League anxious to be sent down to the minors. Hopefully, Senator Boudreau will soon come to appreciate the performance and significance of the Senate and to the realization that it is in this chamber where legislation is most properly scrutinized, where partisanship is never shrill, and where government supporters, ministers and backbenchers alike are treated as individuals, not as rubber stamps, and act accordingly, free from the constraints imposed on our caucus colleagues in the other place.

As mover and seconder of the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, Senators Kroft and Furey acquitted themselves with great distinction and eloquent feeling. One must not look to their remarks, however, to get anything but a vague reference to the speech itself which so unfairly burdened Her Excellency, in sharp contrast to the one she gave following her swearing in. Senator Kroft dismissed it in a few short paragraphs and gave us an appreciation of his strong commitment to his country and to the government, as did Senator Furey.

Indeed, they had little choice, as a speech so anticipated has immediately become a non-event. What should have been a vision of the next century turned out to be paragraphs of platitudes. The anticipation was based on a widespread expectation of concrete proposals to resolve serious current problems. Instead, to everyone's amazement, there was not a word on western agriculture which is going through its worst crisis since the 1930s, on fisheries which have suffered serious complications, on illegal immigration which underlines serious flaws in Canadian legislation, on passenger airline difficulties which even today the government leaves to something called "the market" to resolve, and on tax relief which, if one deciphers the few words devoted to it, will be addressed just prior to the next election. Poverty and the plight of the homeless were given little attention. Nonetheless, there are two subject matters in the speech on which I wish to comment.

The first is in the statement that the government "will never let the nation's finances get out of control again." It is reassuring to see that those who were there at the time and deliberately let the nation's finances get out of control have finally seen the light, however reluctantly. I think in particular of the Prime Minister who, as President of the Treasury Board and Minister of Finance in the 1970s, was a significant contributor to a near six-fold increase in the budgetary deficit and a more than doubling of the net public debt. What is not acknowledged by this government but is more and more being recognized and appreciated elsewhere is that the fiscal and monetary successes of the moment result from the fact that they are a continuation of the policies adopted by the Mulroney governments and constantly opposed by Liberals at the time — reduction of program spending in line with real national needs, creation of an operating surplus, reduction of interest rates, and a reduction in the inflation rate. These results, which would never have been achieved under the Liberals of old — plus free trade, also violently objected to by the same free spenders — are now the mainstays of the current government's policies, a government

[Senator Boudreau]

which shamelessly ignores the extraordinary efforts made by the Mulroney governments, embarrassed as they should be by their vigorous opposition to them as they were being introduced, not the least, of course, being the Goods and Services Tax. In September 1990, the Liberal leader stated:

....the position of the party and the caucus is clear: We are opposed to the GST and we do not want to see it implemented.

Recently, the Prime Minister lauded the tax and dismissed any attempt to remove it, even on reading material, as evidenced by a vote here in September.

[Translation]

The second point in the speech that attracts my attention is the most worrisome, because it impacts upon the future of this country:

The Government of Canada therefore reaffirms the commitment it has made to Quebecers and all other Canadians that the principle of clarity, as set out by the Supreme Court of Canada, will be respected.

This, added to certain less ambiguous comments by certain government spokespersons, suggests that, if there were a referendum, the Liberal government intends to use its own interpretation of the Supreme Court of Canada's opinion on the matter of a vote in favour of sovereignty!

I say opinion rather than decision, because that is what the Supreme Court has in fact brought down. There is nothing in the opinion that is binding on anyone whatsoever. I believe the court went too far, going beyond the three issues on which it was asked to decide, and in so doing participating in a political debate that is not within its mandate. Why? Because, by suggesting the process to be followed before and after a referendum favourable to secession, the Supreme Court has in actual fact legitimized the desire of one province to break away from the Canadian federation: The court advises a clear question, a strong majority, negotiations, without giving any details. The federal government interprets this opinion as indicating that it has a unilateral prerogative to do so. How else could one interpret the commitment in the Throne Speech to ensure that "the principle of clarity, as set out by the Supreme Court of Canada, will be respected"?

As well as believing that the Supreme Court has gone too far in its statements, I am equally dismayed that the federal government is stating its preparedness to take part in a referendum, not only before one is held, but even before it is announced. The top priority for any national government must be the unity of the country, and it ought never to take any action that would be contrary to that unity. By interpreting a series of vague conditions from the Supreme Court as it sees fit, the government is in fact liable to find itself ending up a partner in an adventure that could cost all Canadians dearly.

[English]

I wish to end with a major concern which preoccupies many, and that is the growing irrelevancy of Parliament, especially that of the House of Commons.

I have never hidden my admiration for the United States form of government because it is based on a system of checks and balances that limits the excesses in which one branch can successfully engage by itself. The President and the Congress are more often than not constantly in search of compromise, as both are major participants in the development and final adoption of legislation. Executive indiscretions and cover-ups seldom remain hidden for long, as a slightest whiff of them arouses Congress to investigate them. Of course, many times the legislative branch will take exaggerated advantage of its jurisdiction to hold up indefinitely a presidential appointment or some other executive initiative, but this does not take away from the fact that both branches are more or less on the same footing and can seldom succeed independently of each other.

Honourable senators, contrast that healthy relationship with the anaemic one in this country where the executive, which in law is the Governor in Council but in fact is the Prime Minister's Office, runs roughshod over members of the House of Commons, not least those on the majority side who are covered into doing the PMO's bidding, otherwise demotion and non-recognition result.

The House was in session only a few days this month when the government imposed closure on Bill C-6. Closure was threatened on legislation regarding the Nisga'a Final Agreement. Why? Simply because these bills, we are told, had been debated enough elsewhere, and further discussion in the House of Commons would bring nothing new to the debate. Can disdain for parliamentary democracy be expressed more clearly?

Unfortunately, the Senate was treated more or less the same way in September when it was recalled to debate Bill C-32, the environment bill, and Bill C-78, the pension bill. The new Minister of the Environment, no sooner in office, announced that Bill C-32 had been debated long enough and that no amendments would be accepted. Closure was imposed by the majority on the committee, which then unanimously reported to the Senate that there were so many deficiencies in the bill that a review of it should begin immediately after passage. Closure was imposed at third reading, the government side arguing that while there were many flaws in the bill, it was still better than the act it was called to replace.

• (1630)

What the Senate majority did in passing Bill C-32 is knowingly support a bill which it knew was deserving more study in line with the traditional role the Senate. It was not one of its finer moments.

The pension bill was delayed from June until September in order to allow Treasury Board and the Public Service Alliance an opportunity to meet over the summer months to try to iron out certain misunderstandings, especially with regard to the surplus. Treasury Board refused to meet with the union if the surplus was on the agenda, maintaining that it belonged in total to the government. The new President of the Treasury Board showed the same inflexibility. Thus, the unanimous will of the Senate was completely disregarded. During third reading debate, we were advised that if the union wanted to advance its claim to part ownership of that surplus, all it had to do was take up a court action.

Once again, the Senate abdicated its traditional role of serious examination of legislation in favour of bowing to an instruction from elsewhere to be done with the bill, whatever its weaknesses. In this case, the indecency of the haste was compounded by the knowledge that the major disagreement was to be resolved not by Parliament but left to the courts. No doubt these same parliamentarians, in case of a court decision not to their liking, will be the first to complain about judicial interference.

I spoke earlier of the new Leader of the Government in the Senate being impressed with the work being done here compared with that in the other place. I trust that what happened in September was prompted more by pre-prorogation impatience than by the beginning of an effort to diminish the Senate's contributions to the parliamentary process and that this session will see us back in our traditional role, always mindful, of course, of the will of the elected house.

I also trust that constant rumours of stripping the opposition of all but one committee chairmanship are also ill-founded. Any detached observer cannot but agree that committee chairmanships held by my caucus colleagues during Parliament's first session were exercised with distinction and as a credit to the Senate. Any attempt to reduce the contribution of non-government supporters to the committee system without just cause will be strongly resisted, not out of petty egoism, but because the great value of this place rests on a foundation of working together and not against each other.

When we had a majority in opposition, we resisted many times — with difficulty, I admit — the urge to obstruct for the sake of obstruction, which was the case during much of the 1980s and in 1990 when the roles were reversed. We deliberately worked toward the defeat of only two bills, those dealing with the Pearson airport and redistribution, as they were clearly unconstitutional. At all times, we are conscious that the will of elected representatives must be respected, as long as it is expressed within constitutional bounds.

Honourable senators, the Senate's success is measured not by the massive use of numbers to ram bills through but by the contribution of all members toward the improvement of legislation sent here from the other place. To deny the opposition anything but an insignificant role in this process will be to turn the whole place into a mirror image of the House of Commons and give even more ammunition to those who seek its abolition.

[Senator Lynch-Staunton]

That the new Leader of the Government seeks through his ministerial responsibilities political benefits in his province is one thing. That he might favour reducing the opposition to an irrelevant nuisance to be dismissed because it is numerically inferior, however, would be both an insult to this institution and an unnecessary provocation. Such an approach could easily alter the current spirit of cooperation and harmony which, ironically enough, is not foreign to the opposition's respect for the Senate, a respect the majority, I trust, will continue to share.

On motion of Senator Hays, debate adjourned.

MEDICAL DECISIONS FACILITATION BILL

SECOND READING—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. Sharon Carstairs moved the second reading of Bill S-2, to facilitate the making of legitimate medical decisions regarding life-sustaining treatments and the controlling of pain.

She said: Honourable senators, the purpose of Bill S-2 is to facilitate the making of medical decisions by patients through the protection of health care providers from criminal liability when they act in accordance with their patients' wishes. More specifically, the bill would clarify the law by protecting health care providers when they, first, withhold or withdraw life-sustaining treatment at the request of the patient; or, second, administer pain-relieving medication to alleviate massive physical pain.

This bill also provides for the Minister of Health to establish national guidelines and to promote education and training in the areas of the withholding or withdrawal of life-sustaining medical treatment, the controlling of pain, and palliative care.

Bill S-2, the short title of which is the Medical Decisions Facilitation Act, is the third bill of its kind to be introduced to this chamber in recent years.

Honourable senators, on November 27, 1996, I introduced Bill S-13, to amend the Criminal Code (protection of health care providers). That bill died on the Order Paper with the federal election call in May 1997.

In the last session of this Parliament, Senator Thérèse Lavoie-Roux introduced Bill S-29, which had the same general purpose as Bill S-13, the protection of patients and health care providers. Bill S-29 died on the Order Paper with the prorogation of Parliament in September of this year.

In my view, Bill S-2, the proposed Medical Decisions Facilitation Act, incorporates the best of both Bills S-13 and S-29. However, let me make it perfectly clear to all honourable senators that I do not consider this my bill. I consider this bill to be the bill of the Special Senate Committee on Euthanasia and Assisted Suicide. It is the work of the former Senator Joan Neiman, Senators Lavoie-Roux, Corbin, Beaudoin, DeWare, Keon and, yes, of me, since I, too, sat on the committee.

If I were to dedicate this bill to anyone, however, it would be to the late Senator Noël Desmarais who, while not a full-time member of the committee, replaced Senator DeWare for several months while she was caring for her sick husband, and who continued to dialogue with us until confronted with his own terminal illness. His input was invaluable, and we must not ever forget it.

Honourable senators will note that Bill S-2 begins with a preamble. On February 23, 1994, the Special Senate Committee on Euthanasia and Assisted Suicide was appointed "to examine and report upon the legal, social and ethical issues relating to euthanasia and assisted suicide." It quickly became clear to the members of the committee that we could not deal alone with the issues of euthanasia and assisted suicide, which is why many of the chapters in this report have nothing to do with euthanasia and assisted suicide. They have to do with palliative care and with the withholding and withdrawing of life support treatment. They have to do with the controlling of pain.

On June 6, 1995, the committee submitted to the Senate its report entitled, "Of Life and Death." In my view, the preamble to this bill is essential in order to give the credit to the Senate that it so richly deserves. I know that some legal draftspersons do not like preambles. However, in this case it is not only positive, but, in my view, just to the work of this extremely hard-working committee.

Let me turn now to the specifics of Bill S-2. Clause 2 of the bill provides that no health care provider is guilty of an offence under the Criminal Code by reason only that the health care provider administers medication with the intention of alleviating or removing the physical pain of a person in dosages that might shorten the life of that person.

- (1640)

In "Of Life and Death" the special Senate committee recognized that the practice of providing treatment to alleviate physical pain, even though it may shorten life, is currently legal.

The Criminal Code does not prohibit palliative care even if it hastens the death of a patient, so long as the care is carried out in accordance with generally accepted medical practices. However, a number of witnesses testified before the committee that doctors are often reluctant to provide sufficient pain control medication to alleviate suffering if there is a possibility that it may shorten the life of patients, for fear that the doctor might be held criminally liable. The great tragedy that is occurring daily across this nation is that, because of this fear on the part of physicians, patients are often not receiving adequate palliative care; they are not getting sufficient pain relief.

Because of evidence from a wide variety of witnesses who testified as to the confusion that exists among health care providers and the general public regarding the legal status of the practice, the special Senate committee unanimously recommended that the criminal law be clarified.

There are many palliative care physicians who would argue that the provision of pain relief never shortens life. We heard testimony that patients whose medication is titrated appropriately simply adjust to the increasing amount of medication given. However, we simply do not know, and in my view it is really not the issue. The concern that each and every one of us must have is that patients in Canada are entitled to be as pain free as possible.

The Senate committee was not alone in recommending clarification of the criminal law regarding the permissibility of providing, in order to alleviate suffering, treatment that may shorten life. It was recommended by the Law Reform Commission in its report in 1983. Moreover, the Canadian Medical Association has advocated clarification of the law in this area since 1992.

The special Senate committee used the broader terminology "alleviation of suffering", but the wording of clause 2 narrows the scope and excludes situations where medication might be administered to alleviate emotional or psychological suffering. In my view, we must proceed slowly; nothing in this bill should cause undue controversy, and yet the area of emotional and physiological suffering is fraught with controversy. Clause 2 does not provide protection where another ground of criminal liability, such as criminal negligence, might exist.

Honourable senators, let me be absolutely clear that clause 2 specifically does not apply to situations where there is an intention to cause death. It applies only where the intent is to alleviate the physical pain of the patient. It is very important to stress that. No one should be removed from criminal liability if it is their intention to kill.

Clause 3(1) of Bill S-2 provides that no health care provider is guilty of an offence under the Criminal Code by reason only that they withhold or withdraw life-sustaining medical treatment from a competent person who requests that the treatment be withheld or withdrawn.

Clause 3(2) clarifies the circumstances in which a request is valid under clause 3(1). An advance written directive made under the laws of a province will always take precedence. Most provinces have already enacted some type of legislation regarding advance directives. The most recent province to have advance directive legislation is Alberta, where the Personal Directives Act was proclaimed and took effect on December 1, 1997. Manitoba, Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, Ontario, and Quebec have also legalized the making of what is called, in the vernacular, living wills. British Columbia and Prince Edward Island have passed such laws, but they are not yet in force.

In the absence of an advance written directive under the laws of a province, an informal written directive, or a request made orally or by signs made at any time, is a valid request if it is made in the presence of at least one witness.

Clause 3(3) provides that a substitute request can come from a proxy, legal representative or spouse, only if the patient is incompetent and did not, while competent, make a valid request.

In "Of Life and Death" the special Senate committee defined "the withholding of life-sustaining treatment" as "not starting treatment that has the potential to sustain life"; for example, not initiating cardiopulmonary resuscitation, not giving a blood transfusion, or not starting artificial hydration or nutrition. It defined "the withdrawal of life-sustaining treatment" as "stopping treatment that has the potential to sustain life"; for example, removing a respirator.

The special Senate committee recognized that Canadian courts have held that there is a common law right of patients to refuse to consent to medical treatment or to demand that treatment, once commenced, be withdrawn. Cases such as *Malette v. Schulman* in 1990, *Nancy B. v. Hôtel-Dieu de Québec* in 1992, and the *Rodriguez* case in 1993, specifically recognized this right, even though the consequence of withholding or withdrawing life-sustaining treatment is death.

I think it is important to review some of these cases with you.

In *Malette v. Schulman* in 1990, the Ontario Court of Appeal held that instructions on blood transfusions issued when a patient was competent had to be followed even when she was incapable of making a decision. The court found that the physician must follow a Jehovah Witness' written instruction refusing all blood transfusions, even in an emergency situation where the patient was unable to give consent.

In the January 1992 decision in the case of *Nancy B.*, the Quebec Superior Court ruled that a competent adult patient suffering from an incurable disease, and bedridden for life, had the right to request that her doctor disconnect the respirator keeping her alive. In making his decision, Mr. Justice Dufour cited sections of the Quebec Civil Code which provide that the human person is inviolable and that no one can be made to undergo treatment without consent.

The case also dealt with the issue of the criminal liability of the doctor who, at Nancy B.'s request, would be required to remove her from the respirator. After referring to sections 216, 217, 45 and 219 of the Criminal Code, as well as the provisions dealing with homicide, the judge concluded that it was neither unreasonable nor wanton and reckless conduct for a physician, at the request of a patient, to disconnect the patient's respirator and allow the patient's disease to take its natural course. He also found that the doctor would not be aiding the patient to commit suicide or committing an act of homicide, since Nancy B.'s death would result from the underlying disease.

In 1993, Mr. Justice Sopinka of the Supreme Court of Canada, writing for the majority in the *Rodriguez* case, also acknowledged the right of patients to refuse to consent to treatment or demand that treatment be withdrawn even where doing so would result in death. It is important to remember that the majority in this case did not favour euthanasia and assisted suicide. However, they did favour the right to withhold or withdraw treatment, which is the subject of this bill.

[Senator Carstairs]

However, honourable senators, witnesses before the special Senate committee testified that in some cases patients' wishes were not being honoured because the Criminal Code was unclear and health care providers feared that they would be held liable. Because of this evidence as to the confusion that exists among health care providers and the general public, the special Senate committee again unanimously recommended that the existing common law be codified in order to clarify the circumstances wherein the withholding and withdrawal of life-sustaining treatment is legally acceptable.

Again, the Senate committee was not the first to recommend a clarification of the law in this area.

• (1650)

In 1983, the Law Reform Commission of Canada recommended that the Criminal Code be clarified in that respect as well. Since 1992, the Canadian Medical Association has advocated the clarification in the Criminal Code of the legality of the cessation of treatment in order to protect health care providers from liability.

Honourable senators, clause 6 of Bill S-2 is the most clear example of the merging of Bill S-13, my original bill, and Senator Lavoie-Roux's bill, Bill S-29. Bill S-29 provided for the establishment of national guidelines for pain control and withholding and withdrawal of life-sustaining treatment.

Clause 6 of this bill provides for the Minister of Health to establish national guidelines, in consultation with provincial authorities and associations, for the withholding and withdrawal of life-sustaining medical treatment, for the controlling of pain, and for palliative care. The bill allows for the Minister of Health to promote and encourage public education and training of health care professionals in controlling pain and in palliative care. The bill further provides for the investigation, research and monitoring of the frequency and conditions of requests for the withholding and withdrawal of treatment.

The Senate's special committee, in its report, "Of Life and Death," recognized the importance of national guidelines in these areas. Numerous witnesses before the committee recommended increased education and training for health care providers in palliative care and pain control. Almost all the witnesses who appeared before the special Senate committee agreed that more research was necessary in these areas.

Honourable senators, Bill S-2 is a direct result of the work of the Special Senate Committee on Euthanasia and Assisted Suicide. In my view, it comprises the best elements of the previous two bills that were introduced in this chamber. Its purpose is to clarify the criminal law by codifying the existing common law and making it accessible and understandable for all Canadians, in order to protect patients and their health care providers.

I look forward to the debate on this bill. More important, I look forward to the committee process, wherein I would envisage further study and debate. I particularly welcome the participation of Senator Lavoie-Roux, who, like me, wants to see the recommendations of the Senate special committee put into force and effect. Perhaps this bill still does not have it right. We are not perfect as human beings, unfortunately. I would hope that the Legal and Constitutional Affairs Committee of the Senate will examine this bill fully and with care, in order to meet the needs of Canadians, and to make amendments to enhance the bill, if necessary.

I want this bill to be the best it can be, and I know that that is the desire of Senator Lavoie-Roux and the other members of the special Senate committee. I hope that we can send this bill quickly to the committee so that the study, which, by its very nature, will be time-consuming, can begin as soon as possible, and before the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs, known for the long hours and busy schedule that it keeps, is forced to deal with the heavy load of government legislation.

Honourable senators, I commend Bill S-2 to your deliberations, and I urge you to support it.

Hon. Douglas Roche: Would the honourable senator take a question?

Senator Carstairs: Certainly.

Senator Roche: Thank you. I should first like to express my appreciation to Senator Carstairs for the sensitive manner in which she has presented her bill. I hope there will be a thorough debate on this extremely important subject and that the bill will not be rushed, so that there will be a full opportunity, in the Senate on second reading, as well as at committee stage, to give it the examination that it deserves.

In order to prepare myself for a contribution to this debate, I should like to direct two questions to Senator Carstairs, with her consent. First, Senator Carstairs made it very clear that the purpose of the bill is to alleviate pain and not to shorten life, but because some pain alleviation does have the effect of shortening life, is Senator Carstairs concerned that there could be here an opening of the door to assisted suicide? She has made it very clear that extraordinary treatment to prolong life is, ethically, not required, but, in the treatment of terminally ill patients, is there not some apprehension that the various pressures that arise can lead to some form of encouragement and/or pressure to use pain-alleviation drugs and medicines for a secret purpose, or a purpose that is not put overtly, which is in effect to shorten life?

Senator Carstairs: Honourable senators, I thank the honourable senator for his question, because that really is the nub of the whole issue here. That is why we have to have guidelines and a control system put into place.

I would refer the honourable senator to the Catechism of the Catholic Church, particularly to paragraph 2279, because I think

they understand the difference quite clearly. The catechism says the following:

Even if death is thought imminent, the ordinary care owed to a sick person cannot be legitimately interrupted. The use of painkillers to alleviate the sufferings of the dying, even at the risk of shortening their days, can be morally in conformity with human dignity if death is not willed as either an end or a means...

To me, that kind of clarity is so necessary that, if the bill does not have it, we must make sure that it does. I think it already does, but if it does not, then let us amend it so that it is absolutely clear.

Senator Roche: I thank the honourable senator. That answer is certainly helpful to the core of the debate that is now being developed.

My second question deals with the Criminal Code. I am not clear in my own mind as to why this bill seeks to codify existing common law or to allow certain actions that might, in effect, be criminal actions without addressing the Criminal Code itself through an amendment. Why is this bill bypassing an amendment to the Criminal Code itself?

Senator Carstairs: Honourable senators, again I thank the honourable senator for the question. Interestingly enough, in the first bill I proposed, there was a direct amendment to the Criminal Code. However, it became clear, during the debate and discussion in the Senate chamber and also later through the presentation of Senator Lavoie-Roux's bill, that we were trying to do more than just amend the Criminal Code. We were also trying to establish national guidelines and put into place some controls and some educational experiences in the whole area of pain control and also in areas of research. Therefore, I went the route that has been recommended by, for example, Peter Hogg, the constitutional specialist, who says clearly that the Criminal Code can be amended not just by direct amendments to the Criminal Code but by an act that works with the Criminal Code, and that is what this act does.

On motion of Senator DeWare, for Senator Lavoie-Roux, debate adjourned.

- (1700)

SHELTER STRATEGY FOR ABORIGINAL PEOPLES

INQUIRY—DEBATED ADJOURNED

Hon. Thelma J. Chalifoux rose pursuant to notice of October 14, 1999:

That she will call the attention of the Senate to "Shelter Strategy for Aboriginal Peoples".

She said: Honourable senators, it is difficult for most Canadians to make sense of the reasons for the persistent differences between the conditions and challenges faced by aboriginal peoples and people in the rest of Canada. It is also difficult for them to truly grasp the reasons why different solutions are needed, solutions that flow from aboriginal realities, rights, values and strengths. It may be difficult, but it is essential if we are to move forward in harmony.

This shelter strategy is to determine whether recent federal decisions will lead to shelter improvements for aboriginal families and whether the present federal strategy can be significantly improved. This working paper is intended to facilitate a genuine dialogue about the principal features of a strategy that will take us into the next century and the best way to implement it.

We have chosen to dwell on the strengths of all peoples in Canada and the sources of these strengths to arrive at a contemporary strategy. One source of strength sometimes forgotten or put aside is the will and the right of aboriginal peoples — the Métis, the Inuit and the First Nations people — to seek and implement their own solutions. It is this strength that has spawned hundreds of successful grassroots initiatives. Sometimes they have become bogged down in red tape or somehow derailed. Other self-made initiatives have grown into regional and then national networks, and prominent institutions we now rely on. If we can better combine aboriginal and Canadian strengths and liberate these strengths to create shelter improvements, we will have done much more than anyone might suspect.

I shall turn now to the subject of the scope and intent of a shelter strategy for aboriginal families. Some may think we do not need another study of housing conditions or a study of ways to tinker with national programs in the hope that some benefits will reach aboriginal families. We agree. Too many of these studies have already been done, with little improvement to living conditions. Besides, we have all had the benefit of the advice and unparalleled research of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples of 1996. Now we have seen the early achievements of the "Gathering Strength" initiative, the federal government's action plan introduced in January of 1997.

We had hoped the other partners in Confederation would come forward and announce their plans and their priorities. What has come forward is a disappointment. Some progress is evident, but even so, several senators and aboriginal leaders have become increasingly concerned about the lack of action towards improving shelter conditions for aboriginal families.

Our intent is to rekindle a national dialogue about making a clearer and stronger shelter strategy for aboriginal families. We wish to focus on the future direction of a strategy for families living outside reserve lands and lands set aside for aboriginal people under comprehensive land claims agreements. Aboriginal families living on these lands have very different treaty and statutory arrangements for dealing with shelter matters than families living in other locations.

[Senator Chalifoux]

Nonetheless, any shelter strategy must respond to the population shifts from these lands. Many Métis, Inuit and First Nations people will leave their ancestral communities to seek jobs, promising opportunities and decent shelter in the cities and towns of Canada. It is a growing trend and it will continue.

The higher than national average growth rates and youthfulness — 10 years younger than the general population — is well known. Fifty years ago, less than 200,000 aboriginal people were counted. Now more than 1 million live in Canada. This figure, however, does not include the Métis population of this country.

Many others aboriginals live in the United States and may or may not return after their working years. Future growth rates forecast the aboriginal population will rise another 400,000 over the next generation. Their social and economic circumstances may show only modest improvement. A reasonable shelter strategy must be able to address the expected future circumstances of the aboriginal population and the emerging priorities.

I shall turn now to the reasons for the differences in aboriginal shelter conditions and challenges. One principal reason over half of today's aboriginal families live in substandard shelter is a lingering and deep poverty. Many are either one cheque away from living on the street or about to add to the already overcrowded conditions in rural, remote and urban communities. When aboriginal people do get jobs, they are often lower paying, and their paycheques must be stretched to accommodate the basic needs of food and clothing in larger-than-average size families.

It is estimated that aboriginal employment income is two-thirds of the national average. Over 40 per cent had no employment income in 1995. Credit is often poor or non-existent. What would happen if aboriginal peoples were to achieve employment and wage parity with the average Canadian? Obviously, a higher standard of living would be assured and all of Canada would benefit.

In 1991, former minister of Indian and northern affairs Thomas Siddon testified that if parity were achieved by the year 2000, Canada's gross national product would improve the federal fiscal position by \$4.3 billion and reduce the national debt by \$20 billion. The royal commission ventured its own analysis on this point. The commission estimated that it costs Canada \$7.5 billion per year so long as the economic and social circumstances of aboriginal peoples remain below the national average. Importantly, this cost consists of a loss of net income of \$2.9 billion to aboriginal peoples and a fiscal cost of \$4.6 billion, including \$2.1 billion in forgone government revenue.

Sadly, a shelter strategy will need to contend with deep aboriginal poverty because there is no evidence that the economic and social disparities between the general and the aboriginal populations will soon disappear.

The recent rise of literacy rates and overall education levels will help some families, but good shelter will remain unaffordable for far too many others. The economic gaps have closed far too slowly over the past 20 years to suggest that aboriginal poverty has been dealt with.

Of course, there are other reasons for the differences in shelter conditions. Some are more obvious than others. Together they have caused great hardship. If we are to put a shelter strategy on a solid foundation, it is wise to consider some of these reasons.

Discrimination, in all its forms, is still a reason for poor aboriginal shelter.

Another reason is that aboriginal shelter issues received government attention much later than the needs of other parts of Canadian society. Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation was formed in 1946 to promote the construction of new houses, the repair and the modernization of existing houses, and the improvement of housing and living conditions. It was then called Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. Nearly 30 years later, the rural housing program for aboriginal peoples came into existence. The 1978 Urban Native Housing Program followed. New housing commitments to these programs were terminated at the same time the federal government stopped making social housing commitments on January 1, 1994. In the entire history of the urban native program, no program evaluation was ever conducted.

A further reason for the disparities is the low priority accorded aboriginal shelter matters. One explanation for this may be the lack of aboriginal representation in the Parliament of Canada and participation in the federal public service. The halls of power and authority have few aboriginal voices to bring attention to the growing problems or their solutions. As well, much of aboriginal Canada was invisible to many Canadians. Most families lived on the outskirts of town, in remote northern reaches, or out-of-the-way communities. That made it much easier to ignore their conditions.

• (1710)

Just when more Canadians started to become aware of the needs of aboriginal peoples, national priorities changed. The unfortunate situation is that improved living conditions for Canadians overshadow the aboriginal reality. Governments may believe they have done enough now, and they may believe their policies and programs have worked well for the majority of Canadians. It is most difficult to sustain attention on aboriginal shelter issues when most Canadians live so well.

Honourable senators, the notion that aboriginal problems and solutions are simply scaled-down versions of Canadian problems and solutions is still another reason for poor results and outcomes within aboriginal societies. There is no evidence to suggest such a strategy has been successful over the years. In fact, it is a discredited model, and major studies of social and economic conditions, including the December 1998 homelessness study,

recommend distinct strategies to contend with the realities faced by aboriginal peoples. While there has been some aboriginal service delivery added to the administration of shelter programs, the basic policies and programs are the ones designed to address non-aboriginal problems, and management rests with the federal or provincial governments.

Jurisdictional wrangling over the responsibility for sheltering aboriginal peoples living outside aboriginal lands is a troublesome matter with no end in sight. Most provinces, territories and aboriginal leadership put much of the responsibility on the federal government. Yet transfers of cash, tax points, powers and administration steadily puts greater responsibility in the provincial sphere. It is a source of considerable controversy and has stymied progress.

These are a few reasons for the differences in shelter conditions and the differences in the challenges faced by aboriginal peoples. We raise these to help shape future shelter solutions. There is no intention to blame.

The historical, legal and political reasons for poverty and powerlessness and the damage to aboriginal societies is another story — one told by the royal commission and in the testimony of many aboriginal leaders. Even so, it cannot go unsaid that these overarching reasons bear heavily on the lower social and economic status of aboriginal peoples today.

Honourable senators, I should like to spend a moment or two talking about the impacts and outcomes of past federal strategies. Federal strategies, at different times over the last 25 years, have relied on a non-specific mixture of subsidies for renovation, emergency repairs, a remote housing program, a specific urban program, a rural program with a 50 per cent target of aboriginal occupancy, tax credits, shelter allowances, and self-help projects, including home ownership, that were short-lived. Provincial and local governments cost-shared a small part of these programs but not all of them. For example, the Urban Native Housing Program was financed from aboriginal rents and federal subsidies only. Tripartite committees were formed with aboriginal service providers in some instances.

A recent estimate of CMHC expenditures for aboriginal peoples not living within reserves pegged the annual outlay at \$172.5 million to address shelter needs. The larger rural and urban housing programs made it possible for aboriginal families to live in low-cost, affordable housing. Approximately 10,700 homes are rented to urban aboriginal families, and these are owned and delivered by over 100 not-for-profit urban housing societies. Another 9,100 homes were estimated to be occupied by aboriginal families within the rural program. Most of them are home ownership. It is an estimate that fluctuates and is a source of dispute by many aboriginal leaders.

These are some of the positive impacts of past federal strategies. As well, there are other positive impacts resulting from renovation, emergency repair, senior, disabled, research and demonstration projects.

The statement of aboriginal shelter conditions is a much different matter, and if past federal strategies were intended to improve these conditions and bring them in line with the rest of Canada, then they failed. For those unfamiliar with the disparities in shelter conditions, a set of charts is attached. I will be tabling the attachment.

Suffice to say, honourable senators, the disparities are great but tell little of the hardship of the Métis, Inuit and First Nations people. Over one in three aboriginal families are in core housing need, compared to about one in ten non-aboriginal families. Core housing need is a basic measure of whether a family lives in substandard conditions and cannot afford to live in suitable living space.

Ten years ago, approximately 63,000 aboriginal families lived in core need. The population has increased, and the percentage of families in core need remains three times higher than the national average. The number of households grows and grows.

The December 1998 report of the Mayor's Task Force on Homelessness in Toronto reveals another impact of failed shelter strategies. Approximately 4,000 aboriginal people were homeless in 1996 in Toronto alone. Another 8,000 more were at risk of becoming homeless, and this included many children. There is evidence that Toronto's situation typifies the situation in other cities, especially the six other Canadian cities heavily populated by aboriginal peoples. One out of five aboriginal people lives in seven metropolitan areas.

These are bleak statistics, but we will need to look deeper into the impact and outcomes of past federal strategies if we are to learn from mistakes and missed opportunities and to tap the strengths.

One of these strengths is the evolution of aboriginal housing societies. The societies have proven themselves very successful and trustworthy.

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

Senator Chalifoux: Yes.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Senator Chalifoux: Thank you, honourable senators.

Hundreds upon hundreds of volunteers have given much of their time to these societies, and the dozens of dedicated staff have managed the construction and upkeep of their housing stock, and services to their tenants and applicants. The urban portfolio alone is now worth more than \$500 million. A variety of services are offered by staff, and other services are accessed by the extensive network set up among aboriginal service

organizations, including such services as Aboriginal Head Start, cultural activities, training and job placement, and friendship centre services and activities, where they are available. Construction and maintenance jobs are created, businesses are contracted, property and income taxes are paid, and, most of all, some families have a chance to get on their feet and then move on to the private market. Some housing societies have even started or tried to start small home ownership projects.

I can give you one good example. We had a family, a single parent with six children. We got her into an urban native housing program, and she said to me, "Thank you. For the first time I can buy oranges for my children."

A significant outcome is that many children are able to live in the community with other aboriginal children and families, which helps reinforce their Métis, Inuit and First Nations identities in better neighbourhoods than many other aboriginal parents can afford. They are waiting for this chance. It is a wonderful way to strengthen their identities, a key to keeping young aboriginal people away from the bad situations many youth find themselves in, and it keeps them in school. Modest accommodation in better neighbourhoods has given peace of mind and a sense of security to women, children and the older aboriginal people.

These outcomes do not make headlines, but they have made many lives better and they have created a capacity and desire to do much more.

There are still poor relations between aboriginal peoples and some local governments, but they may improve over time. At least shelter issues and housing societies have created a starting point for dialogue, if nothing else can bring them together.

Aboriginal housing societies also possess something rare. They are the only institutions that have an up-to-date profile of aboriginal families and a way of easily reaching them. Their waiting lists, coupled with existing tenants, allow them to know something about thousands of aboriginal families and their changing circumstances. They are an important tool to coordinating services to the neediest in the aboriginal society.

• (1720)

What are the choices for a future shelter strategy for aboriginal families and emerging priorities? The disproportionate shelter conditions of aboriginal peoples necessitate action in their own right. Even so, there are emerging priorities requiring attention. Recent figures reveal that 46 per cent of aboriginal children under five years of age living in large metropolitan areas live in a single-parent family. This is seven times the rate of the general population. Almost one-third of all aboriginal children live in a single-parent family. A woman heads most of the single-parent families. A highly coordinated strategy will be required to address the shelter, health, cultural, economic and early childhood needs of these families.

Demographic trends underline the youthfulness of the aboriginal population, and this will continue. The number of children under five for every aboriginal woman of child-bearing age is 70 per cent higher than the ratio for the total Canadian population. Lower wages and higher unemployment are characteristic of all youth, and they are more so for aboriginal youth.

Since the termination of new shelter subsidies in 1994, aboriginal housing waiting lists have lengthened. It is evident that the existing social housing stock cannot or does not take in aboriginal families. Provinces have cut back or terminated new commitments over the past few years, and there are no reliable figures on the number of aboriginal families in the general housing stock. It should be noted that the general housing stock relies on credit checks and income thresholds which screen out most aboriginal families in core housing need from accessing non-aboriginal assisted housing programs.

The royal commission estimated that 17,000 new units and 37,000 major repairs would be needed between 1996 and 2016 to address the backlog. In addition, 21,600 new households resulting from population growth and new family formation would also need assistance. With no financial assistance, living standards are expected to fall further, and the actual number of families in core need will rise.

Recent federal decisions have resulted in the transfer of funds and the administration of social housing to the provinces that chose to enter these arrangements. Ontario, Quebec, British Columbia and Alberta have now also opted into this transfer agreement. These transfer agreements include the rural and urban aboriginal housing programs.

The transfer process has created considerable conflict and dispute between CMHC and aboriginal housing providers. In particular, the urban aboriginal housing societies have advocated direct transfers to aboriginal housing societies through negotiated agreements and a national coordinating body. This position is well known and predates the policy to transfer programs to the provinces. Precedents for this type of arrangement are evident in the labour market training field and the friendship centres, among others. Arguments against the federal transfers to the provinces are historical, constitutional, and are deeply rooted in aboriginal peoples' self-determination objectives. It also centres on the lack of consultation about these transfers. Genuine consultation is a cherished principle in the evolving relationship with aboriginal peoples and a principle endorsed by the Supreme Court of Canada in decisions such as *Sparrow*.

As well, there are policy and day-to-day operational reasons for the opposition to provincial transfers. In fact, there is no evidence to suggest provinces can do a better job in administering programs than can the urban aboriginal housing societies. There has never been any independent evaluation to suggest this either. On the other hand, there is evidence that key

policies like the level of rent to income paid by tenants can be unilaterally changed at the will of the provinces.

CMHC has tried to assure aboriginal housing societies that its interests in their housing stock are protected in the transfer agreements and that they will not be worse off in the process. These assurances have been very unconvincing. A principal premise of the urban aboriginal housing societies is that there is federal responsibility for improving shelter conditions, and the provincial transfers move this responsibility further away from what should be done. They believe they have a right and a well-earned entitlement to make decisions on their own. If they chose to enter into agreements with provinces or local governments after, it will be their choice, based on their policies and their programs.

The choice is whether to reverse the transfer of aboriginal programs and negotiate transfer agreements with the aboriginal housing societies who want them or to leave the federal strategy to transfer responsibilities to the provinces.

Very strong arguments have been made to replace the core need model that measures affordability, suitability and adequacy standards within Canadian society with an aboriginal shelter model. For obvious reasons, this model would also include security of family and cultural practices. It would better reflect the aboriginal reality when this need is assessed and strategies are developed to respond to this need. It would allow future shelter strategies to be created with objectives similar to those now being pursued by some housing societies, with next to no recognition by the government. These objectives will ensure aboriginal shelter, make allowances for grandparents, elders and spiritual practices, assure access to cultural activities and early childhood programs, and allow aboriginal services to access financial and employment assistance. The shelter strategy should be better able to protect families from crime and violence because of their aboriginal heritage.

Legislative amendments to the National Housing Act and the Canada Mortgage and Housing Act, assented to June 17, 1999, have given CMHC a more powerful tool to provide assistance and to deal with more types of organizations, according to the testimony of CMHC officials in a meeting of the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology on June 9, 1999. This additional power and authority may be able to assist in the transfer of substantive authority and control to a new aboriginal shelter authority.

Such an approach was the centrepiece of recommendations made by the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs in 1992 after extensive hearings and consultations. Among other things, the all-party committee recommended aboriginal shelter funding be delivered through one agency and that the mandate encompass lending, insurance, policy, decision-making, management of programs, research, training, economic development and financing. At the recent Assembly of First Nations housing conference, leaders advocated a similar structure to meet the needs of their First Nations people.

A new aboriginal shelter authority would be independent, with the capacity to implement legislative powers for aboriginal peoples. It would also have the ability to enter into arrangements with other federal departments and to coordinate or bring training and employment services, early childhood development services, health, education, and business development assistance to thousands of families.

Such a strategy would also free housing societies to do more with the same budgets. The difference between the federal borrowing and lending rates would be used to finance more homes, best practices research and management. It would also allow for the development of new services and mortgage products to help aboriginal families. These services might include the purchase and maintenance of student and medical accommodation through the better use of an estimated \$200 million in federal expenditures for these types of accommodations.

Honourable senators, the transfer of these federal duties can be accomplished without new legislation. It would likely be necessary for the Prime Minister to exercise his authority under the Public Service Transfer of Duties and Rearrangements Act, formalized with appropriate transfer agreements. In the long term, new legislation can be prepared and passed to recognize the existence of local aboriginal housing authorities with unique legal characteristics, powers and duties. These local authorities will no longer be not-for-profit corporations and would be able to create businesses and jobs in their communities. They will be expressions of aboriginal self-determination.

Whether to implement a holistic and courageous aboriginal strategy or to tinker with the existing federal strategy is a choice for the decision-makers.

The government is discussing the grave circumstances of families at risk becoming homeless or who are homeless, including the aboriginals. We believe the existing aboriginal service delivery system in big cities is the key to any assistance strategy for the aboriginal homeless, and any new monies for services should flow through that system. Research strongly indicates the imminent requirement to develop a strategy and an action plan to implement solutions for this critical need. Since Health Canada has declared an adequate home a determinant of basic health, homelessness is a problem that requires immediate action. We must take a hard look at the recommendations from previous studies, inquiries and testimony to offer specific advice on this matter. The recommendations and the action plan will assist the minister responsible for homelessness.

This inquiry must not be shelved. We, as Canadians and parliamentarians, have a responsibility not only to address this urgent need but to develop an action plan that will give all aboriginal families their proper place in Canadian society. Aboriginal housing societies have the expertise. They only need an opportunity and a jurisdictional transfer to do their job.

Honourable senators, may I have permission to table the attachment I mentioned?

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Senator Chalifoux: Thank you.

On motion of Senator Rompkey, debate adjourned.

The Senate adjourned until Wednesday, November 3, 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 J. BERNARD BOUDREAU, 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

(November 2, 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 the Environment
The Hon. Ralph E. Goodale	Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board
The Hon. Sheila Copps	Minister of Canadian Heritage
The Hon. John Manley	Minister of Industry
The Hon. Paul Martin	Minister of Finance
The Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton	Minister of National Defence
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. Alfonso Gagliano	Minister of Public Works and Government Services
The Hon. Lucienne Robillard	President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure
The Hon. Martin Cauchon	Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)
The Hon. Jane Stewart	Minister of Human Resources Development
The Hon. Stéphane Dion	President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
The Hon. Pierre Pettigrew	Minister of International Trade
The Hon. Don Boudria	Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
The Hon. J. Bernard Boudreau	Leader of the Government in the Senate
The Hon. Lyle Vanclief	Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
The Hon. Herb Dhaliwal	Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
The Hon. Claudette Bradshaw	Minister of Labour
The Hon. George Baker	Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)
The Hon. Robert Daniel Nault	Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
The Hon. Maria Minna	Minister for International Cooperation
The Hon. Elinor Caplan	Minister for Citizenship and Immigration
The Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew	Secretary of State (Children and Youth)
The Hon. Raymond Chan	Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)
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 (Western Economic Diversification) and Francophonie
The Hon. Andrew Mitchell	Secretary of State (Rural Development) (Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario)
The Hon. Gilbert Normand	Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)
The Hon. Denis Coderre	Secretary of State (Amateur Sport)

SENATORS OF CANADA ACCORDING TO SENIORITY

(November 2, 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.
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, Que.
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-York	Toronto, Ont.
Charlie Watt	Inkerman	Kuujuuaq, Que.
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	Montreal, Que.
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, Que.
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	Sainte-Foy, Que.
Gérald-A. Beaudoin	Rigaud	Hull, Que.
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, Que.
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	Quebec	Noranda, Que.
Thérèse Lavoie-Roux	Quebec	Montreal, Que.
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.

ACCORDING TO SENIORITY

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
Jean-Claude Rivest	Stadacona	Quebec, Que.
Ronald D. Ghitter	Alberta	Calgary, Alta.
Terrance R. Stratton	Red River	St. Norbert, Man.
Marcel Prud'homme, P.C.	La Salle	Montreal, Que.
Fernand Roberge	Saurel	Ville Saint-Laurent, Que.
Leonard J. Gustafson	Saskatchewan	Macoun, Sask.
Erminie Joy Cohen	New Brunswick	Saint John, N.B.
David Tkachuk	Saskatchewan	Saskatoon, Sask.
W. David Angus	Alma	Montreal, Que.
Pierre Claude Nolin	De Salaberry	Quebec, Que.
Marjory LeBreton	Ontario	Manotick, Ont.
Gerry St. Germain, P.C.	Langley-Pemberton-Whistler	Maple Ridge, B.C.
Lise Bacon	De la Durantaye	Laval, Que.
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	Montreal, Que.
William H. Rompkey, P.C.	Newfoundland	North West River, Labrador, Nfld.
Lorna Milne	Peel County	Brampton, Ont.
Marie-P. Poulin	Northern Ontario	Ottawa, Ont.
Shirley Maheu	Rougemont	Ville Saint-Laurent, Que.
Nicholas William Taylor	Sturgeon	Bon Accord, Alta.
Léonce Mercier	Mille Isles	Saint-Élie d'Orford, Que.
Wilfred P. Moore	Stanhope St./Bluenose	Chester, N.S.
Lucie Pépin	Shawinigan	Montreal, Que.
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, Que.
Serge Joyal, P.C.	Kennebec	Montreal, Que.
Thelma J. Chalifoux	Alberta	Morinville, Alta.
Joan Cook	Newfoundland	St. John's, Nfld.
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	Manitoba	Winnipeg, Man.
Douglas James Roche	Edmonton	Edmonton, Alta.
Joan Thorne Fraser	De Lorimier	Montreal, Que.
Aurélien Gill	Wellington	Mashteuiatsh, Pointe-Bleue, Que.
Vivienne Poy	Toronto	Toronto, Ont.
Sheila Finestone, P.C.	Montarville	Montreal, Que.
Ione Christensen	Yukon	Whitehorse, Yukon Territory
George Furey	Newfoundland	St. John's, Nfld.
Melvin Perry Poirier	Prince Edward Island	St. Louis, P.E.I.
Nick G. Sibbeston	Northwest Territories	Fort Simpson, N.W.T.
Isobel Finnerty	Ontario	Burlington, Ont.
J. Bernard Boudreau, P.C.	Nova Scotia	Halifax, N.S.

SENATORS OF CANADA

ALPHABETICAL LIST

(November 2, 1999)

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
Adams, Willie	Nunavut	Rankin Inlet, Nunavut
Andreychuk, A. Raynell	Regina	Regina, Sask.
Angus, W. David	Alma	Montreal, Que.
Atkins, Norman K.	Markham	Toronto, Ont.
Austin, Jack, P.C.	Vancouver South	Vancouver, B.C.
Bacon, Lise	De la Durantaye	Laval, Que.
Balfour, Reginald James	Regina	Regina, Sask.
Beaudoin, Gérald-A.	Rigaud	Hull, Que.
Berntson, Eric Arthur	Saskatchewan	Saskatoon, Sask.
Bolduc, Roch	Golfe	Sainte-Foy, Que.
Boudreau, J. Bernard, P.C.	Nova Scotia	Halifax, N.S.
Bryden, John G.	New Brunswick	Bayfield, N.B.
Buchanan, John, P.C.	Nova Scotia	Halifax, 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.
Christensen, Ione	Yukon Territory	Whitehorse, Yukon Territory
Cochrane, Ethel	Newfoundland	Port-au-Port, Nfld.
Cogger, Michel	Lauzon	Knowlton, Que.
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-York	Toronto, Ont.
Corbin, Eymard Georges	Grand-Sault	Grand-Sault, N.B.
De Bané, Pierre, P.C.	De la Vallière	Montreal, Que.
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, Que.
Finestone, Sheila, P.C.	Montarville	Montreal, Que.
Finnerty, Isobel	Ontario	Burlington, Ont.
Fitzpatrick, Ross	Okanagan-Similkameen	Kelowna, B.C.
Forrestall, J. Michael	Dartmouth and Eastern Shore	Dartmouth, N.S.
Fraser, Joan Thorne	De Lorimier	Montreal, Que.
Furey, George	Newfoundland	St. John's, Nfld.
Gauthier, Jean-Robert	Ottawa-Vanier	Ottawa, Ont.
Ghitter, Ronald D.	Alberta	Calgary, Alta.
Gill, Aurélien	Wellington	Mashteuiatsh, Pointe-Bleue, Que.
Grafstein, Jerahmiel S.	Metro Toronto	Toronto, Ont.
Graham, Bernard Alasdair, P.C.	The Highlands	Sydney, N.S.
Grimard, Normand	Quebec	Noranda, Que.
Gustafson Leonard J.	Saskatchewan	Macoun, Sask.
Hays, Daniel Phillip	Calgary	Calgary, Alta.
Hervieux-Payette, Céline, P.C.	Bedford	Montreal, Que.
Johnson, Janis	Winnipeg-Interlake	Winnipeg, Man.
Joyal, Serge, P.C.	Kennebec	Montreal, Que.
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, Que.
Kroft, Richard H.	Manitoba	Winnipeg, Man.
Lavoie-Roux, Thérèse	Quebec	Montreal, Que.
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.
Lynch-Staunton, John	Grandville	Georgeville, Que.
Maheu, Shirley	Rougemont	Ville Saint-Laurent, Que.
Mahovich, Francis William	Toronto	Toronto, Ont.
Meighen, Michael Arthur	St. Marys	Toronto, Ont.
Mercier, Léonce	Mille Isles	Saint-Élie d'Orford, Que.
Milne, Lorna	Peel County	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	Quebec, Que.
Oliver, Donald H.	Nova Scotia	Halifax, N.S.
Pearson, Landon	Ontario	Ottawa, Ontario
Pépin, Lucie	Shawinigan	Montreal, Que.
Perrault, Raymond J., P.C.	North Shore-Burnaby	North Vancouver, B.C.
Perry Poirier, Melvin	Prince Edward Island	St. Louis, P.E.I.
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	Montreal, Que.
Rivest, Jean-Claude	Stadacona	Quebec, Que.
Roberge, Fernand	Saurel	Ville Saint-Laurent, Que.
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.
Sibbeston, Nick	Northwest Territories	Fort Simpson, N.W.T.
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, Que.
Wilson, The Very Reverend Dr. Lois M.	Toronto	Toronto, Ont.

SENATORS OF CANADA
BY PROVINCE AND TERRITORY

(November 2, 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-York 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	Peel County Brampton
18	Marie-P. Poulin	Northern Ontario Ottawa
19	The Very Reverend Dr. Lois M. Wilson	Toronto Toronto
20	Francis William Mahovlich	Toronto Toronto
21	Vivienne Poy	Toronto Toronto
22	Isobel Finnerty	Ontario Burlington
23	
24	

SENATORS BY PROVINCE AND TERRITORY

QUEBEC—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	Montreal
4 Michel Cogger	Lauzon	Knowlton
5 Roch Bolduc	Golfe	Sainte-Foy
6 Gérald-A. Beaudoin	Rigaud	Hull
7 John Lynch-Staunton	Grandville	Georgeville
8 Jean-Claude Rivest	Stadacona	Quebec
9 Marcel Prud'homme, P.C.	La Salle	Montreal
10 Fernand Roberge	Saurel	Ville de Saint-Laurent
11 W. David Angus	Alma	Montreal
12 Pierre Claude Nolin	De Salaberry	Quebec
13 Lise Bacon	De la Durantaye	Laval
14 Céline Hervieux-Payette, P.C.	Bedford	Montreal
15 Shirley Maheu	Rougemont	Ville de Saint-Laurent
16 Léonce Mercier	Mille Isles	Saint-Élie d'Orford
17 Lucie Pépin	Shawinigan	Montreal
18 Marisa Ferretti Barth	Repentigny	Pierrefonds
19 Serge Joyal, P.C.	Kennebec	Montreal
20 Joan Thorne Fraser	De Lorimier	Montreal
21 Aurélien Gill	Wellington	Mashteuiatsh, Pointe-Bleue
22 Sheila Finestone, P.C.	Montarville	Montreal
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 Calvin Woodrow Ruck	Dartmouth	Dartmouth
10 J. Bernard Boudreau, P.C.	Nova Scotia	Halifax

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 Melvin Perry Poirier	Prince Edward Island	St. Louis
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

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

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

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 George Furey	Newfoundland	St. John's

 NORTHWEST TERRITORIES—1

THE HONOURABLE		
1 Nick G. Sibbeston	Northwest Territories	Fort Simpson

 NUNAVUT—1

THE HONOURABLE		
1 Willie Adams	Nunavut	Rankin Inlet

 YUKON TERRITORY—1

THE HONOURABLE		
1 Ione Christensen	Yukon Territory	Whitehorse

DIVISIONAL SENATORS

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
1 Normand Grimard	Quebec	Noranda, Que.
2 Thérèse Lavoie-Roux	Quebec	Montreal, Que.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF STANDING, SPECIAL AND JOINT COMMITTEES

(As of November 2, 1999)

*Ex Officio Member

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Chair: Honourable Senator Stewart

Honourable Senators:

Andreychuk,	*Boudreau (or Hays)
Atkins,	Carney,
Bolduc,	Corbin,

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Andreychuk

De Bané,	Losier-Cool,
Di Nino,	*Lynch-Staunton, (or Kinsella)
Grafstein,	Stewart,
Lewis,	Stollery.

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Andreychuk, Atkins, Bolduc, *Boudreau (or Hays), Carney, Corbin, De Bané, Di Nino, Grafstein, Lewis, Losier-Cool, *Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella), Stewart, Stollery.*

SELECTION

Chair: Honourable Senator Mercier

Honourable Senators:

Atkins,	DeWare,
Austin,	Fairbairn,
*Boudreau, (or Hays)	Fraser, Grafstein,

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator

Kinsella,	Mercier,
Kirby,	Murray.
*Lynch-Staunton, (or Kinsella)	

Original Members agreed to by Motion of the Senate

*Atkins, Austin, *Boudreau (or Hays), DeWare, Fairbairn, Fraser, Grafstein, Kinsella, Kirby, *Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella), Mercier, Murray.*

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS

Chair: Honourable Senators:	Honourable Senator Bacon		Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Forrestall
Adams,	Callbeck,	Kirby	Perrault,
Bacon,	Finestone,	LeBreton,	Poulin,
*Boudreau, (or Hays)	Forrestall, Johnson,	*Lynch-Staunton, (or Kinsella)	Roberge, Spivak.

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection
*Adams, Bacon, *Boudreau (or Hays), Callbeck, Finestone, Forrestall, Johnson,*
*Kirby, LeBreton, *Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella), Perrault, Poulin, Roberge, Spivak.*

CONTENTS

Tuesday, November 2, 1999

	PAGE		PAGE
Visitors in the Gallery		Clerk of the Senate	
The Hon. the Speaker	39	Annual Accounts Referred to Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration Committee. Senator Hays	44
<hr/>			
SENATORS' STATEMENTS		Adjournment	
The Late Greg Moore		Senator Hays	44
Tribute. Senator Fitzpatrick	39	Speech from the Throne	
The Late Mwalimu Julius K. Nyerere		Address in Reply—Termination of Debate on Eighth Sitting Day—	
Former President of the United Republic of Tanzania		Notice of Motion. Senator Hays	44
Tribute. Senator Oliver	39	Criminal Records Act (Bill C-7)	
Women's History Month		Bill to Amend—First Reading.	44
Senator Pépin	40	Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Bill (Bill C6)	
Income Tax Policy for Woodlot Owners		First Reading.	45
Senator Cohen	40	Income Tax Conventions Implementation Bill, 1999 (Bill S-3)	
The Late Claude Masson		First Reading. Senator Hays	45
Tribute. Senator Roberge	41	International Search or Seizure Bill (Bill S-4)	
National Defence		First Reading. Senator Nolin	45
Recognition of Peacekeeping Efforts Abroad. Senator Roche ...	41	Parliament of Canada Act (Bill S-5)	
Official Languages		Bill to Amend—First Reading. Senator Grafstein	45
Change to Tabling Date of Commissioner's Annual Report.		Criminal Code (Bill S-6)	
Senator Gauthier	41	Bill to Amend—First Reading. Senator Oliver	45
The Crime of Human Trafficking		Senator Cools	45
Senator Andreychuk	42	Royal Assent Bill (Bill S-7)	
Osteoporosis Month		First Reading. Senator Lynch-Staunton	46
Senator Poy	42	Immigration Act (Bill S-8)	
<hr/>			
ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS		Bill to Amend—First Reading. Senator Ghitter	46
Privacy Commissioner		Criminal Code	
Annual Report Tabled.	43	Corrections and Conditional Release Act (Bill C-247)	
Clerk of the Senate		Bill to Amend—First Reading.	46
Annual Accounts Tabled.	43	The Senate	
Foreign Affairs		Report of Visiting Delegation to the Kyrgyz Republic Tabled.	
First Report of Committee Tabled. Senator Stewart	43	Senator Taylor	46
Consequences of European Monetary Union		Foreign Affairs	
Report of Foreign Affairs Committee Requesting Authority		Notice of Motion to Authorize Committee to Engage Services.	
to Engage Services Presented. Senator Stewart	43	Senator Stewart	46
Foreign Affairs		Notice of Motion to Authorize Committee to Permit Electronic	
Changing Mandate of North Atlantic Treaty Organization—		Coverage. Senator Stewart	46
Budget Report of Committee on Study Presented.		Review of Anti-Drug Policy	
Senator Stewart	44	Notice of Motion to Form Special Senate Committee.	
Committee of Selection		Senator Nolin	47
Third Report Presented. Senator Mercier	44	Federalism and Globalization	
		Notice of Inquiry. Senator Beaudoin	47
		Review of Canadian Environmental Protection Act	
		Notice of Motion. Senator Spivak	47

	PAGE		PAGE
Office of Children's Environmental Health		Senator Boudreau	52
Notice of Motion to Establish. Senator Spivak	48	Farm Crisis in Manitoba and Saskatchewan—Representations to Prime Minister. Senator Spivak	52
National Defence		Senator Boudreau	53
Notice of Motion to Establish Special Senate Committee to Examine Conduct of Personnel in Relation to the Somalia Deployment and the Destruction of Medical Records of Personnel Serving in Croatia. Senator Lynch-Staunton	48	Farm Crisis in Manitoba and Saskatchewan—Efficacy of Agriculture Income Disaster Assistance Program. Senator Andreychuk	53
Financing of Post-Secondary Education		Senator Boudreau	53
Notice of Inquiry. Senator Atkins	48	Farm Crisis in Manitoba and Saskatchewan—Visit to Ottawa by Delegation—Discrepancy in Statistics. Senator Tkachuk	53
Conference on Women's Equality and Participation in Public Life		Senator Boudreau	54
Notice of Inquiry. Senator Milne	49	Farm Crisis in Manitoba and Saskatchewan—Economic Effects of Decline in Farm Income. Senator Gustafson	54
Distinguished Canadians and their Involvement with the United Kingdom		Senator Boudreau	54
Notice of Inquiry. Senator Cools	49	Farm Crisis in Manitoba and Saskatchewan—Possible Program for Farm Credit. Senator Gustafson	55
Access to Census Information		Senator Boudreau	55
Presentation of Petition. Senator Milne	50	Library of Parliament	
Business of the Senate		Official Languages	
The Hon. the Speaker	50	Scrutiny of Regulations	
		Standing Joint Committees—Message from Commons. The Hon. the Speaker	55
QUESTION PERIOD		Business of the Senate	
Canada Customs and Revenue Agency		Speaker's Statement on the Effect of Granting Leave During Routine Proceedings and the Event of October 14, 1999. The Hon. the Speaker	55
Changes to National Child Tax Benefit—Effect on Recipients. Senator Oliver	50		
Senator Boudreau	50	ORDERS OF THE DAY	
United Nations		Speech from the Throne	
Nuclear Disarmament—Policy of Government on New Agenda Coalition Resolution. Senator Roche	51	Motion for Address in Reply—Debate Continued. Senator Boudreau	57
Senator Boudreau	51	Senator Lynch-Staunton	60
National Defence		Medical Decisions Facilitation Bill (Bill S-2)	
Replacement of Sea King Helicopters. Senator Forrestall	51	Second Reading—Debate Adjourned. Senator Carstairs	62
Senator Boudreau	52	Senator Roche	65
West Nova Scotia Regiment—Appointment of Honorary Colonel. Senator Forrestall	52	Shelter Strategy for Aboriginal Peoples	
Senator Boudreau	52	Inquiry—Debated Adjourned. Senator Chalifoux	65
Agriculture and Agri-Food		Appendix	i
Farm Crisis in Manitoba and Saskatchewan—Visit to Ottawa by Delegation—Discrepancy in Statistics. Senator Spivak	52		



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