



Debates of the Senate

2nd SESSION

•

36th PARLIAMENT

•

VOLUME 138

•

NUMBER 75

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Tuesday, September 19, 2000

**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 and Publications: 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, September 19, 2000

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

Prayers.

SENATORS' STATEMENTS

THE SENATE

WELCOME

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I trust you have all enjoyed a peaceful and restful summer.

[Translation]

I trust that this session will be a peaceful and enjoyable one. Welcome, everyone!

[English]

JUSTICE

EFFECT OF CHILD SEX TOURISM STATUTE IN EXTRATERRITORIAL JURISDICTIONS

Hon. Sharon Carstairs: Honourable senators, an Alberta schoolteacher accused of molesting a 17-year-old girl on a class trip to Costa Rica in April 1999 has escaped prosecution in the first test case of the child sex tourism bill known as Bill C-27, which became law after passage and Royal Assent in this chamber in May of 1997.

Under Bill C-27, Canadians accused of having sex with an underage prostitute overseas can be prosecuted in Canada without a formal request from the foreign government where the incident occurred; but, in the case of sexual interference or exploitation of a minor, the legal remedy is in the hands of the foreign jurisdiction. In these cases, charges cannot be laid in Canada unless the government of the country where the offence was committed formally requests the intervention of Canada's Justice Minister. Similar laws in the United States and other countries do not require the intervention of foreign officials.

As what happened in this case was not then against the law in Costa Rica, the Supreme Court of Costa Rica declined to make the request for intervention as necessitated under Bill C-27. Therefore, the teacher who was accused of fondling one of his charges during a school trip will not be prosecuted.

Honourable senators, Bill C-27 has a flaw. If, as in this case, the country where the abuse occurs has lenient laws protecting

children, the prosecution of the abuser is at the whim of the foreign jurisdiction and our hands are tied. The result is that our children travelling abroad on school trips with school bands or athletes travelling abroad for competitions are not protected from sexual interference or sexual exploitation by a child molester who is travelling with them. Remember that both the child and the molester are Canadian citizens.

Honourable senators, obviously there are issues of extraterritorial jurisdiction in these matters. However, as parliamentarians, we need to examine this issue and find a reasonable solution to protecting our children, at home and abroad.

HEALTH CARE

Hon. Wilbert J. Keon: Honourable senators, as we begin a new session, I would like to plead for the collective vigilance and involvement of this chamber in the debates that are underway concerning the future of our nation's health care system.

The federal election that will occur in the near future virtually guarantees that decisions will be made about the future roles and responsibilities of the federal government in the health arena. Like it or not, the health care issue will be front and centre on every political platform in the next federal election. If we are to preserve the concept of universality in our health care system, a strong federal role is imperative. We have a role, and indeed an obligation, to get involved.

For the record, let me say that I am encouraged greatly by the progress that has unfolded at the federal, provincial and territorial level regarding the recent agreement that will increase federal funding in the health arena. The injection of an additional \$23.4 billion for health and social programs over the next five years sets the stage for modernizing and stabilizing the health care system. This agreement, however, is only the beginning of a long and complex process that is urgently needed to resolve a number of issues that have been discussed for over a decade — but not acted upon.

Honourable senators, how should we promote and track excellence as a fundamental standard in the health system? What are the respective goals and modes of accountability of the federal, provincial and territorial governments for the overall planning and organization of the system? What is the best way to improve the management and delivery of health services at the community level? How can we ensure greater stability of health care services with regard to both funding and leadership?

Honourable senators, there are a few key areas where I believe we can play an important and influential role to ensure that the decisions made on these issues take us where we need to go.

First, the upcoming debates can be informed greatly by the work being conducted by the Senate subcommittee studying the state of the Canadian health care system. As honourable senators know, this subcommittee embarked on its work in December 1999 to examine the evolving role of the federal government in the system. Phase one of the subcommittee's work is now complete and the report will be tabled soon in the chamber. In my opinion, it is an excellent document. I encourage each of you to review it and use it as the basis for initiating the exploration of options for renewing the health care system. We need everyone's involvement in this work.

Second, we can play a role in ensuring that the momentum of reforms to medicare continues and that investments occur in the right places.

Honourable senators, we now have an opportunity to embark upon developing long-range initiatives that will support the emerging needs of a new society. Advances in medical knowledge and technology —

• (1410)

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I regret to inform Senator Keon that his three-minute time period has expired.

[Translation]

MS LÉA ROBACK

TRIBUTE

Hon. Lucie Pépin: Honourable senators, on August 28, Canada lost a great citizen, Ms Léa Roback, labour activist, feminist and pacifist. She died in Montreal, not all that long before her 100th birthday.

Léa Roback was born in Montreal to Jewish parents from Poland. She grew up in Beauport, near Quebec City, as one of nine children. She never married and was well known for her outspoken nature.

Léa Roback was one of a kind, a determined woman, a woman of action. She never bowed to convention. When she was young, she aspired to study and to travel, both of which were somewhat unusual intentions for a young woman in the 1920s and 1930s. She attended the University of Grenoble, travelled around England and spent some time in Germany. Her strong commitment to communism was already in place at that time. Her political beliefs plus the fact that she was Jewish made it obvious to her that it would be a good idea to get out of Hitler's Germany.

Returning to Canada in the early 1930s, she became involved in a multitude of labour and women's movements. She had a hand in the founding of the Ladies' Garment Workers' Guild and the Saint-Henri union at the RCA Victor plant. As well, she lent her support to numerous feminist activities, including the suffragette movement, with a view to obtaining the vote for women in provincial elections, and the publication of a journal devoted to promoting peace, *La Voix des Femmes*. At the age of

92, in 1995, Léa Roback gave her support to the women's march against poverty, the Bread and Roses March.

As you can see, honourable senators, Léa Roback was a woman of conviction, a born militant, a tireless fighter! Her life of commitment was recently honoured with the creation of la Maison Parent-Roback, which houses a dozen or so Montreal organizations.

Despite the passage of years, Léa Roback remained a woman of the day; the causes that fired her battles — including the right to vote, poverty among women and violence against them, the availability of abortion — continue to mobilize the women's movement today. Women have yet to enjoy full citizenship privileges. Look at the proportion of women in Parliament, although representation in the Senate is greater; free choice during pregnancy is threatened by the increase in social conservatism; poverty among women and the violence they face are such a fact of life that they mobilized women around the world to take part in a huge happening in New York City on October 16. The long fight waged by Léa Roback in the twentieth century shows us that, on the subject of women's rights, nothing is ever taken for granted.

Léa Roback may no longer be with us, but her teaching on social commitment lives on. In an individualistic society where each of us is more often concerned about maximizing our personal worth rather than investing in the community, Léa Roback is a model of an altruistic and committed citizen. Even in death, she continues her action, which history will immortalize.

[English]

ASSISTANCE TO ETHIOPIA

Hon. Donald H. Oliver: Honourable senators, I was honoured last weekend to be the guest speaker in Ottawa at a fundraising event that is designed to provide Canadian private sector support to the people of Ethiopia.

The group I addressed is called AHEAD, the Association for Higher Education and Development. It began a year ago when Canadians of Ethiopian origin decided they wanted to do something to enhance the health care and education system of the country that gave them their start. More specifically, their goal is to mobilize, coordinate and channel support toward capacity building of academic institutions in Ethiopia. Already this nonprofit group has had success. It includes shipping some 1,000 medical textbooks and journals to the medical faculty at Addis Ababa University, and they have established a bursary program for medical students. This month, 18 students studying medicine in Ethiopia will start to receive money for three academic years to support their academic needs. This is an excellent initiative.

I told the gathering that there are many things senators can do to help. Ethiopia is a country of some 60 million people. In 1998, Canadian bilateral trade was \$48.3 million, but in 1999 it dropped to a minuscule \$14.3 million. Honourable senators, that is deplorable. There is surely more that we can do as Canadians to help the people of Ethiopia.

In conclusion, honourable senators, we can assist as private individuals by speaking out and encouraging the Government of Canada to open its eyes and heart to the people of Ethiopia struggling both with essential social infrastructure initiatives and in becoming players in world trade.

I strongly commend the AHEAD initiative to you.

MR. SCOTT KIRKNESS

TRIBUTE ON RECEIVING AWARD FOR BRAVERY

Hon. Marie-P. Poulin: Honourable senators, I would like to bring to your attention a young man from Valley East who has received one of scouting's highest awards for bravery, the Bronze Cross for Gallantry.

Scott Kirkness, 13 years old, a student at Confederation Secondary School in Chelmsford, Ontario, was decorated by Governor General Adrienne Clarkson on November 17. Adrienne Clarkson is Canada's Chief Scout, as we know.

[*Translation*]

At the age of 13, Scott saved his parents' lives after a very serious car accident. Following the accident, he had the presence of mind and the courage to immediately help and give his father, mother and sister first aid.

His was an act of incredible bravery. He said it was due to the training he had received as a young Canadian scout that he was able to save his family's lives.

On behalf of all the honourable senators, I offer sincere congratulations to Scott Kirkness of the greater Sudbury area.

• (1420)

CANADIAN RADIO-TELEVISION AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

RULING DENYING TVONTARIO REQUEST TO DISTRIBUTE TÉLÉVISION FRANÇAISE DE L'ONTARIO IN QUEBEC

Hon. Jean-Robert Gauthier: Honourable senators, in a ruling issued in March 2000, the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission denied a request made by TVO-TFO, asking the commission to require class 1 cable companies from Quebec to distribute its educational television programming to Quebec subscribers, on an optional basis.

The CRTC had received 1,563 submissions in response to the public notice asking for comments. The overwhelming majority of these replies, that is 99.3 per cent, were in favour of TFO's request. Only 12 stakeholders were opposed to it, namely Vidéotron Communication Inc.; Cogeco Cable Canada Inc.; the Specialty and Premium Television Association; Action Réseau consommateurs; Astral; Télé-Québec; the Association des producteurs de films et de télévision du Québec; the Canadian Association of Broadcasters; the Canadian Cable Television Association; Pierre de Savoye and Roland Saumure.

[Senator Oliver]

Following the denial, I realized that we had to oppose the ruling and I immediately asked my lawyers to table a request for leave to appeal ruling CRTC 2000-72 to the Federal Court of Appeal.

In my opinion, the ruling is tantamount to the commission abdicating its responsibilities for the benefit of the Quebec cable industry. I also believe that this ruling violates sections 41 and 22 of the Official Languages Act. Moreover, I think that this ruling prevents francophones in Canada from using modern means of communication to exchange ideas and discuss cultural, linguistic and social issues. Francophone minorities outside Quebec need Quebec to develop and support the Canadian francophonie. In this age of the Internet and digital television, it is unacceptable that the interests of consumers be ignored for the benefit of commercial interests.

It is not enough for the CRTC to pay lip service to the promotion of French-language services in Canada. It must issue rulings that are compatible with its statements and with the spirit of the Broadcasting Act and of the Official Languages Act.

After a five-month wait, the Federal Court of Appeal denied my request. The order reads as follows:

The request for an oral hearing is denied.

Believe me. I was very disappointed. Imagine! Five months to be told: "We will not hear your case."

No reason is provided. This is very hard to understand. I intend to get back to this issue at another time.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

ANNUAL REPORT OF COMMISSIONER TABLED

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I have the honour to table the report of the Commissioner of Official Languages for the period ending March 31, 2000, pursuant to the Privacy Act, R.S.C. 1985, Chapter P-21, subsection 72(2).

[*English*]

CANADIAN NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

CANADIAN DELEGATION TO SPRING SESSION OF NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY HELD IN BUDAPEST, HUNGARY—REPORT TABLED

Hon. Bill Rompkey: Honourable senators, I have the honour to table the seventh report of the Canadian NATO Parliamentary Association. This is the report of the official delegation that represented Canada at the 2000 spring session of the North Atlantic Assembly, involving parliamentarians from NATO countries and held in Budapest, Hungary, from May 27-30, 2000.

THE SENATE

[English]

PROPOSED CHANGE TO RULES REGARDING
OFFICIAL LANGUAGES JOINT COMMITTEE—NOTICE OF MOTION

Hon. Jean-Robert Gauthier: Honourable senators, I give notice, pursuant to rule 57(1)(a), that on Thursday next, September 21, 2000, I will move:

That Rule 86(1) of the *Rules of the Senate* be amended:

1. by deleting paragraph (e);
2. by adding immediately after paragraph (q) the following new paragraph:

“The Senate Committee on Official Languages, composed of five members, three of whom shall constitute a quorum, to which may be referred, as the Senate may decide, bills, messages, petitions, inquiries, papers and other matters relating to official languages.”; and

3. by relettering the paragraphs accordingly.

That, notwithstanding Rule 85(3), the Senate membership on the Standing Joint Committee on Official Languages lapse; and

That a Message be sent to the House of Commons acquainting that House thereof.

[Translation]

FRENCH-LANGUAGE BROADCASTING SERVICE

NOTICE OF INQUIRY

Hon. Jean-Robert Gauthier: Honourable senators, I give notice that on Tuesday next, September 26, 2000, I shall call the attention of the Senate to the measures that should be taken to encourage and facilitate provision of and access to the widest possible range of French-language broadcasting services in francophone minority communities across Canada.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES IN ONTARIO

NOTICE OF INQUIRY

Hon. Jean-Robert Gauthier: Honourable senators, I give notice that on Tuesday next, September 26, 2000, I shall call the attention of the Senate to the latest official languages issues in Ontario.

QUESTION PERIOD

NATIONAL DEFENCE

REPLACEMENT OF SEA KING HELICOPTERS—
COSTING ELEMENTS OF PROCUREMENT COMPETITION

Hon. J. Michael Forrestall: Honourable senators, I welcome the Leader of the Government back from Halifax, which is the Caribbean of Canada. I can attest, honourable senators, that your leader spent a lot of time on the waterfront, on yachts, opening gala events, welcoming visitors and whatnot. Now it is time for him to go back to work.

As the minister will be aware, I remain very concerned about the Maritime helicopter project and the replacement process as set out in the government's letter of interest to the industry. I am concerned that the process is not fair and open, contradicting what the Leader of the Government and other members of the government he supports have clearly said on numerous occasions over the last several months.

First, the government has clearly backed away from getting the best equipment for our aircrews and their families by stating that the basic vehicle must be “lowest priced compliant” and not “best value.” This virtually eliminates EH Industries from the competition as they are highly unlikely to be able to supply “bare bones” basic vehicles at \$925 million when they could only provide 15 basic helicopters for \$580 million for the Canadian Search Helicopter Program. Everyone knows, honourable senators, that the Sikorsky S-92 and the Eurocopter Cougar MK2 are cheaper than the Cormorant.

Why did the government split the contract and stipulate lowest priced compliant? Was it to purposely side-swipe the EH-101 and to avoid further political embarrassment?

• (1430)

Hon. J. Bernard Boudreau (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I thank the Honourable Senator Forrestall for that question. Let me assure him initially that there was no intention on the part of the government to disqualify any particular company from the competition. Hopefully the competition will proceed in a vigorous way.

The honourable senator referred to the opportunity I had to attend various functions in sunny Nova Scotia. One of those functions was the Shearwater Air Show. It was a beautiful, sunny day and I suspect the honourable senator was there himself. I had the opportunity to tour the sites of what are regarded as the three most prominent competing helicopter firms. While we did not get into any sort of serious discussion, they did seem to indicate that they were very pleased the process is moving forward. I am sure the honourable senator and I both share with them that sentiment. Indeed, none of them raised with me serious objections to the competition.

If the honourable senator has specific concerns, then I would be perfectly happy to relay them to the Minister of National Defence, but I can assure the honourable senator — and all honourable senators — that there is no intention to eliminate any particular competitor.

Senator Forrestall: Honourable senators, it would be interesting if the Leader of the Government in the Senate could tell me and the rest of the world how it would be that the group promoting the EH-101 could compete against “lowest price, not best value,” when the other two competitors are obviously priced so much lower. I need only cite Eurocopter and its Cougar MK2. It is like comparing a Chevrolet Caprice and my 20-year-old vehicle, which just went through 300,000 kilometres. I might get \$4,000 or \$5,000 for it. The leader knows the difference as well as I do.

Honourable senators, I do not think there is any question that the Sikorsky S-92 is virtually eliminated from the competition to replace the Sea King for the fundamental reason, as the minister knows, that it will not be certified until early in the year 2002. The government has said that any contender not certified in the year in which the award is to be offered — 2001 — will be excluded from the competition, which takes Sikorsky out of the picture altogether. The Sikorsky S-70 Seahawk is too small, and Sikorsky realizes that fact. The Seahawk does not have enough room to accommodate crew and passengers in whatever configuration the Canadian Armed Forces might want that aircraft, depending on the mission and the nature of any off-shore peacekeeping support. The S-70 is not quite big enough for our requirements. It should be obvious to any observer, including journalists and the Canadian taxpayer, that the lowest-compliant-price rule and the certification schedule puts Sikorsky out of the competition even before it begins. Why was the certification clause so rigidly put in place and why did we go with the phrase “the cheapest, not the best”?

Senator Boudreau: Honourable senators, I have not had any deep discussions on these issues with any of the companies involved, nor with the Minister of National Defence. However, I will, as I have undertaken, raise with the minister the two issues the honourable senator has brought to the floor. In speaking to representatives of all three companies, I can only say that my impression was that they all believed that they were still in the race. Their presence and their aggressive approach was a testament to that belief.

The honourable senator raises two basic issues. I am not sure, for example, that supporters of the Cormorant believe they are necessarily eliminated by the lowest compliant price. At least, that is the impression I had from them.

As to why that approach was taken, I think it was a reasonable approach for the minister to consider. We are not looking for equipment that cannot do the job, but we have a duty to the taxpayers of the country such that if we can procure equipment capable of doing the job, very specifically defined, then we should obtain that equipment at the lowest possible price.

Senator Forrestall: I have a final supplementary, honourable senators. I raise this question against the background of the

proposals being received and considered by government not later than the 22nd day of this month, which is this coming Friday.

I would ask the minister to consult with his colleagues on this matter, particularly the Prime Minister, the Minister of National Defence, the minister responsible for procurement of arms and goods, and whoever else may be involved, including Herb Gray’s very special group, of whom I stand in great awe, although with not much respect or admiration. Someone has screwed Eurocopter into the boardroom at the top of the building and left these other companies out in the parking lot. Will the leader impress upon his colleagues the importance of reading very carefully — I cannot overemphasize this point — word for word and line by line the responses the government receives from industry? Next week, I will want to ask the Leader of the Government what he then thinks, having seen the three proposals.

Senator Boudreau: Honourable senators, I will undertake to raise those issues with my colleagues. To the extent that I am aware of the proposals, I will make a special effort to determine as much detail as I can about them and release whatever I can, no doubt at the insistence of the honourable senator.

Senator Forrestall: I thank the government leader for that.

• (1440)

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION— REQUEST FOR WIN-LOSS RECORD ON DISPUTE RULINGS

Hon. James F. Kelleher: Honourable senators, my question is for the Leader of the Government in the Senate. He will be happy to know it does not concern helicopters.

Yesterday the World Trade Organization announced that Canada had lost another two disputes. First, the WTO appellate body endorsed an earlier panel ruling against Canada and in favour of the United States regarding Canada’s term of patent protection. Second, the WTO dispute panel has rejected a Canadian complaint and upheld France’s ban on asbestos.

The *National Post* has reported that federal trade lawyers say their advice is routinely ignored in favour of political considerations when Canada decides what cases to take before international bodies. The *National Post* also quoted a senior official in the Trade Law Division of the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade: “Having a friend in the Prime Minister’s Office is far more important than having a good legal case.”

As honourable senators are well aware, the federal government has recently lost WTO cases regarding the stockpiling of pharmaceutical products, dairy supply management and the Auto Pact. As a former minister for international trade, I am concerned that this string of losses is causing Canada to lose credibility with our trading partners and forcing the Canadian public to lose faith in their trade agreements.

Will the leader therefore table in the Senate a full report on all cases Canada has launched and defended since the WTO treaties came into force in 1995 so that the Canadian public can assess the government's win-loss record?

Senator Kinsella: Good question.

Hon. J. Bernard Boudreau (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I will do everything I can to provide that information. If it is not readily available, I will have to ask the minister to prepare it. I am generally aware of the recent decisions, at least those made since my arrival here in this chamber. It strikes me that we won some and we lost some, which is not unusual in that situation. It is also not unusual that there be considerations other than strictly legal arguments brought to bear on any case involving world trade. I do not find that unusual or shocking in any way.

I will request of the minister the specific win-loss record and provide it to the honourable senator.

WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION—INCONSISTENCY BETWEEN
STANCE ON ASBESTOS RULING INVOLVING FRANCE AND POLICY
ON ENVIRONMENT—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. James F. Kelleher: Honourable senators, as I just mentioned, a WTO dispute panel just rejected a Canadian complaint and upheld France's ban on asbestos. I understand that the federal government has announced that it intends to appeal this panel decision to the WTO appellate body. However, last week, the Minister for International Trade announced that Canada is seeking comments on a framework for the environmental assessment of trade negotiations. There has already been press speculation on this government's inconsistent approach to these two important items. Will the leader therefore explain to the Senate how Canada can continue to fight the French asbestos ban on the one hand while, at the same time, arguing that the environment must play a greater role in Canada's international trade negotiations?

Hon. J. Bernard Boudreau (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I would certainly support the minister's comments that environmental regulations should play a greater role and, indeed, I think that will be the case. With respect to the rationale for appealing a specific decision, I will ask the minister and his department to provide that information to the honourable senator, if indeed the appeal is going ahead.

CHURCH COMMUNITY

INDIAN AFFAIRS—FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR LAWSUITS BY FORMER
STUDENTS OF RESIDENTIAL SCHOOLS—GOVERNMENT POLICY

Hon. Douglas Roche: Honourable senators, the Leader of the Government in the Senate will recall that I raised with him in June the issue of the major churches in Canada facing hundreds of millions of dollars in legal costs and liability claims arising from suits launched by former residents of aboriginal residential schools. Just to refresh his memory, the churches involved are the

Anglican, Catholic, Presbyterian, United and Methodist churches.

Over the summer, the Anglican church announced that it had to let go a handful of national staff members because of the financial strain from litigating these residential claims. There are now at least 6,200 claims.

At the time of my question, the minister expressed a sympathetic viewpoint to the plight of the churches in this terrible dilemma. Meanwhile, a government department memo has surfaced stating explicitly that the churches, "cannot expect any easy or painless exit from their responsibilities."

Honourable senators, the issue is not about the churches escaping their responsibility. The churches have accepted their moral responsibility for any incidents of personal abuse against the students, but the issue is not personal abuse in a physical or sexual sense, lamentable as those cases may be. The issue is the government policy under which the churches were operating at the time, to assimilate native children into Canadian society. In fact, many claimants allege that the students were deprived of their culture.

Will the minister ask the government to adopt the same viewpoint expressed personally by the minister in June? He was sympathetic then concerning helping the churches in this terrible moment. Is it really in the interests of the government for churches to fall into bankruptcy or to be so crippled financially that they cannot play an effective spiritual role in modern Canada?

Hon. J. Bernard Boudreau (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, the government continues to work with the churches on this very large problem. The number of suits and the potential liability has grown dramatically in a relatively short period of time. In fact, the government has been in discussions with the churches to find methods and opportunities to resolve some of these cases without resorting to expensive litigation.

To date, I am informed that the government has settled some 300 such claims. Some of those claims have included churches that were involved with the administration of facilities from which those settled claims arose. However, as the honourable senator will know, those settled cases represent a small part of the cases that have been launched.

The honourable senator also raises another issue which is a matter of some discussion and reflection for all of us; that is, the question of cultural deprivation or cultural abuse. To date, no court in the country has ever determined that to be a compensable injury, at least not to the best of my knowledge. The issue is how to deal with that claim. There are clear precedents for dealing with claims of physical or sexual abuse. Courts have dealt with those accusations in the past. Even outside of the normal court structure, when one can take a parallel but more compassionate route, some precedent exists on which to move forward. There is no such judicial basis for claims of cultural deprivation.

The government is facing a major challenge and efforts are being made, as I have described, but more discussion must take place between churches and government.

Senator Roche: Honourable senators, I am grateful that the minister has at least returned the tone of the discussion to a more responsive one than that evinced by the government memo that I cited. However, we are facing a forthcoming government policy that will go through cabinet. Material is now being prepared by the Departments of Indian and Northern Affairs and Justice. While we are on the way to formulating a formal government policy, will the minister ask the government to accept due responsibility for its own policies, which were maintained by churches over these many decades and which resulted in this horrific number of lawsuits that are financially crippling the churches? Will the government put real money into the solution to this problem the churches face?

Senator Boudreau: Honourable senators, I do not think there is any implication that the government intends to simply abandon the churches or any responsibility, legal or financial, that the government should undertake. What form those responsibilities will take, how discussions will be resolved and how the final government policy in this area will look, I am not in a position at this time to share with the honourable senator.

• (1450)

However, as he points out, these discussions are currently ongoing. Hopefully a more detailed policy will be made public in the near future. In the meantime, I will bring the senator's views to any discussion in which I participate.

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

BURNT CHURCH, NEW BRUNSWICK—DISPUTE OVER FISHERY—REQUEST FOR UPDATE ON ARBITRATION PROCESS

Hon. Brenda M. Robertson: Honourable senators, I have a question for the Leader of the Government in the Senate. As we are all well aware, there is a major problem in Burnt Church, New Brunswick, with the fishery and the native people. It is my understanding that Mr. Rae, who has been arbitrating, has advised that he is leaving this afternoon at four o'clock, should he not have a resolution. The latest reports suggest that a resolution is not near. If the leader has further information, I would appreciate his sharing it. If Mr. Rae removes himself from this process, what plans does the government have to come to some solution of this critical problem before it escalates further?

Hon. J. Bernard Boudreau (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I am not in a position to update the honourable senator's impressions as I am simply not privy to any developments that may have occurred over the last several hours. This is a difficult situation. Mr. Rae is an individual who appeared to be acceptable to both sides of the dispute. He has had some contact with both sides in attempting to resolve the matter through discussion and negotiation. Both parties recognize that is the proper approach. We are still hopeful that a resolution will

occur. Mr. Rae has met repeatedly with the band officials and members, with commercial fishermen and neighbouring community representatives, as well as with the Minister of Fisheries and his officials.

The band has taken a strong position to date, but the Minister of Fisheries has maintained publicly and privately that he believes it is his responsibility — indeed, his duty — to ensure the appropriate regulation of the fishery, and his efforts will continue in that regard.

I do not want to shut down the option of negotiations with Mr. Rae specifically, but if things do not proceed successfully, then we will need to look for other means of negotiation. In the meantime, the minister will take his responsibility seriously.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: Bring in the pepper spray!

Senator Robertson: All of that information is fine, but it is information that most of us already know, along with other bits of information, such as the ramming of boats and all the dreadful international press.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: That is shocking!

Senator Robertson: It is shocking. Should this process fail, the government surely must have a more peaceful and better-designed plan for harmonious relations than the one it has followed up until now, which is simply aggravating the situation. There must a position other than the one the government has demonstrated thus far. The government cannot go out and shoot people or ram them with its boats and drown them. We do not want another Oka. The government seems to be abdicating its responsibility in this regard. The public wants better answers.

Honourable senators also know that the problem is more than fishing. A sensible person would assume, probably incorrectly, that the government would have plans, should the negotiations fail. I do not know what else we can say this afternoon if the government leader simply reiterates what we all know. I guess we will have to come back to this issue again tomorrow.

Senator Kinsella: Hear, hear!

Senator Boudreau: Honourable senators, the government, through the Department of Fisheries and the minister, has embarked on a vigorous path of negotiation. In fact, that process of negotiation was successful and resulted in an agreement with something like 32 of the 34 bands. With two bands, that agreement has not happened.

On an ongoing basis, we are attempting to achieve a negotiated settlement with the band in question. If it is possible, we will welcome it, as I am sure will the members of those bands. Failing such successful conclusion as occurred with the other 32 bands, the minister has indicated that he cannot just stand down, stand back and say, "We were not able to reach an agreement, so I am walking away from the situation." He has an ongoing responsibility to preserve and regulate the fishery, as he is doing with the other 32 bands.

If the honourable senator has some other suggestion to make publicly or privately, certainly I would convey it to the minister. I am sure he would appreciate it.

Honourable senators, I have had the opportunity over the last month to tour extensively in the fishing areas of Nova Scotia. The view I heard clearly from the people with whom I spoke in both the commercial fishery and in the aboriginal communities was that the minister does have a responsibility to regulate the fishery.

Senator Robertson: My last comment on this subject is simply that we know the negotiations with each band are different because the history of each band is different. I am glad the government leader has been talking and visiting in Nova Scotia. It might be helpful for him to come to Burnt Church and discover the real story behind the disgraceful activity that has occurred.

Senator Kinsella: Hear, hear! I will drive you!

Senator Boudreau: The honourable senator has a position and a viewpoint, but let me say again that negotiations were successfully concluded with 32 of the 34 bands. Thirty-two bands believed that the position of the Minister of Fisheries was reasonable, or at least they reached a reasonable accommodation, but that did not happen in this case.

If the honourable senator is to condemn the minister and the government for the issue not having come to a conclusion, then she has some responsibility to indicate what she recommends. Does she recommend the Minister and the Department of Fisheries stand down?

Senator Kinsella: Negotiate.

Senator Boudreau: Leave the area?

Senator Robertson: Discuss it with the bishops of the province.

[*Translation*]

LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS

POSSIBILITY OF TELEVISIONING HEARINGS ON CITIZENSHIP BILL

Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, my question is for the Chair of the Senate Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs but, in her absence, I will put it to the Deputy Chair. My question has to do with Bill C-16, which is now before his committee.

I read a notice mentioning that the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration would be appearing before the committee tomorrow. Since this is a very important bill for all Canadians, I would like to know whether the committee has obtained permission to televise its proceedings.

Hon. Gérald-A. Beaudoin: Honourable senators, at the last meeting of the steering committee on Sunday, the question of televising proceedings was not on the agenda. Personally, I would have no objection to this sitting being televised. Perhaps my colleague Senator Moore, who also sits on the steering committee, could add something to this.

[*English*]

• (1500)

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I would like to point out that, although I accepted that the question could be put to the deputy chair, the rules state that any questions must be put to the chair of the committee. It may be, however, that the deputy chair is also the acting chair, I do not know. In any case, I wish to make that point.

The time for Question Period has expired.

ANSWER TO ORDER PAPER QUESTION TABLED

CONCERNING THE CANADIAN FOOD INSPECTION AGENCY
AND ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS
OF GENETICALLY ENGINEERED ORGANISMS

Hon. Dan Hays (Deputy Leader of the Government) tabled the answer to Question No. 12 on the Order Paper—by Senator Spivak.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

PARLIAMENT OF CANADA ACT MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT RETIRING ALLOWANCES ACT

BILL TO AMEND—THIRD READING—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. Dan Hays moved the third reading of Bill C-37, to amend the Parliament of Canada Act and the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act.

He said: Honourable senators, as the sponsor of the bill, I would like to make a brief intervention at this time. I am not speaking for the last time, nor am I trying to close the debate on third reading.

This bill was on our Order Paper over the summer. It addresses what all honourable senators would agree is an anomaly in the treatment of members of the other place who retire, either by their choice or by their constituents' choice, depending on when they were elected.

I do not want to repeat what I said when addressing the bill at second reading.

The bill addresses issues which affect members who were elected in 1993 — issues which were never intended to affect them in the way that they do. Passage of this bill will ensure that those members are treated the same as all other members as far as severance is concerned. It will also provide for parity among members of the other place in so far as the pension plan is concerned. Those are the only two changes that passage of this bill will achieve.

As I have been informed, and I believe it to be the case, Bill C-37 received general support from all parties in the other place, and I would urge this place to deal with it as expeditiously as possible. At the conclusion of the debate on second reading, the bill was referred to the Banking Committee. That committee, in its wisdom, chose to hold only a one-day hearing on the bill and then, having heard from the minister and his officials, reported the bill back to the Senate without amendment.

Honourable senators, the Senate has resumed at this time because this bill, as well as other matters, remained on our Order Paper at the time of our adjournment on June 29. This bill is important to members in the other place, and I believe that, over the course of this week, we can expeditiously conclude the debate on third reading.

I would be pleased to elaborate on the substance of the bill and to answer any questions but, as I said at the outset, I do not think that speaking to the substance of the bill is necessary in that it is a fairly simple bill. I believe it has already been adequately described and debated at second reading stage.

On motion of Senator Lynch-Staunton, debate adjourned.

[*Translation*]

DEFENCE PRODUCTION ACT

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. Bill Rompkey moved that Bill S-25, to amend the Defence Production Act, be read a second time.

He said: Honourable senators, I rise at second reading of Bill S-25, a bill to amend the Defence Production Act. I am pleased to sponsor this piece of legislation aimed at broadening the scope of the industrial security system in Canada by including the protection of certain defence-related goods and technologies.

[*English*]

Honourable senators, Bill S-25 is a cornerstone of Canada's commitment to control the access to and the transfer of defence-related goods and technology within our borders, as set out in Canada's Export Control List. The bill will also help ensure the competitiveness of Canada's defence aerospace and satellite industries. In short, it is an important bill that deserves the support of this chamber.

Honourable senators, we need to consider the unique nature of Canada's defence relationship with the United States in order to put the proposed amendments into perspective. Over the past

[Senator Hays }

decades the two countries have developed a strong, integrated North American base for defence industries to help fulfil our defence and security responsibilities. Canada and the U.S. depend extensively on each other's defence mechanisms. We have a common interest in maintaining a secure North American perimeter to protect against illegal transfers of sensitive goods and technology, commonly known as "controlled" goods.

[*Translation*]

As a result of this special relationship, Canadian firms have always been able to trade controlled goods with American defence industries without having to get a licence.

Under the International Traffic in Arms Regulation, or ITAR, Canadian firms have not had to comply with the costly and time-consuming requirements of the American licensing system.

[*English*]

This is no longer the case, honourable senators. Increased international terrorism, coupled with concerns that United States controlled goods and technology were ending up in the hands of unauthorized foreign individuals or countries, led the U.S. Department of State to amend the ITAR in April, 1999. Many of the preferential elements that had previously been available to Canadian firms were removed. New licensing requirements were imposed on a broad range of goods and technology that had previously been licence free. The definition of who could take advantage of Canadian exemptions was also narrowed considerably.

[*Translation*]

You will understand that these amendments had a significant impact on the industrial sector in Canada, particularly the defence aerospace and satellite industries. The ITAR licensing process is time-consuming and complex. It has seriously hindered Canada's access to U.S. controlled goods and technologies.

American firms refused to get into joint ventures with Canadian firms, resulting in missed business opportunities for the latter. Moreover, deliveries of ITAR controlled goods to Canadian industries experience major delays.

[*English*]

Honourable senators, Canadian government officials have been working hard to resolve this issue. Their goal has been to protect these controlled goods and the associated technology of the North American defence aerospace and satellite infrastructure, while encouraging trade and improving Canada's national economic stability.

[*Translation*]

These efforts were successful. In October 1999, Prime Minister Chrétien and President Clinton concluded an agreement in principle committing Canada and the United States to working together to protect controlled goods from illegal transfer, and to preserve the North American defence industrial base.

[English]

Toward this end, Canada agreed to harmonize its Export Control List, identifying controlled goods with the U.S. Munition List — its U.S. equivalent. As well, Canada undertook to strengthen controls on the re-transfer of items from Canada registered in the U.S. Munitions List. Canada has also proposed to strengthen controls within Canada on the transfer of controlled goods and technology, and to introduce appropriate legal sanctions for infractions.

For its part, the U.S. provided assurances that it was prepared to reinstate many of the benefits of the Canadian exemptions under the U.S. ITAR and ensure that these goods can be accessed within Canada by Canadian citizens, Canadian dual nationals, and permanent residents.

• (1510)

A fundamental element of the solution to this problem, honourable senators, is the establishment of a registration system to ensure effective control of, access to, and the transfer within Canada of controlled goods and technology. After examining a number of possible scenarios, the government has adopted a Canadian-made process — the Controlled Goods Registration Program, or CGRP.

[Translation]

This is the *raison d'être* of Bill S-25. The legislative measure proposed will amend the Defence Production Act so that all persons who examine, possess or transfer a controlled good within Canadian territory are either covered by this program or excluded from it.

[English]

These amendments will also provide the legal authority for the Governor in Council to make regulations to support the new registration regime. Finally, they will establish more appropriate penalties for companies or individuals who violate the act.

Honourable senators, Bill S-25 will divide the Defence Production Act into three distinctive parts. Part 1 will consist of the existing requirements of the act, except for those sections related to offences and punishments. Part 2 will define the purpose and intent of the Controlled Goods Registration Program, describe the roles and responsibilities of the involved parties, and give the Minister of Public Works and Government Services authority to administer the system. Part 3 will deal with offences and punishments for violations of Parts 1 and 2.

The registration system, as described in Part 2, is intended to be reasonable and efficient, for both government and industry.

[Translation]

To be registered, companies or individuals are required to apply to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services. The directors, officers and employees requiring access to controlled goods are covered by the registration. Companies will be responsible for screening these individuals, ensuring that the

new regulations are being respected, and establishing a verifiable compliance system.

[English]

Under Part 2, controlled goods may be transferred in Canada only between persons and certain individuals or classes of individuals whom the minister may exempt, such as U.S. visitors who are already registered with the U.S. government. Companies will be required to submit to inspections by the Department of Public Works and Government Services. Registrations and exemptions may be granted, renewed, denied, suspended, amended or revoked by the minister on the basis of security assessments.

Part 3 of the revised Defence Production Act will include new offences and greater penalties for violations, including possible jail terms. For example, companies will face significant penalties for permitting unauthorized access to controlled goods, for providing false or misleading information to the Government of Canada, for destroying records, or for interfering with an inspection.

Under this new legislation, all minor offences will be punishable on summary conviction with a maximum fine of \$25,000, 12 months imprisonment, or both. More serious violations of the act will be punishable on summary conviction with a maximum fine of \$100,000, two years in prison, or both. The maximum penalty for indictable offences will be a \$2-million fine, 10 years in prison, or both. All offences are continuing — in other words, a person or company may be charged separately for each day on which an offence is committed or continues.

[Translation]

Honourable senators, Bill S-25 is not in itself a solution to defence trade-related problems that have arisen between Canada and our most important ally and trade partner, but it is a positive step in re-establishing the exemption granted to Canada from which our defence, aerospace and satellite companies have benefited in the past.

[English]

In fact, this legislation is a key element of a proposed package of regulatory and legislative measures agreed to this past June by Canada's Foreign Affairs Minister and the U.S. Secretary of State to strengthen defence trade controls in both countries. Under this agreement, the U.S. will revise the ITAR regulations to restore most of the pre-April 1999 Canadian exemptions, allowing for the licence-free-cross-border transfer for most U.S. origin controlled goods and technology. Negotiations are ongoing to fully implement the agreement.

Honourable senators, these amendments will enable the expansion of Public Works and Government Services Canada's Industrial Security Program to cover all transfers of unclassified controlled goods and technology within Canada. The department will also work with the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade to address in-country access and transfers of such goods and technology by unauthorized entities.

[Translation]

I would like to assure you, honourable senators, that the process of monitoring eligibility and the other components of this new registration system will not contravene the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. I would also like to point out that the federal government is not burdening the industry with any unjustified costs and regulations. This regime is necessary to guarantee national security in North America.

[English]

Consultations with industry over the past two months have revealed widespread support for this approach. The fact is that the Canadian defence and aerospace industries have been urging action on this issue for some time now. While companies will have to absorb the administrative costs of complying with the amended Defence Production Act, these costs will be minimal given the economic benefits that will result.

We should not discount these benefits, honourable senators. While this is first and foremost a security issue, these strengthened controls will also help ensure the competitiveness of Canadian defence, aerospace and satellite industries, and safeguard the 85,000 jobs they support in all regions of the country.

About 70 per cent of the \$18.5 billion in sales by the aerospace and defence industries in 1999 went to export markets, primarily the United States. Implementation of the new registration system, and the resulting reinstatement of Canada's privileged access to U.S. technology, is essential to the future viability of these strategic high-tech industries.

[Translation]

Honourable senators, later this year, the two governments will evaluate the progress that has been made in implementing the proposed legislative and regulatory changes approved last June.

[English]

Approval of Bill S-25 before that time is a key element to reaching a final resolution. It will demonstrate Canada's commitment to strengthen its own security system.

With that in mind, I ask honourable senators to join me today in voting to refer this proposed legislation to committee.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

Hon. J. Michael Forrestall: Honourable senators, judging from the applause behind me, I can assure the senator who has just spoken at second reading to this long overdue and positively correct piece of legislation that we on this side of the chamber will be supporting it.

Honourable senators, notwithstanding all of that, and knowing of the great erudition of the distinguished senator, I would like the opportunity to review his remarks.

On motion of Senator Forrestall, debate adjourned.

[Senator Rompkey]

• (1520)

BROADCASTING ACT

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Finestone, P.C., seconded by the Honourable Senator Rompkey, P.C., for the second reading of Bill S-24, to amend the Broadcasting Act.—(*Honourable Senator Kinsella*).

Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, having had the opportunity over the summer break to study Bill S-24, I have come to the conclusion that this bill, which was introduced by our colleague Senator Finestone, is deserving of our careful consideration.

A number of elements in this bill have attracted my support. For example, honourable senators, first, through this amendment to the Broadcasting Act, the Canadian public will have more equitable representation and participation in regulatory and policy matters relating to the broadcasting and cable television industry in our country. Second, this change would be of benefit to the CRTC by improving the quality of evidence it receives and considers as part of the commission's policy and regulatory decision-making processes. Third, this amendment is also fair and will not burden the broadcasting industry itself.

It seems to me, honourable senators, that the bill is supportive of an important principle of public policy, namely, that citizens participate in and are represented in policy, regulatory and other decision-making activities of government and government agencies, and are able to do so in an effective way.

Honourable senators will recall that, under the Broadcasting Act, the CRTC should provide Canadians with an open process that allows all voices to be heard on those matters that come before that important agency. However, the reality is that the increasing importance of communications in our lives as we rapidly develop today's information society means that the services Canadians use, the prices that we pay, and the regulatory and policy issues that affect these have also become increasingly important for all Canadians.

Moreover, daily we all see in the media and in our individual lives the importance of such developments as the Internet and the new media. We have also been noting with dramatic impression this past few weeks the convergence of broadcasting, data and telecommunications services, as well as convergence between formerly separate companies in different sectors of the industry. This has resulted, I believe, in an increased complexity, not only of services, but also in how they are marketed and priced for Canadians. Consider also the structure and practices of the industry and the regulation of policy and, quite frankly, the blurred lines between the formerly separate areas of telecommunications and broadcasting.

My understanding of this bill is that the amendment that it seeks to bring about will not diminish the ability of Canadians to express their general views about matters relating to the broadcasting sector to the CRTC through letters or other means. This level of participation will continue. However, the changes in communications to which I have just alluded mean that, in order to have opportunities to truly participate on a fair and equitable basis and to be effective while doing this, citizens and the groups that represent them need to have the resources available to develop substantive evidence and substantive submissions. This amendment seeks to create the means to ensure that sufficient resources are available when warranted to facilitate this level of participation and representation by the citizens of Canada. The result will be that the interests of Canadian consumers will be better balanced with those of the giant media companies in decisions that are taken by the CRTC.

This change to the Broadcasting Act will also benefit the CRTC itself. Quite simply, to make good decisions that balance the interests and needs of the public with the interests and needs of industry, the commission needs to have quality research and evidence presented during its regulatory proceedings. The increased level of complexity of the communications industry, networks and services requires companies and public participants to have an increased level of expertise and provide better detail of information in their submissions, whether legal, economic, sociocultural, or whatever type of research or analysis. Improving citizens' and citizens' groups' abilities to do this will, in my view, improve the quality of evidence before the regulatory agency and therefore improve the commission's ability to render fair and balanced decisions, and to more effectively manage communications activities through policy and regulations.

My reading and understanding of Bill S-24 leads me to conclude that it addresses a major anomaly between Canada's various communications statutes. As honourable senators know, a number of statutes affect the communications sphere. Increasingly over the past few years, consumer groups have asked the commission to provide costs so they could participate more effectively in broadcasting and new media proceedings. The commission has been unable to accommodate these requests because of differences between the communications acts. This amendment, to my understanding, modernizes and brings symmetry to the major pieces of communications legislation in Canada: the Telecommunications Act and the Broadcasting Act. Therefore, it will empower the commission to apply a common set of rules for consumer participation in all of its proceedings.

Finally, honourable senators, it struck me that the bill and the amendment that it proposes to the act are fair, for this will not be a burden for broadcasters or other communication companies. The bill adopts the same long-established model for facilitating greater and more effective public participation through the awarding of costs to intervenors that has worked with great success under the Telecommunications Act. Cost awards have not been a burden to the telecommunications industry or to those broadcasters who have participated in telecommunications proceedings. Similarly, I do not believe costs awarded in the

future under the Broadcast Act will be a burden for broadcasting or cable companies. Considering the value of awards, as has been the case with communications, those costs are likely to be very small compared to the revenues or the other expenses in the given industries.

For example, honourable senators, in 1997-98, the CRTC processed 2,124 telecommunications-related applications. That is a significant number. These included applications dealing with tariffs, agreements and other applications such as competitive disputes, social and consumer issues, contributions, and exceptions, among others. In addition, the CRTC issued a total of 1,912 telecommunications decisions. That is impressive. There are only 365 days in a year. The CRTC issued 1,912 decisions, orders, public notices, cost orders and taxation orders. A total of 15 costs awards were made in that year.

• (1530)

Consumers do not participate in every CRTC proceeding. They participate in those which are most important to the interests of the broad brush of the Canadian public. Substantial effort and expert evidence are required to properly make their case and, indeed, to facilitate the CRTC in making a proper and fair decision.

The substantive participation by public interest groups in telecommunications proceedings, facilitated by intervenor cost awards, has worked. It has helped to create regulatory decisions that are equitable for a large span of interests. My reading of Bill S-24 leads me to conclude that, in regulatory proceedings conducted by the CRTC under the Broadcasting Act, it will lead to greater fairness and a higher quality of evidence and data before the decision-making body.

Honourable senators, it is for these reasons that I support the principle of this bill and recommend that it be adopted at second reading and sent to the appropriate committee for detailed study and report.

Hon. Dan Hays (Deputy Leader of the Government): Would the honourable senator permit a question?

Senator Kinsella: Certainly.

Senator Hays: Perhaps I should have asked this question of Senator Finestone, the sponsor of the bill, but for some reason I did not. In any event, I will ask Honourable Senator Kinsella, as a supporter of the bill, for a further comment on how other regulatory bodies would treat the applications that Bill S-24 envisages could be made to the CRTC for the awarding of costs. We have, for example, the Canadian Transportation Agency and the National Energy Board. We have many opportunities for panels or boards to hold hearings on environmental assessment. Without going into too much detail, has the honourable senator given any consideration to that issue? Has his research given him any information that would enable him to comment on how this would fit into the way other regulatory bodies in Canada similar to the CRTC might treat the same issue that we are dealing with here in Bill S-24?

Senator Kinsella: Honourable senators, the amendment proposed here fits in perfectly with the operation of the CRTC. It is the articulated view of the CRTC that they need that evidence coming from the great breadth of Canadian society, but there is a cost involved to get that evidence before the commission.

In the past, the industry has not found this to be burdensome at all. Considering the profit that the industry members, happily for them, are able to achieve, this has not been a problem to my knowledge. As to whether that model would work or is working in other spheres, I will plead culpable ignorance; I do not know. Theoretically, here we have a successful model that seems to be working in this sector, and it breathes life and esprit into the proposition of participatory democracy.

On motion of Senator Gauthier, debate adjourned.

STATISTICS ACT NATIONAL ARCHIVES OF CANADA ACT

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Milne, seconded by the Honourable Senator Chalifoux, for the second reading of Bill S-15, to amend the Statistics Act and the National Archives of Canada Act (census records).—(*Honourable Senator DeWare*).

Hon. Mabel M. DeWare: Honourable senators, ever since Senator Milne introduced Bill S-15 in this house, she has been anxious for it to go to committee, so I am prepared to speak to it today. I am sorry she is not here, but I will take part in the debate on Bill S-15, which proposes to amend the Statistics Act and the National Archives of Canada Act as they pertain to census records.

Bill S-15 lays the groundwork for the release of post-1901 census records. Right now, Canadian law dating back to the early 1900s requires that they be kept confidential and not be used for any other purpose. This guarantee of secrecy extends to the information that Canadians will be asked to provide for the 2001 census.

This bill would give researchers access to census records 92 years after the census. Bill S-15 would require all census data from before 1971 to be transferred from Statistics Canada to the National Archives for safekeeping. From there, the records could then be released to the public, subject to the Privacy Act.

Before getting into the nuts and bolts of the bill and sharing my personal thoughts, I wish to commend its sponsor, Senator Lorna Milne, for her hard work in drafting this legislation. Bill S-15 is obviously the product of much research and consultation. I know she took great pains to achieve a balance among a variety of competing interests and concerns. Let us take a look at some of those concerns.

Clearly, census records can be vital research tools. They are useful for genealogists, medical researchers, people who want to learn more about their family history and, in some cases, entire communities. For example, our colleague Senator Chalifoux pointed out that having access to the census records of 1906 and later would enable the Métis nation to determine its lineage. As a result, there is a concern that continued lack of access to post-1901 census records creates a serious gap in Canada's historical record. Some people are also worried that those census records might end up being destroyed, and that would be a real shame.

I do not think anyone would argue with the fact that public access to these census records could have many benefits and that they should, at the very least, be properly conserved. Indeed, Bill S-15 seeks to ensure that census records may only be destroyed or disposed of after they have been transferred to an alternative recording medium, and it reflects a belief that the records are of permanent historic and archival importance. However, these benefits must be weighed against another set of concerns, and those involve privacy and confidentiality.

Honourable senators, the information collected on individual census forms is wide-ranging. Some of the questions might be considered rather intrusive. Your answers to some questions are probably not things you would want your friends, neighbours or anyone else to know. Even after 92 years, when you might be dead and gone, your surviving family members might not want that information released either, but all of your answers to the census questions become part of a record in which you are clearly identified.

I will use myself as an example. I am 74 years old. I can assume that the 1901 census contains the individual identifiable records of my parents, grandparents and other close family. I do not expect the information contains anything terribly controversial, but one never knows. In some cases, the public release of such records might still have the potential to affect succeeding generations of a family even after 92 years have passed.

I know that Bill S-15 tries to address privacy concerns by amending the National Archives of Canada Act to provide for an objection process. The idea is that the National Archivist would accept written objections from individuals who wish their own census information to remain confidential and then, provided that its disclosure is found to be an unwarranted invasion of privacy, that information would not be released. That reminds me rather uncomfortably of negative-option billing. Under Bill S-15, people who participate in the census are deemed to consent to the release of their personal information unless they petition against it.

• (1540)

I am also intrigued by the fact that in order for an objection to be valid the National Archivist must receive it during the ninety-second calendar year following the year in which the census was taken. I would hazard a guess that not many people will be sending in written objections regarding their 1901 and 1906 census records — many of them are probably dead!

What also concerns me is that none of the people who took part in an early census knew that their records might one day be publicly released. After all, they answered the questions under a promise of secrecy. They were told that their information would only be seen by government workers and only used for the census itself. If the rules are changed now, it would be like all those people gave their personal information under false pretences. They also did not know that in the distant future there might be a way to prevent their personal information from being released.

Honourable senators, I believe there is an issue of trust here that must be examined fully when Bill S-15 goes to committee.

This bill also gives rise to another issue, which was mentioned by Privacy Commissioner Bruce Phillips when he appeared before the Committee of the Whole on May 30 — that is, the integrity of the census-taking process.

Because they are guaranteed that their answers will stay confidential, people who take part in the census have no reason to be anything less than truthful. Commissioner Phillips pointed out that a key intent of the legislation providing for the privacy and confidentiality of census records was to ensure that people provided full and accurate information. If the government cannot be certain it is receiving correct information, then I wonder how useful the results of any census would be. Again, this is a matter that should be explored in committee.

While I do have serious personal reservations about Bill S-15, I am pleased that it was introduced. Senator Milne has given us a golden opportunity to consider and to debate how privacy issues affect individuals and Canadian society as a whole. I welcome the contribution that this bill is making to the public debate regarding privacy issues, not only regarding census records, but in a wider sense as well.

Hon. Nicholas W. Taylor: Honourable senators, would the Honourable Senator DeWare entertain a question?

Senator DeWare: Of course, honourable senators.

Senator Taylor: When Mr. Phillips appeared before us, I asked him a question on this issue because I am concerned about privacy and I am trying to work out an accommodation with those who want to look into the past. After all, there are those of us who might find out things that we do not want to find out.

When Mr. Phillips was here, I suggested to him that perhaps the questions could be split in the next census; that is to say, we could have one set of questions sealed forever, as is the case now, while the other questions could either be kept secret forever or made public 20 years or 25 years from the date of the census. Would that make the honourable senator feel better in terms of the way census information is collected?

Senator DeWare: The honourable senator is suggesting that the census be divided into two sections. Alternatively, people could be asked directly if they agree to have their information made public after a certain length of time. If they answered in the

affirmative, then the information could be put into a separate file. The question needs to be asked of the public when the census is taken. That is very important.

Senator Taylor: Honourable senators, I thank Senator DeWare for her answer. It is my intention to introduce an amendment to the Census Act.

Senator DeWare: The honourable senator can suggest that if he wishes.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to and bill read second time.

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

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

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

CONFERENCE OF MENNONITES IN CANADA

PRIVATE BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING—
DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. Sharon Carstairs moved the second reading of Bill S-28, to amend the Act of incorporation of the Conference of Mennonites in Canada.

She said: Honourable senators, the Conference of Mennonites in Canada was founded in 1902 and was incorporated under an act of Parliament in 1947. Traditionally, the Conference of Mennonites in Canada was composed largely of Mennonites who immigrated to Canada in the 1870s, with later immigrations in the 1920s and 1940s. Today, it is comprised of approximately 260 congregations, working in partnership with provincial and regional conferences in Canada and consisting of over 35,000 individual members. Its membership includes representation from diverse ethnic groups. Although we in this country generally tend to think of Mennonites as being of German background, they are now composed of Chinese, Vietnamese, Loation, Cambodian, Taiwanese, French, Spanish, as well as German Canadians.

The bill before us, honourable senators, seeks to update the original incorporation act of 1947 to reflect the changing nature of the organization as we enter the new millennium. In brief, the bill has 11 clauses that seek to do the following: change the corporation's name to Mennonite Church Canada; revise the constitution of the corporation, including its objects and powers; delete certain restrictions on the holding and disposition of real property; and permit the corporation to carry out its objects and exercise its powers outside Canada.

Clause 1 of the bill would change the name of the corporation from “Conference on Mennonites in Canada” to “Mennonite Church Canada.” The reason for this change is that they now want to expand their activities outside this country. Furthermore, the Conference of Mennonites in Canada was integrated with the Mennonite Church of Eastern Canada in recent years and the new name, “Mennonite Church Canada,” more accurately describes the new entity and its expanded goals.

Clause 2 amends section 3 of the 1947 act to change the location of the head office of the corporation from Saskatchewan to Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Clause 2(2) is a technical change needed to update the old act to provide that head office changes can be communicated to the Minister of Industry. The old act referred to the Secretary of State, who is no longer responsible.

Clause 3 of the bill creates a new section 3.1 to the act. The new 3.1(1), 3.1(2) and 3.1(3) are standard clauses setting out the legal capacity of the corporation and its capacity to carry on its work in Canada and throughout other foreign jurisdictions so far as their laws allow.

The new 3.1(4) sets out the objects of the corporation by recognizing and adding to the original objects that were found in section 4 of the 1947 act. Section 4 of the 1947 act contained a mixture of powers and objects. The objects in clause 3 of the bill have been moved to a new section 3.1.

Clause 4(1) of this bill would amend section 4 of the original act to clarify that these are the powers of the corporation. Clauses 4(2), 4(3), 4(4) and 4(5) of the bill all make technical changes to the existing powers of the corporation.

Clause 4(6) adds two new standard powers to the corporation concerning the holding and disposition of real property. These are modelled on those found in the United Church Canada Act.

Clause 5 amends section 5 of the 1947 act to put a cap of 20 on the number of directors the corporation may have. It also provides for a minimum of three, as did the original act.

Clauses 6 and 9 of the bill amend section 6(a) and section 13 of the 1947 act, respectively, to modernize the act and to remove limiting factors to the corporation operating internationally.

Clause 7 repeals section 9 of the 1947 act, which placed old restrictions on the holding of property. These are no longer needed because of changes made in clause 4(6), as I have already mentioned.

Clause 8 replaces section 12 of the 1947 act to modernize the section dealing with who has the authority to sign for the corporation.

• (1550)

Clause 10 replaces section 15 of the 1947 act in order to make it more modern and general. It is a standard investment provision and was taken from the Lutheran Church Act.

[Senator Carstairs]

Clause 11 replaces section 16 of the 1947 act and concerns meetings of the corporation. This clause expands the act to allow for meetings of the corporation to take place abroad as well as in Canada. It also provides that three out of every four meetings must be held in this country.

As you can see, honourable senators, these changes are designed to ensure clarity of operation for the Mennonite Church. None are particularly unusual or revolutionary. It is always a concern of mine that we should even be dealing with this kind of legislation in this setting. Unfortunately, we have yet to find another means, and this is the only way in which the changes to its incorporation can take place.

I do want to close, honourable senators, by thanking the Mennonite community for its strong participation in the activities of Canada. The Mennonite Central Committee has been at the forefront in many parts of the world in that it has given so generously to those in need, many of whom were not of the Mennonite persuasion. This organization prides itself in enhancing the message that they received, as we all have received, that generosity should be a mark of each and every one of our lives. They are generous often beyond all measure of human kindness. It has been my pleasure to introduce this bill, and I recommend it to honourable senators.

Hon. Eymard G. Corbin: Would the honourable senator accept a question?

Senator Carstairs: Yes.

Senator Corbin: I realize that it could more properly be put before the committee, but I am curious. Clause 16(3) states:

For greater certainty and notwithstanding section 158 of the *Canada Corporations Act*, section 102 of that Act does not apply to the Corporation.

My question — and this may be strictly technical — is the following: What does section 102 of that act say?

Senator Carstairs: You have got me, Senator Corbin, because I have absolutely no idea. However, I will undertake to find that information and let the honourable senator know at the earliest possible time.

On motion of Senator Atkins, debate adjourned.

PRIVILEGES, STANDING RULES AND ORDERS

EIGHTH REPORT OF COMMITTEE—SPEAKER'S RULING—
DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Austin, P.C., seconded by the Honourable Senator Banks, for the adoption of the eighth report of the Standing Committee on Privileges, Standing Rules and Orders (changes to Rule 86), presented in the Senate on June 22, 2000;

And on the motion in amendment of the Honourable Senator Roche, seconded by the Honourable Senator Rompkey, P.C., that the Report be amended by adding, before “Respectfully submitted” the following words:

“Also, that the *Rules of the Senate* be amended as follows:

a. by adding a new Rule 85 (2.2)(a):

“(2.2)(a) The Committee of Selection may make a recommendation to the Senate that two additional members be added to any standing committee.”

b. by adding a new Rule 85 (2.2)(b):

“(2.2)(b) Senators may apply to sit on a standing committee either by application to their respective Whip or directly to the Committee of Selection.”—(*Speaker’s Ruling*).

[*English*]

This, of course, is the issue that Senator Kinsella raised in the point of order. Senator Roche made reference to the fact that when the Rules Committee looked at the number and size of committees last year they had done so in one report. Senator Austin also stated they had no problem with this amendment being considered as part of the report. Neither position, however, deals with the challenge raised by the point of order.

[*Translation*]

I have reviewed the eleventh report of the Rules Committee that was presented in the previous session on June 2, 1999. It is true, as was claimed, that the scope of that report included the addition of two new committees and the possible addition of members to all standing committees. The report also proposed new rules on the variable size of all standing committees. Moreover, it is evident that the wording of Senator Roche’s amendment follows closely the text of the eleventh report. On its face then, it would seem that the amendment might be in order. However, I am obliged as Speaker to take into account other criteria.

[*English*]

Senator Kinsella objected to the amendment because he alleged that it was not congruent to the content of the report and beyond its scope. I find myself in agreement with his assessment. The eighth report is very limited in its subject matter, unlike the eleventh report. It seeks only the creation of two new committees and nothing else. Any amendment to this report must fall within its limited scope and be relevant to its purpose. This amendment does not do that. Instead, the amendment seeks to empower the Committee of Selection to recommend the addition of two members to any standing committee. This amendment is really a new question and should be treated as a separate motion. This conclusion agrees with citation 579(2) of *Beauchene’s Parliamentary Rules & Forms*, Sixth Edition, on page 176, which prohibits amendments from raising new questions. Consequently, this amendment should be moved as a distinct motion after notice, which according to rule 57(1)(a) is two days.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, you will recall that during the sitting on Wednesday, June 28, the Senate heard some debate from Senator Roche on the eighth report of the Standing Senate Committee on Privileges, Standing Rules and Orders. That report recommends that the Senate establish two new committees; one on Defence and Security, the second on Human Rights. At the conclusion of his speech, Senator Roche proposed that the report be amended to make two additional changes to the *Rules of the Senate*. The first would authorize the Committee of Selection to recommend the nomination of two more senators to any standing committee over and above what is currently allowed in the rules. The second part of the senator’s amendment would permit senators to apply to sit on any standing committee by application either to their whip or directly to the Committee of Selection.

[*Translation*]

Immediately after Senator Roche had proposed his amendment, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, Senator Kinsella, raised a point of order to challenge its procedural acceptability. Senator Kinsella expressed the view that the amendment was inadmissible because it was incongruent with the content of the eighth report and beyond its scope. After several brief exchanges among senators, I agreed to take the point of order under advisement.

Let me begin by putting this point of order into context. The motion of Senator Austin seeks the approval of the Senate for the recommendation of the eighth report to amend the rules to allow for two new committees. It is the Senate itself that will pronounce itself on the substance of the report. All senators are involved in a question of this sort. All of us have a right to decide what rules we shall have. It is permissible for a senator to move an amendment. As with every amendment, however, it must be valid procedurally.

The proposed amendment is not in order.

Hon. Douglas Roche: I would like to thank His Honour for his ruling. It is perhaps incumbent upon me to seek leave to withdraw the motion. If that is so, I am prepared to do that. However, I need a signal from His Honour whether I should withdraw the motion.

The Hon. the Speaker: The motion is not in order, so it is dropped, Honourable Senator Roche. Nothing prevents you, as I have said in the ruling, from coming forth with a specific motion that does the same thing.

Senator Roche: Honourable senators, I shall do that in due course.

On motion of Senator Kinsella, debate adjourned.

CHANGING MANDATE OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

REPORT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
ON STUDY—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Stollery, seconded by the Honourable Senator Bolduc, for the adoption of the seventh report of the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs entitled: “The New NATO and the Evolution of Peacekeeping: Implications for Canada”, tabled in the Senate on April 5, 2000.—(*Honourable Senator Andreychuk*).

Hon. J. Michael Forrestall: Honourable senators, I wonder if I might intervene on the item that is standing in the name of Senator Andreychuk, simply to make a few comments for a particular reason. After having made those brief interventions, I would ask that the matter stand as it does now, in Senator Andreychuk’s name.

I wish to address one particular section of the report, and that is the section that concerns Canada’s capacity to serve adequately and with conviction in certain of the peacekeeping operations that we are carrying out around the world.

• (1600)

We are called upon from time to time to provide assistance in one form or another, not the least of which is helicopter support. We know about our current bad track record arising from difficulties with aging equipment and old aircraft.

As we now consider replacement for the seaborne equipment, we should keep in mind the important and helpful role that we can and do play alongside our allies through NATO and, in particular, through the United Nations. We should bear in mind that part of that responsibility lies in making available specialized equipment and trained crews. To that end, Canada can make no better contribution. We can make equal contributions but none superior to the contribution we could make if we could offer to the United Nations a good, operating, new fleet of helicopters.

On motion of Senator Forrestall, for Senator Andreychuk, debate adjourned.

THE BUDGET 2000

STATEMENT OF MINISTER OF FINANCE—
INQUIRY—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the inquiry of the Honourable Senator Lynch-Staunton calling the attention of the Senate

to the Budget presented by the Minister of Finance in the House of Commons on February 28, 2000.—(*Honourable Senator DeWare*).

Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, this matter is now at its fifteenth day. I have already spoken to it as a substantive matter. At a moment like this, I always recall the admonition I received from Senator Macquarrie when I first arrived here. He said, “Young fellow, you don’t speak twice in any one session.” However, I do wish to speak twice on this budget debate. I know that my colleague Senator DeWare will also be speaking to it shortly.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable Senator Kinsella, have you spoken already on this same inquiry?

Senator Kinsella: No.

The Hon. the Speaker: Please proceed then.

Senator Kinsella: Honourable senators, debates on a government’s budget tend to be somewhat retrospective, but I should like to make a few comments in a prospective vein.

We shall soon have an update on the budget. Around November, if not earlier, it is generally the practice of the Minister of Finance to give us a fiscal update. I would suspect that the update will reveal last year’s final figures and that these will likely show that the surplus last year was \$12 billion. At least that is what is being reported by *The Globe and Mail*. That compares to the Minister of Finance’s projection in February that the budget would be balanced if the government used its contingency amount, and that there would be a \$3-billion surplus if it did not.

Prospectively, again, the Minister of Finance will probably provide a revised forecast of revenue spending and the surplus for the current year and probably for the year after that as well. If those projected surpluses are to be believed, the government certainly has enough room to provide some assistance to low-income Canadians who are struggling to pay their fuel bills. That, honourable senators, is my plea in this debate.

Each of us who goes to the gas pump recognizes the significant increase in fuel prices. The government must do something about that. Because of the excellent infrastructure inherited by this government —

Senator Bryden: Plus a \$42-billion deficit. No problem spending that surplus.

Senator Kinsella: — we were able to seize upon the advantages of the North American Free Trade Agreement and to seize upon the elimination of the manufacturers’ sales tax. We welcome the fact that Canadians are enjoying a higher standard of living because of a government with a sense of responsible leadership and enough courage to take the tough economic decisions. It did so perhaps knowing that the succeeding government —

Senator Bryden: Yes, borrowing \$42 billion is a tough decision.

Senator Kinsella: — would sail along without a plan, without a vision. Thank God for the tough decisions taken by that Conservative government.

Senator Robichaud: Is this *Canadian Air Farce*?

Hon. Dan Hays (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I cannot resist asking Senator Kinsella if he would permit a question.

Senator Kinsella: I would be delighted to accept.

Senator Hays: This is an interesting topic for discussion. Two things crossed my mind as I listened to the intervention of Senator Kinsella. The Conservative budget of 1979, if I remember correctly, included an increase in fuel tax as one of its prominent features, but the budget was defeated and the government was defeated, albeit that was a minority government.

Would the honourable senator care to comment on the change in position of the Conservative Party, which he represents here, from that time to this time in regard to fuel taxes? Although I can anticipate the answer, I do want to hear the honourable gentleman's comments. I can elaborate on the question if need be.

My second thought related to the statement of the Minister of Finance that he is prepared to consider a reduction in motor fuel tax but only in the context of an initiative by a province or by the provinces.

Senator Kinsella: Honourable senators, I thank the Honourable Deputy Leader of the Government for those questions. First, I am quite willing to admit that he has probably forgotten more about the oil industry than I have ever learned in my life. As a distinguished Albertan, he comes from a province that seems now to forget that, a few years ago, the situation was very different.

Our friends in the province of Newfoundland will, hopefully soon, be in a similar position as the province of Alberta is in today. I am convinced that when that happens, my friends from Newfoundland will not be articulating the kinds of comments that we hear from many people in the other place. I hasten to add that I am referring to certain members who sit in the opposition and who have a worldview of our country that forgets the conditions found in that great oil-rich province of Alberta a few years ago.

• (1610)

Specifically, in answer to the question, I am proud to be a member of the Progressive Conservative Party and I look forward to an exciting next few months as we gear up to go to the people under our leader, who now sits in the House of Commons, the Right Honourable Joe Clark. We will not be adopting policies

where, every time there is a problem, we will hide behind the veil and say, "If the provinces do something, we might do something." That is not our definition of leadership. Our definition of leadership is to develop a national view that deals with the country as a whole —

Senator Taylor: That is called the national energy policy.

Senator Kinsella: — as opposed to the trap of the Balkanized view that our honourable friends opposite often fall into. The country must be viewed as a whole, and taxation at the federal level speaks to the revenue need that will ultimately respond to the national needs of all Canadians. It is a dangerous policy — and I trust it is not the policy of my honourable friend's party — that we only do things at the federal level if we can get the provincial governments to respond.

Consider the reality. If, in the province of Prince Edward Island, whose population is limited, there were a national need — and lower fuel prices is a national need — it would be incumbent upon the Province of Prince Edward Island to reduce some of the revenue that it is able to assess under provincial legislation under their provincial jurisdiction. That would be grossly unfair. That is the kind of analysis that we would expect from those who sit in the opposition benches in the other place. It is not the view of the Pearsons or, indeed, of the Trudeaus of the past. I suggest that we not go down that avenue.

Hon. Nicholas W. Taylor: Honourable senators, perhaps I could ask the oracle on the blue side of the house another question. Was the honourable senator aware that P.E.I. and New Brunswick, supposedly poor provinces, made more money from a litre of gasoline than did the province of Alberta, until the price of crude surpassed \$18 a barrel? In other words, for the last two or three years, those provinces made more from a barrel of gasoline than Alberta did, even though it was produced in Alberta.

Senator Kinsella: If my understanding is correct, we do not refine crude from Alberta; rather, we refine crude from Venezuela and from the Middle East and, indeed, paradoxically, I do not think we even refine crude from Hibernia at the largest oil refinery in Canada, namely, the Irving refinery in Saint John, New Brunswick.

Senator Taylor: That is possibly splitting hairs, since oil is swapped. They may buy it in the West. Where they get it from does not matter. The point is that, after the retail gasoline is delivered to the shores of those provinces, they tack on a retail tax as they do for a bottle of whiskey. Is the honourable senator aware that the tax that those provinces added on to a litre of gasoline was more than the Alberta government received for producing, out of the ground, a litre of gasoline, until the crude price surpassed \$18 a barrel? In the last two years, the Alberta government has been receiving less from producing a litre of gasoline than all the provinces in Canada that have been charging the retail tax.

Senator Kinsella: I am not delighted, but I am forced —

The Hon. the Speaker: I must interrupt the honourable Senator Kinsella. I am not quite clear where we are in the debate. Was the honourable senator asking a question or making a speech? Other senators may want to ask a question of Senator Taylor. Is Senator Taylor asking a question?

Senator Kinsella: We are at the point in the proceedings where I have made a speech as a result of which honourable senators were stimulated and are now asking me questions. I would be happy to answer Senator Taylor's question.

Not only does the Province of New Brunswick get more tax out of a purchased litre of gas than the Province of Alberta does, we also pay 15 per cent HST, which is not paid in Alberta. My point is — and the honourable senator helps me make my case — that many of the provinces of Canada which do not have the natural resources that other provinces have go a great distance in assessing and raising taxation to meet the needs of their people. The fact that we are paying 15 per cent on everything we buy in our stores, and people living in Edmonton are paying significantly less, illustrates why a litre of gasoline is significantly more expensive in our part of the country which is right next to the largest oil refinery in the country. It is because there is higher provincial taxation.

Hon. Lowell Murray: I wish to ask a question of Senator Kinsella.

Would the honourable senator agree to put his excellent research staff to work on two matters that have been raised just now in questions from the other side? Senator Taylor has spoken of the situation in New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. First, would Senator Kinsella confirm that gasoline prices are actually regulated by the Province of Prince Edward Island and perhaps bring in some details for the rest of us about how that is done and how they get away with it? I do not think it is the case in any other province.

Second, Senator Hays drew our attention to the fact that the Tory government in 1979 had proposed in its budget an 18-cents-a-gallon — we were then dealing with gallons rather than litres — increase in the price of gasoline. The budget and the government was defeated at the polls by the Liberal Party. Would Senator Kinsella inform us by what multiple of 18 cents gas taxes were increased in the succeeding four years by the Trudeau government?

Senator Kinsella: I thank Honourable Senator Murray for that question. I shall undertake to have our research staff delve into that question. I am sure that one of my colleagues in this ongoing debate will find an opportunity to present the results of that research.

On motion of Senator DeWare, debate adjourned.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

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— VOTE DEFERRED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Lynch-Staunton, seconded by the Honourable Senator Kinsella:

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;

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 the 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.—(*Honourable Senator Kinsella*).

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I must advise you that if Senator Lynch-Staunton speaks now, his speech will have the effect of closing debate on the motion. Please proceed.

Hon. John Lynch-Staunton (Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, the subject matter of Somalia has been off and on our Order Paper for over three years now. While I will not give its long history, I must remind colleagues of its purpose. It is to complete what the commission of inquiry into the deployment of Canadian forces into Somalia was forbidden to do, that is, to examine the last aspects of the post-deployment phase of the Somalia operation.

I wish to quote from the commission's report to explain the problem that it faced.

• (1620)

It starts off by saying:

First, the Inquiries Act provides the authority to subpoena witnesses, hear testimony, hire expert counsel and advisers, and assess evidence. Under normal circumstances, such

powers should have given us the confidence to present our findings without qualification. However, on January 10, 1997, while Parliament was adjourned, the Minister of National Defence announced that Cabinet had decided that this inquiry had gone on long enough, that all hearings must be cut off on or about March 31, 1997, and that a report with recommendations was required by June 30, 1997.

The commission report goes on to state that:

This was the response of the Government to our letter setting out reporting date options and requesting an extension until at least December 31, 1997, a period of time that would have allowed us to conclude our search for the truth. That search had already involved, among other things, thousands of hours of preparation and cross-examination of the individuals who played various roles in the Somalia deployment – and as time progressed, the superior officers to whom they reported. As our investigation progressed, we were able to move closer to the key centres of responsibility as we moved up the chain of command. Unfortunately, the Minister's decision of January 10, 1997, eliminated any possibility of taking this course to its logical conclusion and prevented us from fully expanding the focus to senior officers throughout the chain of command who were responsible before, during and after the Somalia mission.

The commission concludes this part of its report by stating:

The unexpected decision to impose a sudden time constraint on an inquiry of that magnitude is without precedent in Canada. There is no question that it has compromised and limited our search for the truth. It will also inhibit and delay corrective action to the very system that allowed the offence to occur in the first place.

Honourable senators, the result of this decision to close down the inquiry before it completed its work is that the reputations of senior Department of National Defence officials, military and civilian, as well as at least one former minister of national defence, have been blemished by innuendoes and testimony to which they have never had an opportunity to reply, despite formal requests to appear before the commission to do so. The only purpose of the original motion on Somalia was to complete what the government shamelessly refused the commission and to allow those in the key centres of responsibility an opportunity to reply to previous testimony in which they were mentioned. That this will not be done is a deep stain on the principle of the rule of law, and the Senate has an opportunity to correct that.

When the motion was reintroduced, events in Croatia were added to it. Indeed, over the years there has been a string of events involving the Department of National Defence which, once reported — usually through other than official sources — are denied or “subject to internal investigations,” whatever that means.

I now want to list some of the events over the last few years that have involved the Department of National Defence to show how important it is that a parliamentary committee, whether it be special or standing, do a thorough investigation of this department, which, to date, has been able to get away with internal examinations and with certain denials and — not to be too strong in wording — to use the wording of the Létourneau commission's report, cover-up.

The following is a list of what has been going on and reported regarding the Department of National Defence.

In June 1997, a colonel went missing after he was charged with fraud, bribery and obstructing justice while commander of Canadian peacekeepers in Haiti.

In the spring of 1998, *Maclean's* magazine did two cover stories about sexual assault and sexual harassment that went unpunished in the military. The medical records of one of the soldiers who survived an assault were subsequently leaked to the press in an effort to destroy her credibility.

In June 1998, it was reported that the senior naval officer in Washington was charged with fraud.

In July of that same year, it was reported that the Chief of Defence Staff, formerly the army commander, had ignored an army captain's memo about the alleged sexual harassment of a waitress by the former commander of the Canadian contingent in Somalia in 1993. The incident went unpunished by the former base commander who replaced the Chief of Defence Staff as commander of Canada's army.

In October 1999, it was reported that senior officers of the military police's National Investigative Service, the NIS, were under investigation for illegally using military vehicles to go to bars and shopping malls. Those charges were dropped by the military police. On that same day, it was reported that a former captain was charged with torture and confinement relating to a 1992 military training exercise. He was with the ill-fated platoon in Somalia the night of the March 4 shooting.

In October, it was reported that the Information Commissioner was prepared to ask for a police investigation after documents released under the Access to Information Act were shredded. Also in October, it was reported that members of the 430 helicopter squadron deployed to Haiti were under investigation for unsafe and unprofessional acts. The same month it was reported that Canadian Forces personnel may have been exposed to hazardous chemicals prior to the Kosovo deployment.

In November, it was reported that military justice treated lower ranks more severely than senior officers. Also in November, Warrant Officer Matt Stopford came forward to complain about the way that former peacekeepers were treated by the Canadian government after he and others became sick following overseas service.

In October, the Secretary-General of NATO, Lord Robertson, criticized Canada's lack of defence spending. After five years of infighting over the restructuring of the reserves, the government appointed the Honourable John Fraser to review the critical situation of Canada's militia.

In November 1999, it was reported that a senior NIS investigator was removed from the toxic soil investigation by the ombudsman for threatening legal action against the whistle-blower in the case. In the same month it was reported that documents had surfaced questioning the necessity of building a new armoury in Shawinigan, the Prime Minister's riding. A few days later it was reported that an internal DND survey found that 77 per cent of personnel felt the Canadian Forces were unprepared for war. A day later it was announced that military police were investigating allegations that Canadian peacekeepers had smuggled home confiscated foreign weapons from peacekeeping duties. A week later it was reported that the Minister of Defence closed an investigation into Canadian peacekeepers accused of smuggling refugees in Bosnia. Two days later it was reported that the Auditor General had uncovered a gasoline purchasing kickback scheme involving military personnel and that the investigation was dropped by the military police due to a lack of evidence. On that same day it was revealed that a senior Canadian Forces officer was under investigation for sexual misconduct at Cold Lake.

On December 6, it was revealed that nine members of Canada's elite commando unit JTF2 were charged with weapons violations. Ten days later it was reported that DND had left confidential documents aboard two warships sold to a private scrap dealer. It was earlier reported that the government had failed to remove a rocket launcher, satellite equipment and other communications hardware prior to sale.

Subsequently, it has been reported that the military police would not lay charges regarding Matt Stopford's alleged poisoning, which I mentioned earlier, and that the ombudsman's wish to review the case was disallowed and that a further board of inquiry recommended charges against the platoon members.

Last, but not least, an investigation is now underway into allegations that the Royal 22nd Regiment diverted money meant for training exercises to operate their regimental museum.

Add to these serious discipline and leadership breaches the profound lack of readiness in the Canadian Forces today; Sea Kings in constant emergency landings like the one that was ditched a few months ago in the Pacific; Hercules transport planes that could not go to Timor because of mechanical faults; CF-18s and their rudders, which are rotting out, and the aircraft failing to hit their targets 30 per cent of the time in Kosovo.

Honourable senators, the list goes on and on. What about the investigation of undiagnosed illness of Canadian peacekeepers from Croatia, which found that DND and Veterans Affairs' treatment of Canadian peacekeepers was disgraceful?

In January of this year, it was reported that a brigadier general was made the scapegoat as head of Canada's failing military medical services. On that same day it was disclosed that nine navy divers were facing court martial over the poaching of lobsters. Two have pleaded guilty, one was found guilty, one had charges dropped for lack of evidence, and five faced courts martial.

In January, it was also reported that off-duty military personnel used a helicopter to hunt caribou in Labrador. This followed an earlier incident when another Griffon helicopter crew buzzed the Confederation bridge. A senior Canadian officer was found guilty of being drunk in violation of the two-beer rule while commanding Canadian Forces personnel in Kosovo.

• (1630)

In January, it was reported that no cause had been determined of an undiagnosed illness afflicting Canadian peacekeepers in Croatia. This came after allegations of record tampering and shredding.

In February, it was reported that the military knew that it was on shaky legal grounds to order personnel heading to the gulf to take the suspected anthrax vaccine months before it convened a court martial on Sergeant Kipling. After years of failure and denial in coming to terms with sick Gulf War veterans, an independent autopsy on the late Terry Riordon found traces of depleted uranium in his body, a long-suspected cause of Gulf War sickness, long denied by DND even though DND had known that military radiation detectors had been inadequate since 1975.

In February, it was reported that the investigation into the theft of monies from HMCS *Montreal* had been halted for fear of violating the crew's privacy. In February, it was reported that the Honourable John Fraser's report to the Minister of Defence on the Canadian Forces progress had found that the senior military leadership was in need of a cultural shift. In the same month, it was announced that the Minister of National Defence would challenge his subpoena to testify before the Kipling court martial.

In March, in the trial of a former member of the Airborne Regiment for a bank robbery in Calgary in 1998, it was revealed that military weapons had been used in the robbery and that criminal gangs were trying to recruit Canadian military personnel because of their expertise with weapons and explosives.

In May, it was reported that DND was accused of a cover-up after two Canadian officers were beaten and interrogated in the Congo. On that same date, it was reported that between 1995 and 1999 there had been 25 racist incidents in the Canadian Forces. That same month, it was reported that members of JTF2 and the

naval reserves were suspected of being involved, along with a former member of the Airborne Regiment, in the 1998 Calgary bank robbery and that they were still serving in the Canadian Forces. Later, it was reported that a military investigation had found that members of Matt Stopford's platoon tried to poison him in Croatia in 1993.

In June, it was reported that it was widely known that soldiers in Croatia in 1993 were distraught over their conditions and mission and were hatching plots to harm their leaders.

Honourable senators, I am trying to present to this chamber that there are some very disturbing things going on in the department. We are only getting small fragments of information about them, and we leave it too much to DND to resolve the problems itself under its own conditions, within its own walls, without any parliamentary input whatsoever.

This is a bit off topic, but remember that the Aurora maritime patrol aircraft cannot fly too high due to aircraft skin weaknesses and it cannot fly too low due to altitude meter failures. The army's main battle tanks are too soft-skinned for front-line service, and its LAV vehicles were called junk in an internal report by the commander of Canada's Kosovo contingent. We have an army stretched so thin that it cannot deploy two battle groups at once and sustain them indefinitely overseas, and we have a navy that has had three ship collisions and two significant missile misfires, one of which hit a storage shed in British Columbia. We will put those down to human error, but there is something fundamentally wrong in the treatment of those who want to bring some semblance of order in a culture that for too long has been allowed to decide by itself, for itself, how certain charges and certain grievances should be treated.

I wish to end, honourable senators, by going back to this motion and quoting from a CBC interview on June 28 with former private Kyle Brown, who was there the night of the murder in Somalia and who, of all those who were charged and eventually found guilty — and there were not many — spent the longest time in jail. He has found himself in a position now to live in northern Alberta. He has an axe to grind, but I will quote him, knowing full well that his feelings toward this government and the military are certainly no longer very positive. He does say things here that I do share, as do, I hope, many in this chamber.

He was asked by the interviewer:

When this is all going on, your court martial, you get sentenced, you're in jail, and then afterwards the Somalia inquiry is going on. It's going on and you're thinking you know, I'm going to get my time, I'm going to get my say in this. And then the Somalia inquiry is shut down before they get to you. What was your reaction?

This is Brown's answer, or part-answer:

I've never heard of anything that was more of an affront to democracy, an affront to justice as the Liberal administration ending that inquiry. And I know exactly why they did it, we all do. Even if they want to pretend that they did it for different reasons we all know that the Liberals knew that they wouldn't be able to survive this inquiry if the truth was made known about their involvement.

Question:

It's still...unresolved with you?

Brown answers, in part:

...I think back on the injustices and the tragedies which are multi-level in this case, and I think the greatest tragedy to occur in this entire sordid affair was the fact that the inquiry was shut down. I viewed the inquiry as the last vestige of justice, not only for myself but for the Airborne Regiment and for the two commandos, but the government just didn't want to see that. The government didn't want the truth, they just wanted silence.

Again, keep in mind the authorship of those statements and the background to them, but there is a lot of truth to that. The government shut down the Somalia inquiry because it did not want to know, as Justice Létourneau himself said, the truth.

Honourable senators, the purpose of this motion is to get to that truth, and I hope that the motion will be supported. The chances of that are quite slim, and I appreciate that. I know that there is a proposal on the Order Paper to create a standing committee on national defence, which I support, but not at this time, because I do not think that we should look at our committees in isolation. I think we should look at the whole committee structure and the resources available to them.

I had hoped that during the summer, at the urging of this side, the Rules Committee would have been able to look at the committee structure and come back with specific recommendations as soon as we reconvened. Unfortunately, that was not done. If this motion is not given the support I think it deserves, I would hope that a committee on national defence, once it is formed, will have as its first obligation to the people of Canada a term of reference that would allow it to go into a thorough examination of the Department of National Defence, particularly in terms of discipline, in terms of fairness, in terms of equality of treatment and in terms of allowing those members who have grievances an opportunity to air them. They must be given a fair hearing, rather than be dismissed or dealt with internally without any opportunity for the public and, in particular, Parliament, which represents the public, to see that fairness and justice are done.

That, honourable senators, is the purpose of this motion, and I thank you for your patience.

[Senator Lynch-Staunton]

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

Some Hon. Senators: Yes.

Some Hon. Senators: No.

The Hon. the Speaker: Will those honourable senators in favour of the motion please say "yea"?

Some Hon. Senators: Yea.

The Hon. the Speaker: Will those honourable senators opposed to the motion please say "nay"?

Some Hon. Senators: Nay.

The Hon. the Speaker: In my opinion, the "nays" have it.

And two honourable senators having risen:

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, we will have a standing vote. Is there an agreement between the whips?

• (1640)

Hon. Mabel M. DeWare: I move that the standing vote be deferred until tomorrow at 5:30 p.m.

The Hon. the Speaker: Pursuant to our rules, the opposition whip requests that the vote be deferred until tomorrow at 5:30 p.m. Is it agreed, honourable senators?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

BUSINESS OF THE SENATE

ADJOURNMENT

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

Hon. Dan Hays (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I would like to move a motion which, under the provisions of our rules, I will change somewhat from the text before me in that we now have a vote scheduled for 5:30 p.m. tomorrow. I was not aware of that possibility at the time this particular adjournment motion was drafted. Accordingly, I will make some modifications to ensure that we accommodate that decision of this chamber.

Therefore, 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, September 20, 2000, at 1:30 p.m.; and

That at 3:30 p.m. tomorrow, if the business of the Senate has not been completed, the Speaker shall interrupt the proceedings to suspend the Senate until 5:30 p.m. for the taking of the deferred vote on the motion of Senator Lynch-Staunton and any deferred vote which might occur on September 20, 2000; and

That all matters on the Orders of the Day and on the Notice Paper that have not been dealt with by 3:30 p.m. shall retain their original position.

Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Perhaps the Deputy Leader of the Government would agree that it might be more convenient for the conduct of tomorrow's business if we could have an agreement that the vote be deferred until 3:30 in order that the bells will ring at 3:15 and the committees shall proceed following the vote.

Senator Hays: I hear significant support for that idea. In order to be on good terms with my colleagues, I would be happy to so agree. I do point out that it is possible that votes will be called tomorrow, and that part of the motion that deals with a vote that is deferred tomorrow would provide that it be deferred to 5:30 p.m. Though I am not aware of any votes that will be deferred to that time, we must provide for that eventuality.

Subject to that, I agree with my colleague and would amend the motion that I have made accordingly.

The Hon. the Speaker: Is leave granted to rescind the decision to defer the vote until 5.30 p.m.?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

The Hon. the Speaker: The next proposal before us which deals with the motion which was changed from the text that I have is that we meet tomorrow at 1:30. Perhaps I should ask for agreement on my understanding of the motion rather than quote the exact wording of the motion. Is the motion that at 3:15 the

sitting of the Senate be suspended, the bells will then ring, and the vote will be held at 3:30?

Senator Hays: Your Honour, I suggest that we ought to indicate that the vote will be on item number 7.

The Hon. the Speaker: The item to which we are referring is number 7, the motion by the Honourable Senator Lynch-Staunton. Is it agreed, honourable senators?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Senator Hays: However, Your Honour, a matter may arise for which we need a division and which might require to be deferred until 5:30 tomorrow. That is why I elaborated on this motion, as I have on all occasions. In the event that happens, that deferred division would take place at 5:30 on Wednesday, as would normally be the case, even though the Senate had adjourned, by order, at 3:30.

Senator Kinsella: If I might be of assistance, it is our understanding that we will meet tomorrow at 1:30 p.m. At 3:15, the Speaker will call for the ringing of the bells. A vote will be taken on the motion of Senator Lynch-Staunton. At the end of that vote, there may be a suspension of the sitting because a deferred vote has occurred between 1:30 and 3:15. If there is no such deferred vote, the motion will not be for suspension, but rather for adjournment.

Senator Hays: That is correct.

The Hon. the Speaker: That would be the preferable way to proceed. We cannot agree to both suspend and adjourn. We cannot do both at the same time. Thus, we will address the subject of suspension or adjournment tomorrow when we reach that point. Is it agreed, honourable senators?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

The Senate adjourned until Wednesday, September 20, 2000, 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

GARY O'BRIEN

LAW CLERK AND PARLIAMENTARY COUNSEL

MARK AUDCENT

USHER OF THE BLACK ROD

MARY McLAREN

THE MINISTRY

According to Precedence

(September 19, 2000)

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

(September 19, 2000)

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
Herbert O. Sparrow	Saskatchewan	North Battleford, Sask.
Gildas L. Molgat, <i>Speaker</i>	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
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.	Ottawa-Vanier	Ottawa, Ont.
E. Leo Kolber	Victoria	Westmount, Que.
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.
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	Fredericton-York-Sunbury	Fredericton, N.B.
John Buchanan, P.C.	Nova Scotia	Halifax, N.S.
Mabel Margaret DeWare	Moncton	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.
Thérèse Lavoie-Roux	Quebec	Montreal, Que.
J. Michael Forrestall	Dartmouth and Eastern Shore	Dartmouth, N.S.
Janis Johnson	Winnipeg-Interlake	Winnipeg, Man.
Eric Arthur Bertson	Saskatchewan	Saskatoon, Sask.
A. Raynell Andreychuk	Regina	Regina, Sask.
Jean-Claude Rivest	Stadacona	Quebec, Que.
Terrance R. Stratton	Red River	St. Norbert, Man.
Marcel Prud'homme, P.C.	La Salle	Montreal, Que.
Leonard J. Gustafson	Saskatchewan	Macoun, Sask.

ACCORDING TO SENIORITY

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
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	Ontario-Vanier	Ottawa, Ontario
John G. Bryden	New Brunswick	Bayfield, N.B.
Rose-Marie Losier-Cool	Tracadie	Bathurst, N.B.
Céline Hervieux-Payette, P.C.	Bedford	Montreal, Que.
William H. Rompkey, P.C.	Labrador	North West River, Labrador, Nfld.
Lorna Milne	Peel County	Brampton, Ont.
Marie-P. Poulin	Nord de l'Ontario/Northern Ontario	Ottawa, Ont.
Shirley Maheu	Rougemont	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.
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 Territory	Whitehorse, Y.T.
George Furey	Newfoundland and Labrador	St. John's, Nfld.
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.
John Wiebe	Saskatchewan	Swift Current, Sask.
Tommy Banks	Alberta	Edmonton, Alta.
Raymond G. Squires	Newfoundland	St. Anthony, Nfld.
Jane Marie Cordy	Nova Scotia	Dartmouth, N.S.
Betty Kennedy	Ontario	Milton, Ont.
Raymond C. Setlakwe	La Laurentide	Thetford Mines, Que.

SENATORS OF CANADA

ALPHABETICAL LIST

(September 19, 2000)

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address	Political Affiliation
THE HONOURABLE			
Adams, Willie	Nunavut	Rankin Inlet, Nunavut	Lib
Andreychuk, A. Raynell	Regina	Regina, Sask.	PC
Angus, W. David	Alma	Montreal, Que.	PC
Atkins, Norman K.	Markham	Toronto, Ont.	PC
Austin, Jack, P.C.	Vancouver South	Vancouver, B.C.	Lib
Bacon, Lise	De la Durantaye	Laval, Que.	Lib
Banks, Tommy	Alberta	Edmonton, Alta.	Lib
Beaudoin, Gérald-A.	Rigaud	Hull, Que.	PC
Berntson, Eric Arthur	Saskatchewan	Saskatoon, Sask.	PC
Bolduc, Roch	Golfe	Sainte-Foy, Que.	PC
Boudreau, J. Bernard, P.C.	Nova Scotia	Halifax, N.S.	Lib
Bryden, John G.	New Brunswick	Bayfield, N.B.	Lib
Buchanan, John, P.C.	Halifax	Halifax, N.S.	PC
Callbeck, Catherine S.	Prince Edward Island	Central Bedeque, P.E.I.	Lib
Carney, Pat, P.C.	British Columbia	Vancouver, B.C.	PC
Carstairs, Sharon	Manitoba	Victoria Beach, Man.	Lib
Chalifoux, Thelma J.	Alberta	Morinville, Alta.	Lib
Christensen, Ione	Yukon Territory	Whitehorse, Y.T.	Lib
Cochrane, Ethel	Newfoundland	Port-au-Port, Nfld.	PC
Cohen, Erminie Joy	New Brunswick	Saint John, N.B.	PC
Comeau, Gerald J.	Nova Scotia	Church Point, N.S.	PC
Cook, Joan	Newfoundland	St. John's, Nfld.	Lib
Cools, Anne C.	Toronto-York	Toronto, Ont.	Lib
Corbin, Eymard Georges	Grand-Sault	Grand-Sault, N.B.	Lib
Cordy, Jane Marie	Nova Scotia	Dartmouth, N.S.	Lib
De Bané, Pierre, P.C.	De la Vallière	Montreal, Que.	Lib
DeWare, Mabel Margaret	Moncton	Moncton, N.B.	PC
Di Nino, Consiglio	Ontario	Downsview, Ont.	PC
Doody, C. William	Harbour Main-Bell Island	St. John's, Nfld.	PC
Eyton, J. Trevor	Ontario	Caledon, Ont.	PC
Fairbairn, Joyce, P.C.	Lethbridge	Lethbridge, Alta.	Lib
Ferretti Barth, Marisa	Repentigny	Pierrefonds, Que.	Lib
Finestone, Sheila, P.C.	Montarville	Montreal, Que.	Lib
Finnerty, Isobel	Ontario	Burlington, Ont.	Lib
Fitzpatrick, Ross	Okanagan-Similkameen	Kelowna, B.C.	Lib
Forrestall, J. Michael	Dartmouth and the Eastern Shore	Dartmouth, N.S.	PC
Fraser, Joan Thorne	De Lorimier	Montreal, Que.	Lib
Furey, George	Newfoundland and Labrador	St. John's, Nfld.	Lib
Gauthier, Jean-Robert	Ontario-Vanier	Ottawa, Ont.	Lib
Gill, Aurélien	Wellington	Mashteuiatsh, Pointe-Bleue, Que.	Lib
Grafstein, Jerahmiel S.	Metro Toronto	Toronto, Ont.	Lib
Graham, Bernard Alasdair, P.C.	The Highlands	Sydney, N.S.	Lib
Gustafson Leonard J.	Saskatchewan	Macoun, Sask.	PC
Hays, Daniel Phillip	Calgary	Calgary, Alta.	Lib
Hervieux-Payette, Céline, P.C.	Bedford	Montreal, Que.	Lib
Johnson, Janis	Winnipeg-Interlake	Winnipeg, Man.	PC
Joyal, Serge, P.C.	Kennebec	Montreal, Que.	Lib
Kelleher, James Francis, P.C.	Ontario	Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.	PC
Kennedy, Betty	Ontario	Milton, Ont.	Lib
Kenny, Colin	Rideau	Ottawa, Ont.	Lib
Keon, Wilbert Joseph	Ottawa	Ottawa, Ont.	PC

SENATORS OF CANADA

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address	Political Affiliation
THE HONOURABLE			
Kinsella, Noël A.	Fredericton-York-Sunbury	Fredericton, N.B.	PC
Kirby, Michael	South Shore	Halifax, N.S.	Lib
Kolber, Leo E.	Victoria	Westmount, Que.	Lib
Kroft, Richard H.	Manitoba	Winnipeg, Man.	Lib
Lavoie-Roux, Thérèse	Quebec	Montreal, Que.	PC
Lawson, Edward M.	Vancouver	Vancouver, B.C.	Ind
LeBreton, Marjory	Ontario	Manotick, Ont.	PC
Losier-Cool, Rose-Marie	Tracadie	Bathurst, N.B.	Lib
Lynch-Staunton, John	Grandville	Georgeville, Que.	PC
Maheu, Shirley	Rougemont	Saint-Laurent, Que.	Lib
Mahovlich, Francis William	Toronto	Toronto, Ont.	Lib
Meighen, Michael Arthur	St. Marys	Toronto, Ont.	PC
Mercier, Léonce	Mille Isles	Saint-Élie d'Orford, Que.	Lib
Milne, Lorna	Peel County	Brampton, Ont.	Lib
Molgat, Gildas L. <i>Speaker</i>	Ste-Rose	Winnipeg, Man.	Lib
Moore, Wilfred P.	Stanhope St./Bluenose	Chester, N.S.	Lib
Murray, Lowell, P.C.	Pakenham	Ottawa, Ont.	PC
Nolin, Pierre Claude	De Salaberry	Quebec, Que.	PC
Oliver, Donald H.	Nova Scotia	Halifax, N.S.	PC
Pearson, Landon	Ontario	Ottawa, Ontario	Lib
Pépin, Lucie	Shawinigan	Montreal, Que.	Lib
Perrault, Raymond J., P.C.	North Shore-Burnaby	North Vancouver, B.C.	Lib
Pitfield, Peter Michael, P.C.	Ottawa-Vanier	Ottawa, Ont.	Ind
Poulin, Marie-P.	Nord de l'Ontario/Northern Ontario	Ottawa, Ont.	Lib
Poy, Vivienne	Toronto	Toronto, Ont.	Lib
Prud'homme, Marcel, P.C.	La Salle	Montreal, Que.	Ind
Rivest, Jean-Claude	Stadacona	Quebec, Que.	PC
Robertson, Brenda Mary	Riverview	Shediac, N.B.	PC
Robichaud, Fernand, P.C.	New Brunswick	Saint-Louis-de-Kent, N.B.	Lib
Robichaud, Louis-J., P.C.	L'Acadie-Acadia	Saint-Antoine, N.B.	Lib
Roche, Douglas James	Edmonton	Edmonton, Alta.	Ind
Rompkey, William H., P.C.	Labrador	North West River, Labrador, Nfld.	Lib
Rossiter, Eileen	Prince Edward Island	Charlottetown, P.E.I.	PC
St. Germain, Gerry, P.C.	Langley-Pemberton-Whistler	Maple Ridge, B.C.	Ind
Setlakwe, Raymond C.	La Laurentide	Thetford Mines, Que.	Lib
Sibbeston, Nick G.	Northwest Territories	Fort Simpson, N.W.T.	Lib
Simard, Jean-Maurice	Edmundston	Edmundston, N.B.	PC
Sparrow, Herbert O.	Saskatchewan	North Battleford, Sask.	Lib
Spivak, Mira	Manitoba	Winnipeg, Man.	PC
Squires, Raymond G.	Newfoundland and Labrador	St. Anthony, Nfld.	Lib
Stollery, Peter Alan	Bloor and Yonge	Toronto, Ont.	Lib
Stratton, Terrance R.	Red River	St. Norbert, Man.	PC
Taylor, Nicholas William	Sturgeon	Bon Accord, Alta.	Lib
Tkachuk, David	Saskatchewan	Saskatoon, Sask.	PC
Watt, Charlie	Inkerman	Kuujuuaq, Que.	Lib
Wiebe, John	Saskatchewan	Swift Current, Sask.	Lib
Wilson, The Very Reverend Dr. Lois M.	Toronto	Toronto, Ont.	Ind

SENATORS OF CANADA
BY PROVINCE AND TERRITORY

(September 19, 2000)

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.	Ottawa-Vanier Ottawa
4	Jerahmiel S. Grafstein	Metro Toronto Toronto
5	Anne C. Cools	Toronto-York Toronto
6	Colin Kenny	Rideau Ottawa
7	Norman K. Atkins	Markham Toronto
8	Consiglio Di Nino	Ontario Downsview
9	James Francis Kelleher, P.C.	Ontario Sault Ste. Marie
10	John Trevor Eyton	Ontario Caledon
11	Wilbert Joseph Keon	Ottawa Ottawa
12	Michael Arthur Meighen	St. Marys Toronto
13	Marjory LeBreton	Ontario Manotick
14	Landon Pearson	Ontario Ottawa
15	Jean-Robert Gauthier	Ontario-Vanier Ottawa
16	Lorna Milne	Peel County Brampton
17	Marie-P. Poulin	Northern Ontario Ottawa
18	The Very Reverend Dr. Lois M. Wilson	Toronto Toronto
19	Francis William Mahovlich	Toronto Toronto
20	Vivienne Poy	Toronto Toronto
21	Isobel Finnerty	Ontario Burlington
22	Betty Kennedy	Ontario Milton
23
24

SENATORS BY PROVINCE AND TERRITORY

QUEBEC—24

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

SENATORS BY PROVINCE—MARITIME DIVISION

NOVA SCOTIA—10

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
1 Bernard Alasdair Graham, P.C.	The Highlands	Sydney
2 Michael Kirby	South Shore	Halifax
3 Gerald J. Comeau	Nova Scotia	Church Point
4 Donald H. Oliver	Nova Scotia	Halifax
5 John Buchanan, P.C.	Halifax	Halifax
6 J. Michael Forrestall	Dartmouth and Eastern Shore	Dartmouth
7 Wilfred P. Moore	Stanhope St./Bluenose	Chester
8 J. Bernard Boudreau, P.C.	Nova Scotia	Halifax
9 Jane Marie Cordy	Nova Scotia	Dartmouth
10		

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	Fredericton-York-Sunbury	Fredericton
6 Mabel Margaret DeWare	Moncton	Moncton
7 Erminie Joy Cohen	New Brunswick	Saint John
8 John G. Bryden	New Brunswick	Bayfield
9 Rose-Marie Losier-Cool	Tracadie	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		
4		

SENATORS BY PROVINCE—WESTERN DIVISION

MANITOBA—6

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

BRITISH COLUMBIA—6

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

SASKATCHEWAN—6

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
1 Herbert O. Sparrow	Saskatchewan	North Battleford
2 Eric Arthur Berntson	Saskatchewan	Saskatoon
3 A. Raynell Andreychuk	Regina	Regina
4 Leonard J. Gustafson	Saskatchewan	Macoun
5 David Tkachuk	Saskatchewan	Saskatoon
6 John Wiebe	Saskatchewan	Swift Current

ALBERTA—6

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

 SENATORS BY PROVINCE AND TERRITORY

 NEWFOUNDLAND—6

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
1 C. William Doody	Harbour Main-Bell Island	St. John's
2 Ethel Cochrane	Newfoundland	Port-au-Port
3 William H. Rompkey, P.C.	Labrador	North West River, Labrador
4 Joan Cook	Newfoundland	St. John's
5 George Furey	Newfoundland and Labrador	St. John's
6 Raymond G. Squires	Newfoundland	St. Anthony

 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 Thérèse Lavoie-Roux	Quebec	Montreal, Que.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF STANDING, SPECIAL AND JOINT COMMITTEES

(As of September 19, 2000)

*Ex Officio Member

ABORIGINAL PEOPLES

Chair:	Honourable Senator Chalifoux	Deputy Chair:	Honourable Senator
Honourable Senators:			
Andreychuk,	Christensen,	Johnson	Rompkey,
*Boudreau, (or Hays)	Cochrane,	*Lynch-Staunton, (or Kinsella)	Sibbeston,
Chalifoux,	DeWare,	Pearson,	Watt.
	Gill,		

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Andreychuk, Austin, Beaudoin, *Boudreau (or Hays), Chalifoux, Christensen, Comeau, DeWare, Gill, Johnson
Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella), Pearson, Sibbeston, Watt.

**THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ABORIGINAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN RELATION
TO NORTHERN NATIONAL PARKS**

Chair:	Honourable Senator Christensen	Deputy Chair:	Honourable Senator
Honourable Senators:			
Andreychuk,	Christensen,	*Lynch-Staunton, (or Kinsella)	Sibbeston,
*Boudreau, (or Hays)	Cochrane,		Watt.

AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

Chair:	Honourable Senator Gustafson	Deputy Chair:	Honourable Senator Fairbairn
Honourable Senators:			
*Boudreau, (or Hays)	Gustafson,	Robichaud, (<i>Saint-Louis-de-Kent</i>)	Sparrow,
Cordy,	*Lynch-Staunton, (or Kinsella)	Rossiter,	Stratton,
Fairbairn,	Oliver,	Setlakwe,	Wiebe.
Fitzpatrick,			

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

**Boudreau (or Hays), Chalifoux, Fairbairn, Fitzpatrick, Ferretti Barth, Gill, Gustafson, *Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella),
Oliver, Robichaud (Saint-Louis-de-Kent), Sparrow, Spivak, St. Germain, Stratton.*

**THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON FORESTRY
(Agriculture and Forestry)**

<p>Chair: Honourable Senator Fitzpatrick</p> <p>Honourable Senators:</p> <p>*Boudreau, Fitzpatrick, (or Hays) Gill, Fairbairn,</p>	<p>Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator</p> <p>*Lynch-Staunton, Oliver, (or Kinsella) Stratton.</p>
--	--

BANKING, TRADE AND COMMERCE

<p>Chair: Honourable Senator Kolber</p> <p>Honourable Senators:</p> <p>Angus, Furey, *Boudreau Hervieux-Payette, (or Hays) Kelleher, Fitzpatrick, Kolber,</p>	<p>Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Tkachuk</p> <p>Kroft, Oliver, *Lynch-Staunton, Poulin (or Kinsella) Tkachuk, Meighen, Wiebe.</p>
---	---

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Angus, *Boudreau (or Hays), Fitzpatrick, Furey, Hervieux-Payette, Joyal, Kelleher, Kenny, Kolber,
Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella), Meighen, Oliver, Tkachuk.

ENERGY, THE ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

<p>Chair: Honourable Senator Spivak</p> <p>Honourable Senators:</p> <p>Adams, Christensen, Banks, Cochrane, *Boudreau, Eyton, (or Hays) Finnerty, Buchanan,</p>	<p>Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Taylor</p> <p>Kelleher, Spivak, Kenny, Taylor. *Lynch-Staunton, (or Kinsella) Sibbeston,</p>
---	---

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Adams, *Boudreau (or Hays), Buchanan, Chalifoux, Christensen, Cochrane, Eyton, Furey,
Kenny, *Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella), Sibbeston, Spivak, St. Germain, Taylor.*

FISHERIES

Chair: Honourable Senator Comeau
Honourable Senators:

Adams, Cook,
 *Boudreau, Johnson,
 (or Hays) *Lynch-Staunton,
 Carney (or Kinsella)
 Comeau,

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Perrault

Mahovlich, Robichaud,
 Meighen, (Saint-Louis-de-Kent)
 Perrault, Squires,
 Robertson, Watt.

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

**Boudreau (or Hays), Carney, Comeau, Cook, Doody, Furey, *Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella), Mahovlich, Meighen, Murray, Perrault, Perry, Robichaud (Saint-Louis-de-Kent), Watt.*

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Chair: Honourable Senator Stollery
Honourable Senators:

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

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Andreychuk

De Bané, *Lynch-Staunton,
 Di Nino, (or Kinsella)
 Furey, Stollery,
 Grafstein, Taylor.

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

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

INTERNAL ECONOMY, BUDGETS AND ADMINISTRATION

Chair: Honourable Senator Rompkey
Honourable Senators:

*Boudreau DeWare,
 (or Hays) Forrestall,
 Cohen, Kenny,
 Comeau, Kroft,
 De Bané,

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Nolin

*Lynch-Staunton, Robichaud,
 (or Kinsella) (Saint-Louis-de-Kent)
 Maheu, Rompkey,
 Milne, Simard,
 Nolin, Stollery.
 Poulin,

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

**Boudreau (or Hays), Cohen, De Bané, DeWare, Forrestall, Kelly, Kenny, Kroft, *Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella), Maheu, Milne, Nolin, Poulin, Robichaud (Saint-Louis-de-Kent), Rompkey, Rossiter, Stollery.*

LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS

Chair:	Honourable Senator Milne	Deputy Chair:	Honourable Senator Beaudoin
Honourable Senators:			
Andreychuk,	Cools,	*Lynch-Staunton,	Nolin,
Beaudoin,	Fraser,	(or Kinsella)	Pearson.
Buchanan,	Joyal,	Milne,	Pépin.
*Boudreau (or Hays),		Moore,	

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection
*Andreychuk, Beaudoin, *Boudreau (or Hays), Cools, Fraser, Ghitler, Joyal, Kelleher,*
**Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella), Milne, Moore, Nolin, Pearson, Poy.*

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT (Joint)

Joint Chair:	Honourable Senator Louis Robichaud	Deputy Chair:	
Honourable Senators:			
Atkins,	Finnerty,	Poy,	Robichaud,
Cordy,	Grafstein,		(L'Acadie-Acadia).

Original Members agreed to by Motion of the Senate
Atkins, Finnerty, Grafstein, Poy, Robichaud (L'Acadie-Acadia), Ruck.

NATIONAL FINANCE

Chair:	Honourable Senator Murray	Deputy Chair:	Honourable Senator Cools
Honourable Senators:			
Banks,	Doody,	Kinsella,	Moore,
Bolduc,	Finestone,	*Lynch-Staunton,	Murray,
*Boudreau, (or Hays)	Finnerty,	(or Kinsella)	Stratton.
Cools,	Ferretti Barth,	Mahovlich,	

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection
*Bolduc, *Boudreau (or Hays), Cools, Finestone, Finnerty, Ferretti Barth, Kinsella,*
**Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella), Mahovlich, Moore, Murray, Perry, Stratton.*

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES (Joint)

Joint Chair: Honourable Senator Losier-Cool
Honourable Senators:

Beaudoin, Losier-Cool,
 Fraser,

Deputy Chair:

Rivest. Robichaud,
 (L'Acadie-Acadia)
 Setlakwe.

Original Members agreed to by Motion of the Senate
Beaudoin, Fraser, Gauthier, Losier-Cool, Meighen, Pépin, Rivest, Robichaud (L'Acadie-Acadia).

PRIVILEGES, STANDING RULES AND ORDERS

Chair: Honourable Senator Austin
Honourable Senators:

Andreychuk, DeWare,
 Austin, Di Nino,
 *Boudreau, Doody,
 (or Hays) Gauthier,
 Corbin, Grafstein,

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator

Gustafson, *Lynch-Staunton,
 Joyal, (or Kinsella)
 Kroft, Robichaud,
 Losier-Cool, (L'Acadie-Acadia).
 Rossiter.

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection
*Austin, Bacon, Beaudoin, *Boudreau (or Hays), DeWare, Gauthier, Ghitter, Grafstein, Grimard, Joyal,*
*Kelly, Kroft, *Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella), Maheu, Pépin, Robichaud (L'Acadie-Acadia), Rossiter.*

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS (Joint)

Joint Chair: Honourable Senator Hervieux-Payette
Honourable Senators:

Bryden, Finestone,
 Cochrane,

Deputy Chair:

Hervieux-Payette, Rivest.
 Moore,

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection
Cochrane, Finestone, Furey, Grimard, Hervieux-Payette, Moore, Perry, Rivest.

SELECTION

Chair:	Honourable Senator Mercier	Deputy Chair:	
Honourable Senators:			
Atkins,	Fairbairn,	Kirby,	Mercier,
Austin,	Grafstein,	*Lynch-Staunton, (or Kinsella)	Murray,
*Boudreau, (or Hays)	Kinsella,		Nolin.

Original Members agreed to by Motion of the Senate
*Atkins, Austin, *Boudreau (or Hays), DeWare, Fairbairn, Grafstein, Kinsella,*
*Kirby, *Lynch-Staunton or (Kinsella), Mercier, Murray.*

SOCIAL AFFAIRS, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Chair:	Honourable Senator Kirby	Deputy Chair:	Honourable Senator LeBreton
Honourable Senators:			
Banks,	Carstairs,	Keon,	*Lynch-Staunton, (or Kinsella)
Beaudoin,	Cohen,	Kennedy,	Roberston.
*Boudreau, (or Hays)	Cook,	Kirby,	
Callbeck,	Fairbairn,	LeBreton,	

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection
**Boudreau (or Hays), Callbeck, Carstairs, Cohen, Cook, Di Nino, Fairbairn, Gill, Kirby,*
*Lavoie-Roux, LeBreton, *Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella), Pépin, Robertson.*

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

Chair:	Honourable Senator Meighen	Deputy Chair:	Honourable Senator Wiebe
Honourable Senators:			
Atkins,	Kirby,	Meighen,	Pépin,
*Boudreau, (or Hays)	*Lynch-Staunton, (or Kinsella)		Wiebe.

THE SPECIAL SENATE COMMITTEE ON ILLEGAL DRUGS

Chair:	Honourable Senator Nolin	Deputy Chair:	Honourable Senator Carstairs
Honourable Senators:			
Carstairs,	Kenny,	Nolin,	Rossiter.
*Boudreau, (or Hays)	*Lynch-Staunton, (or Kinsella)	Pépin,,	

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Carstairs, *Boudreau (or Hays), Kenny *Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella), Nolin, Pépin, Rossiter.*

TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

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

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.*

**THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS
(Transport and Communications)**

Chair:	Honourable Senator Poulin	Deputy Chair:	Honourable Senator Spivak
Honourable Senators:			
*Boudreau, (or Hays)	Finestone,	*Lynch-Staunton, (or Kinsella)	Poulin,
	Johnson,	Perrault,	Spivak.

**THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION SAFETY
(Transport and Communications)**

Chair: Honourable Senator Forestall

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Adams

Honourable Senators:

Adams,

Callbeck,

*Lynch-Staunton,

Perrault,

*Boudreau,
(or Hays)

Forestall,

(or Kinsella)

Spivak.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, September 19, 2000

	PAGE		PAGE							
SENATORS' STATEMENTS										
The Senate										
Welcome. The Hon. the Speaker	1926	Senator Boudreau	1931							
Justice										
Effect of Child Sex Tourism Statute in Extraterritorial Jurisdictions. Senator Carstairs	1926	World Trade Organization—Inconsistency Between Stance on Asbestos Ruling Involving France and Policy on Environment— Government Position. Senator Kelleher	1931							
Health Care										
Senator Keon	1926	Senator Boudreau	1931							
Ms Léa Roback										
Tribute. Senator Pépin	1927	Church Community								
Indian Affairs—Financial Support for Lawsuits by Former Students of Residential Schools—Government Policy. Senator Roche ..				1931						
Assistance to Ethiopia				Senator Boudreau	1931					
Senator Oliver	1927	Fisheries and Oceans								
Mr. Scott Kirkness				Burnt Church, New Brunswick—Dispute Over Fishery—Request for Update on Arbitration Process. Senator Robertson	1932					
Tribute on Receiving Award for Bravery. Senator Poulin	1928	Senator Boudreau	1932							
Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission				Legal and Constitutional Affairs						
Ruling Denying TVOntario Request to Distribute Télévision française de l'Ontario in Quebec. Senator Gauthier	1928	Possibility of Televising Hearings on Citizenship Bill. Senator Kinsella	1933							
<hr/>				Senator Beaudoin	1933					
ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS				Answer to Order Paper Question Tabled						
Official Languages				Concerning the Canadian Food Inspection Agency and Environmental Assessments of Genetically Engineered Organisms. Senator Hays		1933				
Annual Report of Commissioner Tabled.	1928	<hr/>								
Canadian NATO Parliamentary Association				ORDERS OF THE DAY						
Canadian Delegation to Spring Session of North Atlantic Assembly Held in Budapest, Hungary—Report Tabled. Senator Rompkey	1928	Parliament of Canada Act								
The Senate				Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act (Bill C-37)						
Proposed Change to Rules Regarding Official Languages Joint Committee—Notice of Motion. Senator Gauthier	1929	Bill to Amend—Third Reading—Debate Adjourned. Senator Hays				1933				
French-Language Broadcasting Service				Defence Production Act (Bill S-25)						
Notice of Inquiry. Senator Gauthier	1929	Bill to Amend—Second Reading—Debate Adjourned. Senator Rompkey				1934				
Official Languages in Ontario				Senator Forrestall				1936		
Notice of Inquiry. Senator Gauthier	1929	Broadcasting Act (Bill S-24)				Bill to Amend—Second Reading—Debate Continued. Senator Kinsella		1936		
<hr/>				Senator Hays				1937		
QUESTION PERIOD				Statistics Act						
National Defence				National Archives of Canada Act (Bill S-15)						
Replacement of Sea King Helicopters—Costing Elements of Procurement Competition. Senator Forrestall	1929	Bill to Amend—Second Reading. Senator DeWare				1938				
Senator Boudreau	1929	Senator Taylor				1939				
Foreign Affairs				Referred to Committee.				1939		
World Trade Organization—Request for Win-Loss Record on Dispute Rulings. Senator Kelleher	1930	Conference of Mennonites in Canada (Bill S-28)				Private Bill to Amend—Second Reading—Debate Adjourned. Senator Carstairs		1939		
				Senator Corbin				1940		
				Privileges, Standing Rules and Orders				Eighth Report of Committee—Speaker's Ruling—Debate Continued. The Hon. the Speaker		1941
								Senator Roche		1941

PAGE

PAGE

Changing Mandate of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization

Report of Foreign Affairs Committee on Study—Debate Continued.
Senator Forrestall 1942

The Budget 2000

Statement of Minister of Finance—Inquiry—Debate Continued.
Senator Kinsella 1942
Senator Hays 1943
Senator Murray 1944

National Defence

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—
Vote Deferred. Senator Lynch-Staunton 1945
Senator DeWare 1948

Business of the Senate

Adjournment. Senator Hays 1948
Senator Kinsella 1949

Appendix i



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