



CANADA

# Debates of the Senate

---

1st SESSION

• 37th PARLIAMENT

• VOLUME 139

• NUMBER 113

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Tuesday, May 7, 2002**

—  
THE HONOURABLE DAN HAYS  
SPEAKER

## 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, May 7, 2002

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

Prayers.

### SENATORS' STATEMENTS

#### NATIONAL HOSPICE PALLIATIVE CARE WEEK

**Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, May 5 to 12 is National Hospice Palliative Care Week. This week provides us with an opportunity to give praise to the individuals who work tirelessly to promote and deliver palliative care in Canada.

Tremendous progress has been made on the palliative care file since I rose to mark this occasion a year ago today. I was able to provide honourable senators with the details on this progress, as well as the Government of Canada's commitment to palliative care, during my speech on the inquiry initiated by the Honourable Senator Cordy. Today, I think it is important to draw the attention of honourable senators to some of the achievements of ordinary Canadians, the achievements that I have become aware of during my travels across Canada.

"What Do I Do Now? A Resource Guide for Persons Who Have Experienced the Death of a Loved One," is a community publication, authored by Lynn Yetman and sponsored by the Colchester Bereaved Support Group. This pamphlet provides those who have experienced the loss of a family member with assistance on coping with practical matters after a death has occurred. Matters such as funeral arrangements, estate settlements, bill paying and insurance are covered.

John Tomczak, a gentleman who lost his wife in the late 1980s, started a walking group program to help raise awareness for Victoria Hospice and to provide bereaved individuals an opportunity to share their experiences and offer friendship and assistance. This week will be the fifth anniversary of the Awareness Walk for Victoria Hospice, and I wish all this year's walkers much success.

Both formal and informal caregivers are another crucial component of palliative care. Strengthening the support offered to family caregivers involves ensuring that they are aware of and able to access the services available locally, from respite care to counselling. It involves helping them access appropriate educational materials. It also means ensuring that medical professionals are sensitized to their needs. The Family Caregivers Association of Nova Scotia does all of this and more.

Cheryl Moore, a primary nurse working in cancer care in Brantford, Ontario, designed and published a personal care journal. This journal provides space for appointments, personal details, doctor information and, of course, lots of room to write down thoughts and feelings.

There are many more stories to tell, all of them of people who work tirelessly without accolades, day in and day out, to ensure quality end-of-life care for Canadians. Their constant energy and dedication is what drives hospice palliative care. It is the reason we are moving forward on this issue in Canada.

Honourable senators, it is these individuals to whom I wish to pay tribute this afternoon.

#### THE HONOURABLE FRANCIS WILLIAM MAHOVLICH

CONGRATULATIONS ON RECEIVING  
HONORARY DOCTOR OF LAWS DEGREE FROM  
ST. FRANCIS XAVIER UNIVERSITY

**Hon. B. Alasdair Graham:** Honourable senators, there is a new doctor in the house.

The Canadian legend of six Stanley Cups, nine National Hockey League all-star teams, and the Canadian Sports Hall of Fame, the Honourable (Frank) Francis W. Mahovlich became Dr. Mahovlich when he was awarded an honorary Doctor of Laws degree at spring convocation exercises at St. Francis Xavier University in Antigonish, Nova Scotia, over the weekend.

I am sure I will be forgiven for just a bit of partisanship when I suggest that this legendary hockey icon came to the home of champions to achieve this very special recognition.

The "Big M" is now the "Big X."

It was fitting that Dr. Mahovlich received his doctoral degree at the first graduation exercises in the new Charles Keating Millennium Centre which, among many other things, is the new home of the St. FX men's and women's varsity hockey teams.

• (1410)

The presence of our newly minted doctor caused quite a stir, both on the St. FX campus and in surrounding communities. Generations were linked together. Students and senior citizens crowded Senator Mahovlich wherever he went, either for an autograph, a picture or just a kind word. There were even occasional traffic jams on the stage as the chancellor, Bishop Colin Campbell, and the president, Dr. Sean Riley, conferred degrees and graduates paused to shake Frank's hand, get an autograph, or to pose for the camera lens of a proud parent.

As I said when I introduced Senator Mahovlich to this chamber on June 15, 1998, if there ever was an inspirational and visible ambassador for the game of hockey and a model for our youth, it has been the great left-winger Frank Mahovlich, a man of power and grace and trademark skating style, whose blades flashed brilliantly — a hockey legend who has learned all there is to learn about endurance and courage, and about humility being part of the elation that comes with winning.

I do not know of anyone who has given as much time to Canadian youth as the “Big M.” When one watches him at work with them, as I was able to do this past weekend, one sees the magic of a presence that gives not only tremendous motivation, but belief and hope and confidence as well, along with all the values, class and nobility that are part of the persona of one of Canada’s finest gentlemen emissaries of the sport of hockey.

Senator Mahovlich, you are indeed a symbol of national pride and courage in the pursuit of excellence.

Of particular significance, honourable senators, was the mention by President Riley in his citation of the numerous charitable organizations and events to which Senator Mahovlich has devoted so much of his time and talent since his retirement from the National Hockey League in 1978.

In his address, our colleague gave timely advice to his student classmates. He was a model of excellence for the graduating class of 2002 and a great credit to this institution.

Congratulations, Senator Mahovlich — Dr. Mahovlich.

#### MENTAL HEALTH WEEK

**Hon. Yves Morin:** Honourable senators, May 6 to 12 is Mental Health Week.

[*Translation*]

Five of the top ten causes of disability in the world are related to mental illness: major depression, schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, alcoholism and obsessive-compulsive disorder.

[*English*]

During Mental Health Week, the Canadian Mental Health Association is inviting Canadians to share the message of hope through stories of resiliency and recovery. The theme “Emerging into Light, Sharing our Stories” focuses on increasing the visibility of mental illness to reduce stigma and promote dialogue and understanding.

About one out of every five Canadians will suffer from mental illness at some point in their lives. At least 1 per cent of the population is likely to have a serious and persistent mental illness, such as schizophrenia, at any given time.

[*Translation*]

Under the skilled leadership of its scientific director, Dr. Rémi Quirion, the Institute of Neurosciences, Mental Health and Addiction, one of the Canadian Institutes of Health Research, encourages mental health research.

For example, thanks to CIHR funding, Dr. Michel Maziade of Laval University, in Quebec City, is studying the genetics of complex psychiatric disorders such as schizophrenia and bipolar disorder. This research will contribute to the development of effective treatments.

[*English*]

Beginning in mid-May, 30,000 Canadians will participate in the Canadian Community Health Survey on Mental Health and Well-being, developed by Statistics Canada, to determine prevalence rates of selected mental disorders. The results, available in 2003, will inform and guide our understanding of mental health issues.

Honourable senators, Mental Health Week brings to light stories of courage and kindness. Let us respect the courage required to cope with mental illness, accepting the differences while staying focused on the similarities amongst all.

[*Translation*]

#### PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION IN FRANCE

**Hon. Lise Bacon:** Honourable senators, last week, in France, I had the privilege of witnessing a historic moment in French democracy, along with Senators Maheu and Beaudoin, and two members of the House of Commons.

This visit, which was organized through the Canada-France Interparliamentary Association, with the attentive and effective cooperation of our embassy, had been scheduled for a long time, but the circumstances that you are all familiar with gave it a special dimension.

Honourable senators, France is not out of the woods. The unequivocal victory of Jacques Chirac over his opponent Jean-Marie Le Pen in the second ballot of the presidential election did not solve anything, and France is entering a period of strong turbulence.

During our stay, we had many meetings, both in Paris and outside the French capital, with politicians representing the left and the right, but not extremists. We attended political meetings, including the last big meeting of Jacques Chirac, three days before the election.

We also met with business people. We attended a major public debate, a long-standing tradition in France, that included intellectuals, philosophers, politicians, opinion leaders and journalists. The debate took place at the Bataclan. It is a small Parisian theatre, but the event was a major one.

We met with experts on the French election system at the ministère de l’Intérieur, the home ministry, and with researchers interested in the extreme right-wing phenomenon in France. I will have the opportunity to provide you with all the details of our visit. For the time being, let me just say that the political debate we attended dealt with the very foundations of the French republic, namely, democracy, liberty, equality and fraternity. Incidentally, we should not forget that France is the fourth world power.

The rise of the extreme right-wing movement has triggered a fundamental review of French institutions, and even of the Fifth Republic itself. The expectations of the French people are huge: security, integration of immigrants, youth unemployment, poverty, the complexity of the levels of power, Europe, the gap between politicians and the public, and so on.

After reaffirming the great values that make up their country, French politicians will have to rise above partisan bickering, including the experience of cohabitation, which has often undermined the state's ability to meet public needs.

This time, France cannot afford to make a mistake.

[English]

### VISITOR IN THE GALLERY

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable senators, I wish to draw your attention to the presence in the gallery of Ms Karla Jessen Williamson, the first female Executive Director of the Arctic Institute of North America. She is the guest of Senator Watt.

Welcome.

---

## QUESTION PERIOD

### INTERNATIONAL TRADE

#### RENEWAL OF SOFTWOOD LUMBER AGREEMENT

**Hon. Gerry St. Germain:** Honourable senators, my question is to the Leader of the Government in the Senate. It relates to softwood lumber.

In British Columbia, as we march closer to D-Day in regard to the tariff that has been imposed, the Liberal government has known since 1993 that this is a disaster waiting to happen. Knowing full well that softwood lumber was not properly covered under the Free Trade Agreement, why is it that the government went through the 1996 process and did not take any action to have softwood lumber declared a commodity to be freely traded?

• (1420)

**Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, I am puzzled by the honourable senator's question. Does he want a specific reference to every single commodity in the Free Trade Agreement or does he want us to enter into free trade agreements in good faith, using the best negotiators available and then using the dispute settlement mechanisms that are built in to those free trade agreements in order to settle problems that ensue?

**Senator St. Germain:** Honourable senators, we knew that this was a problem area. Yet, it has been virtually neglected. We are now marching towards disaster, when thousands of British Columbians will lose their jobs. It is not a question of whether you are NDP, Liberal, Conservative, Alliance or whatever. It is a question of communities being devastated. I sometimes wonder what would occur if this were happening in either Ontario or

Quebec. Approximately 50 per cent of the softwood lumber exported from this country comes from British Columbia. What is happening between now and disaster day? Could the minister inform all Canadians who are impacted? Alberta, Ontario and Quebec will experience a negative impact by this decision, but it will be more severely felt in British Columbia. Could the minister give an update as to where we are at the present time?

**Senator Carstairs:** Honourable senators, let us begin with the premise of Senator St. Germain's question as to whether B.C. is being treated differently. This is not just a British Columbia problem, as the honourable senator then went on to enunciate after he made the attack in the first instance. It is a problem in other provinces as well. It is a problem in Atlantic Canada, Quebec, Ontario and Alberta. Yes, it is a significant problem in British Columbia.

Honourable senators, it is a tragedy that the dispute settlement mechanism — and the honourable senator was a member of the other party that worked so hard to achieve it — did not work. If it worked, then we would have a genuine Free Trade Agreement and a genuine NAFTA agreement. However, it does not work. Therefore, we must use other mechanisms. We are using the mechanisms of the WTO and NAFTA because what we thought were good faith negotiations did not happen. They broke down, not because our side broke down but because the Americans broke down.

**Senator St. Germain:** Honourable senators, I do not want to be argumentative.

**Senator Taylor:** Perish the thought.

**Senator St. Germain:** Senator Taylor, if you had any respect at all, you would give up your seat to the elected senators of Alberta, so be quiet.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Oh, oh!

**Senator St. Germain:** I have had it. I have been listening for three years now to these attacks from Senator Taylor and I have had it. I hated to say that because I like Senator Taylor. He is a nice man.

Honourable senators, my supplementary question to the Leader of the Government in the Senate is this: Can the minister tell us if there will be a relief package of some form that does not jeopardize future trade relations with the United States? Will there be some relief not only for the people of Alberta, Ontario and Quebec who are affected by this situation, but especially the people of British Columbia who will have to bear the most severe impact?

Honourable senators, I differ with the minister in that I do not believe that the Atlantic provinces will be affected as negatively.

**Senator Carstairs:** The honourable senator can disagree all he wants. The reality, however, is that the people of Atlantic Canada involved in the lumber business will also be suffering as a result of the decision by the Americans not to settle.

[ Senator Bacon ]

Honourable senators, there have been discussions. However, as Senator St. Germain pointed out so well in his question, one of the problems with providing relief programs is that they will in turn lead to further countervailing and anti-dumping charges by those living south of the border, who, despite the fact that they keep losing these rulings over and over again, use the slightest instance to make further challenges.

Honourable senators, the governments are still working together. What has pleased me throughout this issue has been the work of all the provinces involved, in that they have worked collectively with the federal government. It would have been easy for any one of them to go off on a tangent or in a new direction, but they hung tough together. Those negotiations and discussions remain ongoing.

**Hon. Pat Carney:** Honourable senators, my first question is to the Leader of the Government in the Senate. I attended the softwood summit called by our premier, which was also attended by Minister Dhaliwal and Minister Pettigrew and about 50 members of the British Columbia softwood community who have been severely impacted.

I heard the mayors and the industry representatives explain how terribly impacted their communities were. I also read with disbelief the comments by Minister Pettigrew, who, although present, did not hear these arguments and subsequently told the media there had been no unemployment in British Columbia because of the softwood lumber issue.

Is there a specific cabinet committee dealing with this issue and drawing together the various funding cabinet ministries, the Minister of International Trade and the Minister of Natural Resources? Is there a working group of ministers dealing with this issue, which, as the minister points out, is national in scope, or is there a group in the PCO that is dealing with this issue? That information would be valuable for us to know.

**Senator Carstairs:** Honourable senators, I can tell the honourable senator that there is no formal cabinet committee working on this matter. However, I can tell her that a number of ministers have been working together, including the Minister of Human Resources Development, who also planned to be at the softwood summit but was called back to Ottawa on another matter.

There is a group of ministers working together and pooling their information and their staffs in order to come up with a package that will work to everyone's advantage.

**Senator Carney:** Honourable senators, I should like to know the name of this working group, because ministers working together must have a site or a committee or an infrastructure or some mechanism to work together. I would appreciate it if the leader could give me the name.

Second, for the record, as the minister responsible for the FTA, I found the honourable senator's remarks about dispute settlement confusing. Could she clarify them? The process was as follows: A softwood lumber agreement was to be dealt with in the FTA. The FTA set in place a formula for dealing with anti-dumping and countervail in seven years. That target was not met in the WTO. In NAFTA each country agreed to keep their anti-dumping and countervail laws and make changes in the WTO.

I found the honourable senator's comments about the dispute settlement mechanism failing in the context of those agreements puzzling. What is the minister proposing?

**Senator Carstairs:** As I indicated to the honourable senator, there is no formal working or cabinet committee. There is a group of ministers who are working together to bring their expertise to this matter.

In terms of the dispute settlement agreement, if the dispute settlement mechanism worked, we would not constantly have to prove to the Americans that we are not engaged in unfair practices. We have proved it over and over again. We no sooner prove it than yet another action is launched against us by the United States. Clearly, the rules that were set up do not work.

• (1430)

**Senator Carney:** Canada won this agreement in the WTO. The minister is quite right in pointing out that American law permits the Americans to bring these actions against us. I asked specifically what the honourable leader would suggest in its place.

**Senator Carstairs:** I was not a part of the negotiating team. I would like to reverse the question: What would the honourable senator suggest, since she negotiated the agreement and it has not worked?

**Senator Carney:** I want to answer that question. When I negotiated, we put in an export border tax that allowed the provinces to change the stumpage arrangements. No mill closed and no one was out of work.

#### DISTINGUISHED VISITOR IN THE GALLERY

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Before proceeding to Orders of the Day, honourable senators, I draw your attention to the presence in the gallery of our former colleague, the Honourable Archie Johnstone. Welcome.

#### BUSINESS OF THE SENATE

**Hon. Michael Kirby:** Honourable senators, I seek leave to revert to Notices of Motions.

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

**Some Hon. Senators:** Agreed.

**Hon. John Lynch-Staunton (Leader of the Opposition):** Leave is given at the end of Routine Proceedings.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** The suggestion has been made, Senator Kirby, that our practice is to request leave at the end of Routine Proceedings.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT BILL, 2001

MESSAGE FROM COMMONS—  
REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of Honourable Senator Carstairs, P.C., seconded by the Honourable Senator Robichaud, P.C.,

That the Senate do not insist on its amendment numbered 1(a) to Bill C-15A, to amend the Criminal Code and to amend other Acts to which the House of Commons has disagreed; and

That a message be sent to the House of Commons to acquaint that House accordingly.

**Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Honourable senators, I rise to speak to the motion of Senator Carstairs. It is important for the integrity of the Senate as a chamber of reflection, a chamber of legislative review, a chamber, as they say, of second sober thought, that we examine very carefully the nature of the disagreement existing between the House of Commons and the Senate on this matter, as indicated in that message now before us from the other place.

Honourable senators, I agree with the assessment of Senator Carstairs as to the debate on Bill C-15A as it unfolded in the House of Commons. An examination of the Hansard of the House of Commons clearly demonstrates the unfortunately poor level at which they debated this very important bill and the level of the atmosphere in which they were considering the Senate amendments. To quote from Senator Carstairs at page 2716 of the *Debates of the Senate*:

As we saw happen in the other place just a few days ago, such issues can easily degenerate. We could hear, “You like pornography,” or, “You will support pornographers,” ...

I believe that it is incumbent on all senators to look behind this decision of the House of Commons to reject Senate amendment 1(a) given the atmosphere in the House of Commons when they took that decision, a decision that was taken not in an atmosphere or environment of calm, reflective assessment but rather a decision coloured by name-calling and confusion. If ever there was a case to be made justifying the existence of the Senate, a chamber of calm reflection wherein decisions of the House of Commons are subjected to revision and review, the message before us today is such a case.

Honourable senators, we must not fail in our duty. I believe that Senator Carstairs is not only correct in her assessment of what happened in the other place but that she has raised a valid point concerning the difficulty that has been discovered with the precise wording of Senate amendment 1(a). We are told that the Department of Justice thinks the amendment, as presently worded, is not necessary because an Internet service provider — Yahoo!, for example — that has child pornography transmitted through its system, will not be found guilty of such transmission if it is unaware or has no knowledge of the transmission.

The argument being advanced is that the Crown would first have to prove *mens rea*. As Senator Carstairs said:

However, if service providers knowingly transmit child pornography, they should and would be found guilty.

I agree again with Senator Carstairs. In order to deal in a reflective manner, but expeditiously, I would suggest that we look at her words “knowingly transmit” to determine whether they would be appropriate in a re-crafting of our amendment 1(a). I think the doctrine of due diligence comes to play a role here. That, too, must also be part of our consideration.

The best way to handle this matter in an expeditious fashion and yet provide a reflective, calm assessment would be to refer the message to the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs.

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

**Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Therefore, honourable senators, I move, seconded by the Honourable Senator Rossiter:

That the motion, together with the Message from the House of Commons on the same subject, dated April 23, 2002, be referred to the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs for consideration and report.

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

**Hon. Senators:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

• (1440)

[Translation]

### COMPETITION ACT COMPETITION TRIBUNAL ACT

BILL TO AMEND—REPORT OF COMMITTEE—  
ORDER STANDS

The Senate proceeded to consideration of the sixteenth report of the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce (Bill C-23, An Act to amend the Competition Act and the Competition Tribunal Act, with one amendment and observations), presented in the Senate on May 2, 2002.

**Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Deputy Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, it was my distinct impression that the Chair of the Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce, who had presented this report in the chamber last week, was going to give a short speech today to explain the work done by the committee. As you know, the committee’s report, presented in the Senate on May 2, 2002, following consideration of Bill C-23, contained an amendment and observations. Usually, when a bill is reported with amendments, the chair or his or her representative provides us with a brief explanation of the scope of the report.



Not having taken part in this committee's hearings, honourable senators, I would not try to explain the report to you myself. I do not wish to begin debate on the topic, but instead propose that we deal with this point later today or tomorrow.

[*English*]

**Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Honourable senators, there has been no motion to deal with the matter.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable senators, that is true; it has not been moved. Does any honourable senator wish the matter to stand?

**Some Hon. Senators:** Stand.

Order Stands.

### FOOD AND DRUGS ACT

#### BILL TO AMEND—THIRD READING— DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Grafstein, seconded by the Honourable Senator Cook, for the third reading of Bill S-18, to amend the Food and Drugs Act (clean drinking water).—(*Honourable Senator Sibbeston*).

**Hon. Nick G. Sibbeston:** Honourable senators, I am pleased to contribute to the debate on Bill S-18 from the northern perspective. Water — good, pure, clear water — is critically important to the health of all people. The provision of potable water might be the single most important thing governments can do. It impacts on the health care systems, on the economy, on every aspect of community life. Recent events have demonstrated that we can never have enough safeguards when it comes to protecting our water supply. The situation in the North is no less severe than in other parts of Canada, and in many ways the provision of good water is even more challenging.

I believe it will come as some surprise to honourable senators that delivering clean water in the North is a problem. After all, the North is a land of ice and snow; surely, there can be no lack of water. Indeed, the northern territories, which comprise a third of Canada's land mass, have 18 per cent of its lakes and rivers. Counting water flowing north from the provinces, nearly a quarter of all Canada's groundwater flows through the territories. Great Bear Lake and Great Slave Lake are two of the largest fresh bodies of water in North America, and the Mackenzie River, at 4,000 kilometres long, is one of the largest rivers. Yet much of the North is a cold desert with a lot of the water permanently locked in ice or permafrost. Still, one would think there must be plenty of

water for the rather small number of people who live there, and there is, even if it is often trapped beneath metres of ice during the cold winter months.

The challenge, of course, is getting the water from lakes and rivers into people's houses. There are very few water and sewer systems like you have in the South, with water delivered through underground pipes. These exist only in the larger towns and even then are often supplemented by other systems, such as above-ground utilidors or truck services.

In small communities, the most common system consists of a fill station at a lake, river or reservoir, where trucks take on water a few thousand litres at a time and deliver it to tanks in people's houses. Usually people have water tanks of 200 gallons or 300 gallons, and water is delivered a number of times a week as needed. Where reservoirs are used, as in Tuktoyaktuk, Pangnirtung or Fort Good Hope, the expense is enormous. The reservoirs have to be big enough to supply the community for a year, and deep enough so they do not freeze to the bottom in the winter. They have to be built in the short summer season with materials barged in from the South. Each year these reservoirs must be refilled from lakes and rivers, often from some distance away. In some communities, there are simple water purification plants that filter and chlorinate water. In others, water treatment consists of dumping a cup of chemicals in the top of the tank after every fill.

Twenty years ago, when I was Minister of Local Government in the Northwest Territories Government, that cup might have been filled from a bottle labelled "Javex Bleach." Things are a bit more sophisticated now, but the principle is the same. It is not always easy to maintain even those simple systems because there are limited resources to train people properly. Even a very small mistake can lead to big problems. In Jean Marie River, a small community south of where I live, Fort Simpson, the person responsible for filling the reservoir made a mistake in terms of the season in which he carried out this procedure. It was a mistake of only a week or two but the water supply became contaminated as a result, and this created quite a health problem for the community.

Even where more sophisticated systems are in place, problems can arise. Many years ago, an in-ground pipe delivery system was built in a High Arctic community. It promptly froze solid and has never been used to this day. More recently, in Cape Dorset in Nunavut, the heating system in the waterline that carried water from a lake to a large storage tank broke down. The line froze solid and split in numerous places. This occurred in the middle of winter with temperatures hovering near minus 40. A new system had to be flown in from Ottawa by Hercules aircraft and installed as quickly as possible. It is a credit to the engineers and other workers that they were able to do this before a more serious problem arose.

Fortunately, the quality of water in the North has been generally good. There have been few boil-water advisories, and those mostly in the spring when you get heavy runoff and lots of sediment in the water. Testing by the water managers is done regularly in communities or at the station. Territorial or federal

officials conduct more complex tests once or twice a year. So far, so good, no serious outbreaks, such as those in Walkerton or North Battleford, have yet occurred, but the danger is certainly there.

Honourable senators, it is not enough to deliver safe water. It must also be drinkable water. As you can imagine, when you are simply dumping chemicals in a water truck, the result is not always very tasty. People do not always want to drink it when it contains these chemicals. They prefer to use an alternative. This can be snow water or ice water, which tastes better. When I am home, I prefer to make my tea from snow taken from the middle of a pristine field. In some communities, such as Colville Lake, there are installations of in-house filter systems and other innovative methods so that people can have safe, clean water that also passes the “tea test.”

Honourable senators, the territorial governments are doing what they can. For example, in the Northwest Territories, all of the funds originally allocated from the federal infrastructure program are being used this year to upgrade water and sewer systems. Some \$11 million will be spent over the next three years on water and a similar amount on sewer systems. This is in addition to the \$7 million or \$8 million spent each year by governments and consumers to operate existing systems. Similarly, in Nunavut, the government is reviewing all of the community water systems to make sure they are adequate and capable of delivering potable water.

Unlike in southern Canada, the federal government still plays a significant role in water management in the North. This is changing and will continue to change over time as these authorities are transferred to territorial and self-government institutions, but for now the federal government is still involved, through DIAND, in doing water studies and managing watershed issues. They also act as the enforcement agency for water licences issued by various water boards in claim settlement areas. However, because their focus is on the big picture, they sometimes do not recognize the impact of events on community water supplies and do not always let communities know when events occur that might affect them.

• (1450)

To conclude, the delivery of potable water in the North is a special challenge, and there are clearly gaps in the level of certainty. This bill will help close some of those gaps by providing a further means to monitor and control the purity of water. Water is a big issue — big enough that it requires all of us, as citizens and as governments, to be involved.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Deputy Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, Senator St. Germain informed me that he wished to speak to this bill. I therefore move that debate be adjourned in his name until the next sitting of the Senate.

[ Senator Sibbeston ]

On motion of Senator Robichaud, for Senator St. Germain, debate adjourned.

[*English*]

## FEDERAL NOMINATIONS BILL

### SECOND READING—SPEAKER'S RULING— ORDER STANDS

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Stratton, seconded by the Honourable Senator Cohen, for the second reading of Bill S-20, to provide for increased transparency and objectivity in the selection of suitable individuals to be named to certain high public positions.—(*Honourable Senator Tkachuk*). (*Speaker's Ruling*).

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable senators, I am now ready to give my ruling on this item under our Senate public bills business heading. However, I do not wish to do so in the absence of the senator who raised the point of order, Senator Cools. I will wait until she is in the chamber.

Order stands.

[*Translation*]

## NATIONAL ANTHEM ACT

### BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING— DEBATE CONTINUED

On the order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Poy, seconded by the Honourable Senator Banks, for the second reading of Bill S-39, to amend the National Anthem Act to include all Canadians.—(*Honourable Senator Lapointe*).

**Hon. Jean Lapointe:** Honourable senators, I have spent many hours studying the national anthem and its English version. I have discovered that the Honourable Stanley Weir protected his copyright by registering his text with Delmar Music Company in 1908. This creation could not therefore be altered thereafter by anyone without authorization by the author.

The action taken in 1968, on recommendation by the special joint committee of the Senate and House of Commons, is sacrilegious and displays a lack of respect toward the Honourable Mr. Weir. The situation has gone on long enough. Enough is enough! We have absolutely no right to lay a finger on our national anthem, even though certain individuals have, in their ignorance, dared to do so.

Unfortunately, we can do nothing about the past. To do such a thing today would be like touching up a Riopelle painting on the pretext that we dislike one of the colours.

I do, however, understand the reaction of other senators, but this was only a matter of interpretation. In my humble opinion, the expression “sons command” encompasses, in a poetic way, the men and the women of Canada. Let us stop taking ourselves for song-writers. If we want to be one, we need to apply for membership in SOCAN. I am, in fact, a card-carrying member myself, which is why I speak up when it comes to even the most minor alteration to an artistic creation.

If, honourable senators, we make even the most minor alteration to our national anthem, we are creating a precedent, which could lead to even more drastic changes, so that down the road we would end up with a national anthem that had no connection with the original. This would be a denial of our history, our past, its moments of glory and its moments of difficulty. It would be a denial of this rallying cry sung by our people on millions of occasions. Most of them have sung it in a spirit of patriotism toward and admiration for this country, which many from other countries consider “God’s country.”

[English]

**Hon. Jim Tunney:** Honourable senators, I have some brief comments in relation to Bill S-39.

For many years, we have changed our phraseology, our terminology and the way we express ourselves. I am convinced all of those changes were made in an effort to improve and to express our understanding of who we are.

I rise to support this bill in the manner proposed.

On motion of Senator Tunney, for Senator Jaffer, debate adjourned.

## FEDERAL NOMINATIONS BILL

### SECOND READING—SPEAKER’S RULING

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Stratton, seconded by the Honourable Senator Cohen, for the second reading of Bill S-20, to provide for increased transparency and objectivity in the selection of suitable individuals to be named to certain high public positions.—(*Honourable Senator Tkachuk*). (*Speaker’s Ruling*).

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Since Senator Cools is now in the chamber, I will give my ruling on the matter she raised.

[Translation]

Honourable senators, last Thursday, May 2, Senator Cools raised a point of order in connection with second reading of Bill S-20, a bill designed to increase transparency and objectivity in the process of appointment to certain public offices.

[English]

The point of order raised doubts about the propriety of proceeding with second reading given that Royal Consent had not yet been signified for this private member’s bill, even though a ruling has already been made that Royal Consent will be needed before Bill S-20 can become law.

According to Senator Cools, the only way Senator Stratton, the sponsor of the bill, can obtain Royal Consent is through a motion for an address to the Governor General. Several other senators intervened in the discussion on this matter before I closed proceedings, and I stated that I would review the *Debates of the Senate*, as well as earlier decisions on Royal Consent.

As honourable senators are aware, I have already ruled on whether Bill S-20 requires Royal Consent. Last autumn, on October 25, 2001, in response to a point of order raised by Senator Joyal on June 5, I ruled that Bill S-20 required Royal Consent, since it affected the royal prerogative of appointment.

At the time, I noted the fact that in Canadian practice, as distinct from the procedure followed by the Parliament of the United Kingdom, there is no evidence that Royal Consent for a bill needs to be signified in both Houses. In fact, based on the precedents, it would seem that Royal Consent has been signified to most bills that required it in the House of Commons alone, not the Senate, and that, up to now at least, no case has been found where Royal Consent to a bill has been signified in both Houses. Based on this established practice that spans more than 130 years and motivated by a preference to allow debate on a bill, I ruled that the bill could proceed through the Senate.

Senator Cools is attempting to raise a concern that was not directly addressed in my original ruling on Bill S-20. The fundamental position of Senator Cools is that, because Bill S-20 is sponsored by a private member, and one from the opposition at that, the only way Royal Consent can be secured is through an address to the Governor General. Senator Cools cited two recognized Canadian parliamentary authorities, *Beauchesne’s Parliamentary Rules & Forms*, and *Bourinot’s Procedure and Practice in the Dominion of Canada*. The senator also made reference to two cases from the British Parliament, one dating back to 1868 involving William Gladstone and another from 1911 involving Lord Lansdowne.

[Translation]

While I do not dispute the accuracy of the senator’s references and examples, I do question their binding relevance to modern practice. All senators can appreciate that the law of Parliament is not static; it changes and evolves to suit the needs of Parliament and its members.

• (1500)

[English]

As an example of change, one that is not entirely irrelevant to the point of order we are dealing with now, I would note that in the other place it is now possible for private members to bring in bills that involve an expenditure of money. This new development, which was introduced about 10 years ago, allows private members greater scope in preparing bills that are of particular concern to them.

Formerly, this practice would not have been possible. Any bill that involved an expenditure required a Royal Recommendation that can only be obtained by a minister. This requirement no longer impedes a private member from introducing a “money” bill, but the government must be willing to provide the Royal Recommendation before the bill receives third reading.

Similarly, in the United Kingdom, it has been possible for some time now for a parliamentarian to introduce a bill that requires Royal Consent without seeking an address. Normally, the sponsor will communicate in writing to a secretary of state to inquire if the government would be prepared to seek Royal Consent for the bill. From what I can gather, the Royal Consent is usually forthcoming since it is not taken to be an endorsement of the bill by the government.

Whether Senator Stratton will avail himself of this British procedure will be for him to decide. For my part, as I indicated in my ruling of October 25, I do not think it is in the best interest of the Senate to curtail debate on an issue of undoubted importance. Consequently, it is my ruling that there is no valid point of order and debate on second reading of Bill S-20 can proceed.

### COMPETITION ACT COMPETITION TRIBUNAL ACT

BILL TO AMEND—REPORT OF COMMITTEE—  
DEBATE ADJOURNED

Leave having been given to revert to Reports of Committees:

The Senate proceeded to consideration of the sixteenth report of the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce: (Bill C-23, to amend the Competition Act and the Competition Tribunal Act with one amendment and observations), presented in the Senate on May 2, 2002.

**Hon. E. Leo Kolber:** Honourable senators, I move the adoption of the report.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** It is moved by the Honourable Senator Kolber, seconded by the Honourable Senator Maheu, that this report be adopted now.

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

**Hon. John Lynch-Staunton (Leader of the Opposition):** Honourable senators, I will not speak to the report, but I will say that I am most distressed about the inconvenience that occurs when a senator cannot be here to present his or her item on the Order Paper at the time that the order is called. It is unfair for those senators who have been waiting for that order, which cannot be called because the senator is not present, to hear the order has been called with leave one hour or two hours later than expected. There may be senators interested in the particular item who have been waiting for it to be called and, when it is passed over, will learn tomorrow by reading the *Debates of the Senate* or the *Journals of the Senate* that the item has been discussed.

Honourable senators, I think we are being too lax, generous and unfair to colleagues by granting leave in such cases. I, for one, will be much more selective in granting leave, for that reason only.

[ The Hon. the Speaker ]

The privileges and responsibilities of senators who may wish to discuss an item when it is called must be protected. We are being a little too generous in this instance.

**Hon. David Tkachuk:** Honourable senators, it is my understanding that if the house adopts the report, I will not be able to speak to it. Will the chairman of the committee speak to the report?

**Senator Kolber:** Honourable senators, this report calls for one government amendment, which has to do with a clerical error in the English wording of proposed section 106.1. Had we not corrected this mistake, it would have taken up to one year for it to be corrected by omnibus legislation. This would mean that the section would either not come into force until that time or would have been open to misinterpretation. What is the point of having a Senate committee if we cannot fix a clear mistake that the minister and the Commissioner of Competition admitted was a clerical error?

There is a letter in response from the minister responsible for Bill C-23. Appended to the report is a letter to the minister signed by the deputy chairman, Senator Tkachuk, and by me. The minister's response, which is also appended to the report, states that he will review the legislation in two years. There was a general agreement that some of the legislation should be a temporary measure. The minister will review and report back to see how it has worked out. At that time, if the committee is not satisfied, it will take appropriate action. In addition, there are observations by the Conservative senators on a variety of items in the bill.

Honourable senators, I must point out that the most difficult section in the bill that we looked at was clause 13.1. We felt that the power of judge and jury to be given to the commissioner would be inappropriate. That power would be given under the overall Competition Act, which was Bill C-26. We were dealing with Bill C-23, which contains amendments. In fact, so that we could conclude the matter, we consulted many people to try to understand all the implications before us and the powers that we had to deal with it. I was persuaded, as were some members of the committee, that there was nothing much we could do to amend Bill C-26 because it was not before us. However, we did have amendments to Bill C-26 before us. As such, we did not feel that we had the power to do, if we wanted to, anything about some of the items in the original Competition Act that may have been causing concern.

**Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Honourable senators, I want to ask the Chairman of the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce a question about the copy of the sixteenth report that is now before us, dated May 2, 2002. The substantive amendment in the report refers to page 37 of the bill, clause 14. I have page 37 of the bill open and there is no clause 14. Obviously, that is an error. Does the honourable senator intend to move an amendment to the committee report that, on a prima facie basis, contains an error?

**Senator Kolber:** The honourable senator has caught me completely unawares. I am unable to answer that question, but I will certainly look into it.

- (1510)

**Senator Kinsella:** Honourable senators, the sixteenth report that is before us, under the signature of the chairman, Senator Kolber, states on the eighth and ninth lines of a thirteen-line report:

“Page 37, clause 14: Replace in the English version line 25 with the following.”

If one turns to page 37 of the bill, there is no clause 14. That is a serious error.

[*Translation*]

And in the French version, it reads:

a) avec la modification suivante:

Page 37, article 14:

It is the same in the French version; there is no clause 14 on page 37. I have a copy of the bill and of the report. There is an error in the report because I consider the copy of the bill to be authentic.

How does the committee chair wish to correct this error? Does he intend to send it back to the committee for the correction to be made there? Does he intend to amend the report?

[*English*]

**Senator Kolber:** If honourable senators will give me five minutes, I will provide an answer.

**Hon. Marcel Prud'homme:** Honourable senators, could we not suspend this matter until the great minds of the members of the Banking Committee are able to respond to this concern? We could come back to this item tomorrow.

I am in the same position as Senator Lynch-Staunton. I wish to speak to other items. If we move to suspend this deliberation until tomorrow, I am sure the honourable senator would receive the unanimous consent of the Senate for such a motion.

**Senator Kolber:** Clause 14 starts on page 36 of the bill and continues on page 37. There is no error.

**Senator Prud'homme:** I propose that we suspend.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** To clarify, we are under the first item of Reports of Committees. Questions have been put to Senator Kolber in response to his speech. We have come to a pause. If there are no more questions of Senator Kolber, we should decide what to do, either put the question or adjourn the debate.

Senator Tkachuk, do you wish to adjourn the debate?

**Senator Tkachuk:** Is there a suspension? Senator Prud'homme asked for a suspension. What does that mean?

**Senator Prud'homme:** I said “until tomorrow” when everything will be clear.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Suspension is not something known to honourable senators. However, moving the adjournment of the debate is a normal practice.

Senator Tkachuk, do you wish to move adjournment of the debate?

**Senator Tkachuk:** I believe Senator Prud'homme wishes to adjourn the debate.

**Senator Prud'homme:** I wish to adjourn this item, seconded by Senator Tkachuk.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Before we put the motion and leave Senator's Kolber's speech, there are other senators rising, perhaps on questions.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Deputy Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, I thought I heard Senator Tkachuk move that the debate be adjourned. This adjournment would accomplish exactly what Senator Prud'homme wants, which is to give Senator Kolber a little time. Senator Kolber could give us appropriate answers tomorrow.

[*English*]

**Senator Lynch-Staunton:** Honourable senators, I wish to thank Senator Kolber for eliminating the confusion. However, the honourable senator must admit that if one reads the report, the clause is identified at page 37, when in effect it begins on page 36.

There was a misunderstanding on our part as to what the honourable senator was referring to and I thank him for the clarification. I hope that the next time a similar report will be more precise. It is difficult enough to read these things, especially for those honourable senators who were not members of the committee.

I thank Senator Kolber for the clarification and we accept the report as presently written.

**Senator Prud'homme:** Honourable senators, either we proceed or we do not. Senator Robichaud said that he heard Senator Tkachuk make a motion to adjourn. Every discussion following has not been according to the rules. A motion was made to adjourn. Once we dispose of that we may then return to Senator Lynch-Staunton.

As far as I am concerned, there is a motion to adjourn until tomorrow on this issue. We must dispose of that first.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable senators, the elements that take us beyond Senator Kolber's speech are a motion and putting the question. We had a motion, but the question was not put. We continued under Senator Kolber's time and there were other questions and comments.

We have come to the question stage again. Two honourable senators expressed an interest in adjourning the debate. The Speaker will see whom the Speaker wishes to see. I believe that the first to indicate a desire to adjourn was Senator Tkachuk. However, I will take the Chair and look for the first senator to rise.

On motion of Senator Tkachuk, debate adjourned.

## HUMAN RIGHTS

### BUDGET AND REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION TO ENGAGE SERVICES AND TRAVEL—STUDY ON CANADA'S ADHERENCE TO INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS INSTRUMENTS— REPORT OF COMMITTEE ADOPTED

The Senate proceeded to consideration of the third report of the Standing Senate Committee on Human Rights (budget 2002-2003), presented in the Senate on May 2, 2002.—(*Honourable Senator Andreychuk*).

**Hon. A. Raynell Andreychuk** moved the adoption of the report.

She said: Honourable senators, I am anticipating some of the questions that have been put to committee members and I am sure I will not be spared.

The Human Rights Committee began its work last year. We wanted to establish a track record before we looked at more specific studies. We chose to look at all of the human rights machinery and came to the conclusion in our first report that there were seven areas deserving further study. That is the overview of the human rights machinery to which Canada is, should or could be subject. In developing our report we did not travel. After hearing many witnesses in Ottawa, some by videoconference, we filed our first report.

The members of the Human Rights Committee prepared what we believe to be a comprehensive plan of action and study for the committee. This study would see the committee complete six of the seven areas within one year. For committee costs, we estimated a total of \$638,550. We were mindful that it would be difficult for the subcommittee on budgets to approve all the budget requests and decided that this may not be the best way to approach our study. We therefore decided to conduct our study over two years, in two parts, rather than asking for that amount of money in one year. Consequently, we requested a budget of \$266,000, of which we received \$80,000, that being a 70 per cent reduction.

• (1520)

Committee members were disconcerted that it was not taken into account that we had not expended funds on any studies the previous year. We had advised the Senate that we would be proceeding in this way in order to establish a track record before asking for monies, giving the Senate a basis upon which to judge whether we used resources effectively and being mindful of the collegiality that is necessary in apportioning monies.

[ The Hon. the Speaker ]

The reduction to \$80,000 means that we will be able to do little of our proposed work. I believe that the funds that have been granted are for the first phase of our study and we will continue to work with that.

When I appeared before the subcommittee, I was not asked questions about our budget, but rather about how the Senate should deal with so many requests with a limited budget. I responded that, as long as all committees were treated fairly over a broad period of time, our committee would abide by whatever rules were in place. However, it is difficult to determine what rules were followed, as every committee received a different proportion of the monies requested. We are left to guess at what overall formula was used.

One wonders whether the same rules will apply next year. We chose to do some work outside the country because of the nature of our study. We are studying a very technical field and, rather than embarking on only a fact-finding mission to assess institutions outside of Canada, it would have been useful to travel with a fuller complement of senators in order to educate those senators who do not have a background in international human rights legislation. This is not the kind of information that is easily assembled. We had planned to do our external travel in the first year in order to bring senators up to speed and assess the machinery before doing further studies. Obviously, the route we chose put us at a disadvantage in the budget process. Consequently, we will have to go back to the drawing board.

We hope to finish the first part of our study with the funds that were allocated, but in September we will have to do a total reassessment, as our original study plan is not feasible under this budget. We will have to revisit our areas of study, and that may not be fair to some senators.

**Hon. John Lynch-Staunton (Leader of the Opposition):** Honourable senators, the reduction of 70 per cent to Senator Andreychuk's request is the second highest we have heard of so far. However, I understand that she wants to carry on with her study. Has she been given any assurance, directly or indirectly, officially or unofficially, that in the fall the balance of the funds requested will be made available through Supplementary Estimates?

**Senator Andreychuk:** Honourable senators, I have been given no assurances with respect to that. With the \$80,000, we are proceeding to do that part of the study that we had put in, in the first place, that is, reviewing the Inter-American Convention. We hope that, with the \$80,000, we can complete that portion of our study, which is one of six parts of the study. We have no assurances regarding funding for the five other parts of our study. Of course, we will not embark on those other areas of study without the resources to do so.

**Senator Lynch-Staunton:** Honourable senators, the committee has a term of reference that it has apportioned into six parts. Therefore, the committee has a commitment from the chamber to support the study. However, the committee has now been told that, despite the commitment made here, which I think was unanimous, the funds required to complete that study are not available.

This demonstrates a fault in our system in allocating funds after the fact. The committee gets full support from the chamber for its terms of reference. In order to carry them out, the committee must go the subcommittee of the Internal Economy Committee, only to learn that the funds are not available.

I again request that we reverse the process. When a committee requests a mandate for a special study, it should present its proposed budget so that both issues can be discussed at the same time, thereby saving senators embarrassment. Senator Andreychuk, Senator Comeau, Senator Taylor and others received the approval of the Senate to carry on with their committee activities, yet, once they determined the cost of their studies, they learned that the monies needed were not available. I believe that that is an error in our procedure. Why do we not reverse the procedure and study both the mandate and the budget at the same time and decide both questions at the same time?

The Committee on Human Rights is only the latest example of a committee that will be unable to complete a study that the Senate has approved.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Deputy Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, we tried to implement the suggestion made to us by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition regarding committees that obtain an order of reference from this house to then present a budget to the Standing Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration, which does not have the necessary funds to support all the initiatives these committees wish to undertake.

Honourable senators, you will remember that on a number of occasions I asked for the adjournment of a debate when there was an order of reference in order to receive the information that would confirm the needs of the committees. However, it was brought to my attention that I was trying to reverse the process. Committees must first obtain an order of reference and then present a budget to the Internal Economy Committee.

I agree with what Senator Lynch-Staunton said. It is time to reassess our way of doing things. Perhaps we could review our rules to see how to implement the proposal made by the Leader of the Opposition.

• (1530)

**Hon. Roch Bolduc:** Honourable senators, I was a member of the Standing Senate Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration in 1988, 1989 and 1990. If memory serves me well, the internal procedure that we used is basically the same as that used by the government. It is not complicated. In other words, a date is set and all the submissions arrive at the same time. When we have all of the requests in front of us, including the terms of references, it is easier to decide on the committee's priorities. I would go even further: Should the leaders not agree on the priorities for Senate committee studies?

Committee studies have to do with policy development, whereas legislative studies come under the traditional role of the assembly, which studies bills one at a time, as they are introduced. When the time comes for the budget, the internal workings of the government are such that the Treasury Board writes to everyone to let them know that it wants to receive the submissions by a certain date. Starting at that time, it analyzes all of the submissions. The parameters established by the Department of Finance set out the amounts for spending, debt and taxes.

This amount of \$173 billion for statutory and non-statutory programs is divided among 20 departments, where a needs assessment is carried out. This year, the Department of National Defence received more funding because of terrorism. What is the point of these internal workings where you have, on the one hand, the Minister of National Defence who needs funds, and on the other, the Treasury Board that tells him that it has limited amounts? Should the Senate not use the same process?

I call on the experience of the chair of the Standing Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration. We should see all of the requests before deciding. What message are we sending by acting in this way? This year, we are being told that the Standing Senate Committee on National Security and Defence is more important than the Standing Senate Committee on Human Rights. I do not know which of the two committees has priority requests. I am trying to see the criteria that will be applied by the chair and the members of the committee when they do their analysis.

In my experience, we analyzed all the requests, as well as the arguments of each of the committee chairs. There was a certain rationality. Otherwise, there is no logic to the distribution of funds. In the end, the last in are the least well served. This is not fair. Senator Lynch-Staunton put the problem very well, and Senator Andreychuk explained the impact to us very clearly. There should be a way to improve the system. Otherwise, decisions are based on a value system, the rules of which we have no knowledge.

[*English*]

**Hon. Richard H. Kroft:** Honourable senators, I welcome the opportunity to make a few remarks in this debate. It is one in which I have participated and one to which I have listened in this house since I arrived here, in particular since I became the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Budgets. It is a perplexing one.

I would like to comment briefly on the remarks of Senators Bolduc and Lynch-Staunton. The problem with a priority-setting exercise, if we wish to use the analogy from the government standpoint, is that the Standing Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration is not the government. It is not a priority-setting mechanism; it does not have that power. The government has the ultimate responsibility for the allocation of funds. It can set priorities in execution of that responsibility.

The dilemma in the situation that the Leader of the Opposition has raised is that, if one follows that line of thinking through logically, and I have attempted it — in fact, I have drafted an internal memo asking for comment — this chamber is giving to the Internal Economy Committee the task of saying, “If this committee wants to do that study, and that committee wants to do that study, then we will allocate the budgets.” I share the concern of the Leader of the Opposition in this regard. In fact, I have spoken to it before in this house.

According to the Leader of the Opposition, the committee would then come forward with a request for the order of reference as well as for a budget. If the Internal Economy Committee had chosen not to give them a budget, or if it was an inadequate budget, then it would be depriving the chamber of the opportunity to grant that order of reference.

It is a reversal. If honourable senators think it through, they will see that it is in fact a delegation by this chamber to the Internal Economy Committee that I do not think is appropriate.

[Translation]

**Senator Bolduc:** I propose some sort of agreement between the leaders on the priorities to be given to the consideration of policy development. The rule for policy development is not the same as for legislation. In any event, this agreement should cover the framework of the mandates and funds required. This is reasonable. There is no advantage or disadvantage, from a partisan point of view, that would prevent this approach. It would be a big improvement in the consideration of policy development, one of the important roles of the Senate. It is not just a question of investigating contentious situations. It is more than that. We are trying to fine-tune the procedure in order to improve government policies in a number of areas. It is possible in foreign policy. We have seen this in connection with defence and other areas. It would be in the interest of all senators if their leaders were to cooperate in this regard.

[English]

**Hon. Jim Tunney:** Honourable senators, I am most interested in this debate. I have come recently to know the problems our committees face in terms of funding for the many projects.

I am committed to human rights; I always have been. The situation with the committee to which I am committed and the budget it presented bothers me. The Internal Economy Committee judged the validity of that budget and reduced it by 70 per cent.

I wonder what can be accomplished with only 30 per cent of the budget they presented. Either we are terribly underfunded or else the number of committees is too great. Another factor may be that, perhaps, our ambitions or our projects are too great.

Perhaps it would do well for this chamber to have a debate on what we do when we do not have the keys to the bank and the other place has decided how much money we will have for our committee work. They do not, I hope, judge the worthiness of the inquiries or the committee work we want to undertake. This disturbs me.

[ Senator Kroft ]

• (1540)

I know that other committees have been allocated substantially reduced budgets. We must find a better way of doing this.

[Translation]

**Senator Bolduc:** Honourable senators, if we draw an analogy with the government, I would propose that the relationship between the joint leaders be comparable to that between the Minister of Finance and the President of the Treasury Board. The Standing Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration would become the equivalent of the Treasury Board. On the one hand, the equivalent of the government would assume leadership. On the other hand, in accordance with its mandate, the committee would do the work it is supposed to do.

[English]

**Senator Kroft:** I should like to close this debate with a mild observation. It is rather a positive reflection when I think that, over the past three years, the most dramatic increase of any component of our budget has been in the works of the committees. Let us not forget, this is not based only on the increased number of committees; it takes into account the secretariat of committees and all the support work that committees require. This has been the most rapidly growing portion of our budget.

It is well to note that our problem is created by the fact that so many senators want to work so hard on so many days in the interests of Canadians.

**The Hon. the Speaker *pro tempore*:** Honourable senators, is the house ready for the question?

**Hon. Senators:** Question!

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

**Hon. Senators:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to and report adopted.

## LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS

### BUDGET—STUDY ON IMPLEMENTATION OF STATUTORY REVIEW PROVISIONS— REPORT OF COMMITTEE ADOPTED

The Senate proceeded to consideration of the sixteenth report of the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs (budget 2002-2003), presented in the Senate on May 2, 2002.—(*Honourable Senator Milne*).

**Hon. Lorna Milne** moved the adoption of the report.

She said: Honourable senators, the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs has a mandate from this chamber to examine acts containing a mandatory review provision.



The committee found at least three instances where the period of time allowed for a mandatory review had passed. It is the intention of the committee to research this further with the help of personnel from the Library of Parliament. We estimate that this in-house study will cost \$2,000. I would, therefore, request that the Senate approve this budget.

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

**Hon. Senators:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to and report adopted.

## STUDY ON MATTERS RELATING TO FISHING INDUSTRY

### REPORT OF FISHERIES COMMITTEE— DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Comeau, seconded by the Honourable Senator Johnson, for the adoption of the fifth report of the Standing Senate Committee on Fisheries entitled *Selected Themes on Canada's Freshwater and Northern Fisheries*, tabled in the Senate on February 19, 2002.—(Honourable Senator Watt).

**Hon. Charlie Watt:** Honourable senators, I rise to speak to the report entitled, "Selected Themes on Canada's Freshwater and Northern Fisheries," which was tabled in the Senate on February 19. The committee's report is based largely on fact-finding meetings conducted in Nunavut, the Northwest Territories and Nunavik in 2000 and 2001.

Let me begin by saying that it is important that the Fisheries Committee be able to travel to fishing communities. The last time I checked, there was no fishery in the Rideau Canal. Senator Comeau noted in his recent remarks that "a northern visit was long overdue." Indeed, the committee last considered the northern fisheries 16 years ago in a fishing market report. I am confident that members who participated in this more recent study now have a greater understanding of the culture, lifestyle and aspirations of northern Canadians.

My remarks will be limited to the Arctic, a region that accounts for 40 per cent of Canada's land mass but only 1 per cent of the population. At the outset, it is important to point out that the Arctic is, first and foremost, the homeland of Aboriginal people.

A number of major issues are dealt with in the report. A major health concern of Aboriginal people is the contamination of fish and marine mammals. Traditional foods are vital from an economic and cultural standpoint, and are a major part of their diet. Persistent organic pollutants — or POPs — have been linked to cancer, birth defects and various genetic abnormalities. High levels of these substances have been found in mothers' breast milk, and the risks associated with the accumulation of contaminants increase over a person's lifetime.

The committee recommended that the Department of Fisheries and Oceans expand the amount of research it undertakes in determining contaminant levels in fish and marine mammals in the Arctic, and that the department work more closely with other federal government departments — Health Canada, Environment Canada and Indian and Northern Affairs — and Aboriginal communities, to monitor and interpret the significance of findings.

Another major issue addressed in the report is climate change. The coastlines are changing due to the melting of ice. Wildlife is appearing in areas where it had not been previously seen. Global warming is well underway in the Arctic, and the long-term consequences of climate change are expected to be greatest in the Arctic.

Canada has either signed or endorsed a number of international agreements to protect the region, and the implementation of these commitments is a priority for northern Canadians. The committee recommended that the Government of Canada more vigorously promote international action to address the global issues of climate change and long-range air pollution and, on an annual basis, report to Parliament on the activities undertaken by Canada.

Canada and the other circumpolar countries have collaborated in scientific research. The Inuit have long recognized the benefits of such multilateral cooperation and information sharing. The committee recommended that Aboriginal participants at international fora be expanded. The building of partnerships in support of global Arctic issues must also be encouraged. Regional linkages, such as those established by the Inuit Circumpolar Conference, the Arctic Council and the council's working groups, can only strengthen efforts for action on common interests.

There is a discussion of co-management in our report. The first comprehensive land claim settlement in Canada — the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement of 1975 — which I helped to negotiate, set the tone for the other comprehensive claims and modern-day treaties that followed. Since 1975, comprehensive claims agreements have incorporated systems of sharing power and responsibilities between government and local users of resources, including fish. As a result, the fisheries programs of the DFO are conducted mainly in conjunction with co-management boards. Co-management arrangements range from large-scale projects between government authorities and Aboriginal organizations, to small-scale, community-based, cooperative projects in which government officials work closely with local groups.

Co-management is founded on the notion that government shares decision-making power with the local fishers in exchange for their knowledge, cooperation and assistance in managing the resource. Co-management recognizes local-level management, consensus decision making, community-based data collection and monitoring, and the traditional ecological knowledge of Aboriginal people. Community-based co-management is widely accepted and supported in the Arctic. As an indispensable complement to scientific knowledge, the committee recommended that traditional ecological knowledge always be given consideration in fisheries decision making.

• (1550)

There are many challenges in the Arctic, not the least of which is the growing number of people dependent on a renewable resource base. Throughout the region, there is much interest in developing the renewable resource economy, including fisheries, while at the same time preserving subsistence harvesting. Demographically, the population is very young. This sets the stage for tremendous pressure to create jobs in an area where unemployment is much higher than the rest of the country.

With respect to development, the challenges are unique. Transportation, energy and communication costs are unusually high. Economic opportunities are unevenly distributed. The region is isolated from potential markets. Lack of capital is an obstacle. Committee members were told that the three northern territories were the only jurisdictions in Canada that do not have economic development agreements with the federal government. On a more positive note, the committee reported that there are relatively small fisheries projects that show good potential for development.

In June 2001, a group of committee members travelled to the town of Kuujuaq in Nunavik, which happens to be my community. Nunavik means the "main land" in my native language of Inuktitut. The Inuit territory of Nunavik is located north of the fifty-fifth parallel and encompasses one third of the province of Quebec. Approximately 8,600 Inuit reside there in 15 communities along the coast of Hudson Bay, Hudson Strait, the Quebec/Labrador peninsula and Ungava Bay. Near Kuujuaq, on the Nepihjee River, the committee members visited Canada's first "fish way" in the Arctic. They met a number of individuals in Nunavik, including Geoff Klein, a biologist with the Makivik Corporation, and Allen Gordon, the President of Nayumivik Landholding Corporation. Mr. Gordon is also an Inuit subsistence and commercial fisher. I will have more to say about Allen in a few moments.

In Nunavik, there are obstacles like waterfalls and low water flows that impede the migration of fish to the sea in the summer and over winter and spawn in freshwater. Those barriers result from the land slowly rebounding from the weight of the glaciers that dominated North America in the last Ice Age.

The work on the fish way began in 1999, when a channel was blasted around two small waterfalls on the Nepihjee, which flows into Ungava Bay. The channel allows fish to swim up to freshwater. To further boost the Arctic char stock, juvenile fish are also reared in a hatchery that operates in an abandoned water plant. Some 100,000 fry are now being produced each year. The eggs are brought in from an area about 85 miles from Kuujuaq, near the village of Tasiujaq, with the authorization of that community and on the condition that the eggs would not be sent elsewhere.

The project is very much a success. In fact, Arctic char and other fish like brook trout and whitefish started using the fish way in a matter of hours after the fish way was built. Local lakes that had not previously supported Arctic char are becoming populated with both wild fish and hatchery-raised fish. The benefits to the community include the ability to meet the growing subsistence

needs of the local population and the opportunity to practise traditional harvesting techniques. Other lakes and rivers can be similarly reconnected to the sea, and other communities in the region have expressed an interest in undertaking similar projects. The potential for enhancing Atlantic salmon is also believed to be good. In February, the committee recommended that governments encourage and help fund local river improvement projects. The committee concluded that projects such as the one on the Nepihjee River for Arctic char are deserving of federal and provincial government support.

That brings me to the Roméo LeBlanc National Awards for Responsible Fishing. Each year, since 1999, individuals from Canada's Atlantic, Pacific and the freshwater and Arctic fisheries are selected by the Canadian Responsible Fisheries Board. They are presented with the prestigious awards in recognition of their outstanding contribution to responsible fishing practices and conservation. Last week, four people were so honoured for "rolling up their sleeves and making a positive difference in the future of Canada's fisheries," as the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans put it. The ceremony was hosted by Senator Comeau and was held just outside this chamber in the Senate rotunda. Allen Gordon, the person I mentioned earlier, received the Arctic award for his outstanding work in restocking the rivers and lakes of his community. The people of Nunavik are very proud of Allen's achievement.

In closing, I thank Senator Comeau for his excellent work as the Chair of the Fisheries Committee.

**Hon. Nicholas W. Taylor:** I compliment the honourable senators on the report. As one who had to live on Arctic char about 50 years before you were born, I realize it is a very excellent source of food for the people on the land today.

The honourable senator mentioned global warming. In other words, there is a certain tilting of the pole, and that may in itself bring on more pollution. Did the committee hear anything about the concentration of PCBs or other types of chemicals in the livers and vital organs of the fish you were examining?

**Senator Watt:** Senator Taylor, thank you for your question. The information that we have received so far from the witnesses who have appeared in front of our committee has not specifically addressed that problem in regard to Arctic char. As a person who has lived there and utilized the resources, I know that a certain amount of contamination already exists within the Arctic char, especially around the fatty tissue area. A number of concerns are building up in our community. To what extent can we safely continue to utilize that fish for human consumption? That is the question for today, because they are not being properly monitored and checked.

Let me go a step further. Inuit people do not only eat Arctic char. Other fish come from the Arctic that every human being in this country, maybe even in the international community, utilize and consume. The committee did ask specific questions in that regard.

[ Senator Watt ]

• (1600)

To what extent is fishing being monitored? Let us say, for example, there are trawlers out in the ocean. Most of them have their own processing plants. What kind of technology do they use to check for contaminants in those fish? None really. The only thing they do, from time to time, when the fish come into the plant, is check perhaps one fish out of 1,000 to see if there are any worms in the fish.

In other words, honourable senators, I do not think we are at the stage, today, where we know what is really happening to our food source. This is very important. Hopefully, when the committee presents its supplementary budget, the Internal Economy Committee will take that into consideration.

On motion of Senator Comeau, for Senator Johnson, debate adjourned.

## ISSUES IN RURAL CANADA

### INQUIRY—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the inquiry of the Honourable Senator Andreychuk calling the attention of the Senate to issues surrounding rural Canada.—(*Honourable Senator Andreychuk*).

**Hon. A. Raynell Andreychuk:** Honourable senators, I wish to preface my remarks about rural communities in Canada by again addressing the issue of agriculture. Much has been said, and many recommendations for action have been made from the Senate, with respect to agriculture. I simply wish to underscore the urgency of the agricultural crisis and the need for a more comprehensive long-term approach to sustain this valuable industry in Canada.

Agriculture cannot simply be seen as another business, but must be treated as the most critical and necessary element in food production for the population of Canada. In our haste to be viable, flexible and competitive, we must not forget the need for a secure and safe food production and food distribution system.

The United States farm bill will provide huge subsidies to the farming community and, most notably, many giant food corporations. This bill is clearly not in the spirit or the intent of the World Trade Organization. This, coupled with the slow pace of any real reform in the European Union, is worrisome to countries like Canada and others that have positioned themselves to adhere to the World Trade Organization rules in agriculture.

Honourable senators, I would therefore call upon the Government of Canada and the provincial governments to work in a comprehensive, unified way in reassessing our approach to the World Trade Organization on this issue of agriculture and to put aside our differences in favour of a unified voice and action plan.

This has not always been the case in Canada due to the varied concepts in agriculture and the nature of politics in this country. At this time, we can ill afford to continue to accentuate our differences internally when the real threat is coming from the mega-powers. While the issue of economic development is at the heart of continuing rural viability, there are other equally important issues that have not received sufficient attention. I wish to highlight some of them today.

The survival of rural communities in Canada has received increased attention lately due to the farm crisis on the Prairies, the declining forestry industry in B.C., the lack of sustainability of the fishery on the East Coast, and continued underdevelopment of most rural areas of Central Canada. These communities are suffering, not only from an absence of investment capital and economic hope, but also from a declining stock of social capital. In the past, the strong system of local governments, cooperatives, farm organizations, voluntary organizations and associations, community groups, sports and cultural groups, and so on, created high levels of civic engagement leading in turn to the creation of what social scientists have recently come to refer to as social capital. More recently, however, with the withering away of these institutions of cooperation, there is a growing concern not only about the economic viability of rural Canada but also about the quality of governance in these small communities and hence the quality of life.

The concept of social capital refers to the social connections, the attendant norms and trust that allow people to work together and pursue shared objectives. The idea is simply that the more we connect with other people, the more we trust them, and the more we trust them, the more we are willing to work with them in our community. Social capital is built on the conventions of reciprocity found in communities, organizations, clubs and groups in which tightly knit networks of people benefit from the mutual support, collective sharing and empowerment provided by pooling their resources; in other words, the pioneering spirit on which Canada was founded.

In both the academic and policy-making communities within governments, there is an increasing recognition that the level of social capital is closely associated with issues such as poverty, crime, economic development and government performance. The less social capital that exists, the harder it will be to deal with many of the public policy problems. Increasingly, social capital is coming to be seen as an undervalued commodity that will increase with use and diminish with disuse.

Social capital has been withdrawn or run down in rural Canada — especially in smaller towns — over the last decade, at an alarming rate. This has put the survival of many small towns in doubt. There are probably three overarching reasons for social capital being withdrawn or run down in rural Canada: first, rural population trends; second, intensified market pressures; and, third, pressures on government to reduce taxes and limit spending.

A high level of social capital was based on the fact that many rural communities needed to be self-reliant and used to pride themselves in this self-reliance. The decline of social capital in rural Canada can be seen in developments, such as declining farm populations, shrinking communities, closure of rural elevators,

the end of various fisheries, declining church membership, closing of service clubs and declining newspaper circulation. There is a clear indication of a decline in the former civic culture that used to characterize rural Canada.

The consequences of this decline in social capital in rural Canada are to be found in the increased alienation of rural voters, a greater move from collective to individual values, and an increasingly difficult time to meaningfully connect rural issues to urban issues. There is clearly a danger in a decline in rural Canada's tradition of vigorous self-government and its former role in providing leadership for the country as a whole.

• (1610)

Rural Canada, with vision, leadership and tenacity, can fight back through various processes such as those associated with rural development. The term "rural development" simply refers to making the towns and villages of this country enjoyable places to live, work, raise families and create a sense of community. Generally, the four major areas of rural development are economic growth, education, public health and safety, and community. Each of these four areas is greatly affected by technology and communications policies, which need to be addressed in such a way that they provide opportunities for rural Canada, rather than deny them.

The traditional businesses of rural communities have been farms, retail stores, manufacturing plants and companies that harvest natural resources such as coal and timber. The strength of these businesses determines the financial health of the families and local governments of rural communities. Rural businesses are facing challenges getting the basics they need to thrive, such as access to capital, infrastructure, educated and skilled employees, and a generally supportive business environment.

What we see mostly with regard to rural Canada are images of farmers appealing for more assistance through existing agricultural programs. However, most of the programs fail to address the root causes of the problems.

Rural Canada's decline is as much a decline of small manufacturing in rural areas, and other economic activities in communities, as it is about farm crisis. Although the main manufacturing sector is bouncing back from its downturn of the 1980s, it is not coming back in rural areas where we are seeing a steady movement toward larger urban communities.

A related problem is the growing gap in per-capita incomes between rural and urban populations. Rural citizens now earn, on average, about 30 per cent less than their urban counterparts. This is as wide as the gap has been since World War II. Obviously, this difference in income also encourages people to move out of rural areas.

Working on the rural side of the equation alone will not resolve the problem. Urban centres are highly attractive to migrants. The concentration of economic activities in these centres is due, in part, to the direct and indirect subsidies from the federal and provincial governments to the firms that locate there. These subsidies are reflected in the publicly built water and sewage systems, occasional tax relief for location in these centres, and the continued construction of transportation systems to alleviate congestion.

The decline of the family farm and rural communities that we see around us is not inevitable. It results from decisions made by governments and people, and can be reversed by the same agents with the help of community initiative, passion, citizenship involvement and perseverance.

Sceptics tell us that family farms cannot compete and rural communities cannot survive. They say we cannot have economic opportunity without sacrificing environmental quality and accepting growing inequality and concentration of wealth and power. In essence, they say we have no choice about our future.

That, honourable senators, is simply not true. It only comes true if we resign ourselves to it. We must ensure that one generation into the future people will be asking not whether family farms can survive but whether large corporations in urban Canada can compete with lean, well-managed and socially responsible small enterprises in rural Canada.

Another issue surrounding rural Canada is poverty. Poverty in rural areas is a complex problem and one that tends to be obscured beside the intense media coverage of other issues, such as homelessness. However deserving this may be, there are some particular distinguishing features of rural poverty that have to be identified. They are, for example, the high level of invisibility of this poverty, the out-migration and its effects on local demography in terms of depopulated areas, physical isolation and aging populations. It involves other related issues, such as a diminishing economic base, substandard housing, isolation of women and older people, the non-availability or withdrawal of local services, limited health and social services provisions, inadequate information on service entitlements, and low levels of participation in local government development mechanisms and development activity with an anti-poverty focus.

Those living in, or at risk of, poverty in rural areas have been identified to be farmers, fishermen, those who are not property owners engaged in part-time or seasonal work, unemployed people, children — particularly early school dropouts — rural women, lone parents, people with disabilities, older people and single men living alone.

There is a need for greater local involvement in rural policy development. Those in greatest need of services, older people and people with disabilities, may not be able to access them. There are strong social arguments for not curtailing services in rural areas such as post offices, health centres and, in particular, public transport.

The basic ingredients of a country life in Canada are rapidly being eroded. That sense of belonging and participating in a community is diminishing. Many rural and remote communities lack the essential service infrastructure required to support young people and their families. If family support services are thin on the ground in major centres, they may be practically non-existent in rural parts of Canada. While local community support networks still exist in rural and remote communities, the changing social and economic circumstances in these communities no longer provide the safety net they once did for people when they were in crisis.

In relation to health, research reports are beginning to appear suggesting a correlation between health status indicators and the level of social capital. Many rural communities have accumulated considerable social capital through involvement in their local hospital. Often this has been translated into financial and fiscal capital through fund-raising for buildings and equipment. Seen in this light, it is not surprising that rural communities experience externally imposed restructuring of their hospitals as stealing from their community. Community participation in developing health service models promotes a sense of ownership of the local health service, increases local knowledge and skills and strengthens local relationships and networks.

The economic viability of many rural communities and that of farms and ranches is closely tied. Main street businesses in rural communities depend on the spending power in nearby farms and ranches. In turn, these operations often depend on the services of the local agricultural input suppliers and local agricultural processing, distribution and marketing enterprises. Therefore, investments that support enterprises associated with the products of sustainable agricultural systems will help farms and ranches, as well as rural communities, to capitalize on the economic benefits of these systems.

Investments that directly support sustainable agriculture are not by themselves sufficient to curtail the exodus of residents from rural communities. To be healthy, rural communities must have at their base a solid infrastructure to support economic development; for example, investments in upgrades to bridges and roads and the modernization of medical, communication and capital lending systems.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Senator Andreychuk, I regret to advise that your 15 minutes have expired.

**Senator Andreychuk:** Honourable senators, I have one page left. I ask for leave to finish.

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

**Hon. Senators:** Agreed.

**Senator Andreychuk:** Thank you.

• (1620)

The federal government must begin to design strategies that foster social capital throughout rural Canada. If one attempts to build social capital through commercially driven activities alone, one will not create much. Of course, public policy from any level of government can both create and destroy social capital. Public policy that is myopic and lacks sufficient planning or expertise can result in policy that leads to the formation of cliques, exclusionary organizations, closed societies, apathy and helplessness, lack of political efficacy and poor government responsiveness.

The message for the federal government is that it is better to bind the citizens of Canada together by horizontal relations or reciprocity and cooperation than by vertical relations of authority

and dependency. The point is that it is important to have citizens interact as equals, not as patrons and clients of the federal government. This interaction need not be in political forms and can occur in other kinds of activities, such as memberships and organizations. The health of the associational system in rural Canada will be an important indicator of the health of rural society.

Honourable senators, it is my hope that the federal government will lead the way in acknowledging the diversity of our communities and will place equal weight on the need to encourage and support rural communities, as well as urban centres. It should not be a matter of choosing. It should be a matter of giving each their pride of place. It was best said by Prince Charles last year when he visited Saskatchewan. He stated that Canada is "a much more urban society than people in Europe perhaps realize." Yet, he said, "We must not lose sight of the contribution of rural life to the natural psyche or, put another way, to the national soul. I compare rural and agricultural areas, like forests and parks, to lungs which enable our urban civilization to breathe."

Therefore, honourable senators, the emphasis should not be on where we live but rather on what values and services all Canadians share or should share and, equally on how all can make a contribution to the whole of Canada. In the coming months, as we reflect on many social issues in this chamber, I trust that rural communities will be part of that discussion.

**Hon. Jim Tunney:** Honourable senators, I cannot help but express a few comments at this time. The lead story in the television news this morning and in a daily newspaper that I read is the crisis in agriculture. That crisis in agriculture has been caused by a neighbour of ours who hardly knows we exist. According to an Ipsos-Reid poll, the ignorance of those polled about just who we are was unbelievable. We are, for many, another state in the union. Others believe that the largest trading partner of the U.S. is Japan. Some believe that the resources they depend on do not come from Canada, but they do not quite know where they do come from. If I had the authority and the opportunity, they would certainly know where their natural gas comes from after I shut off the valves. I would only do that to draw their attention, not to punish them. It would not take long after the light bulbs went out in California for them to begin talking to us. They would then know who we are and where we are.

Another recent story in the news is very disturbing: Over 1 million people in South Africa will soon face starvation. Low prices for foodstuffs caused by subsidies in the U.S. and the EU are putting Canadian farmers out of business. We should be feeding those starving people. We have money for almost everything else, but we do not have money for the protection or salvation of lives.

On motion of Senator Tunney, debate adjourned.

The Senate adjourned until Wednesday, May 8, 2002, at 1:30 p.m.

## CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 7, 2002

	PAGE		PAGE
<b>SENATORS' STATEMENTS</b>			
<b>National Hospice Palliative Care Week</b>		<b>Food and Drugs Act (Bill S-18)</b>	
Hon. Sharon Carstairs . . . . .	2796	Bill to Amend—Third Reading—Debate Continued.	
<b>The Honourable Francis William Mahovlich</b>		Hon. Nick G. Sibbeston . . . . .	2801
Congratulations on Receiving Honorary Doctor of Laws Degree		Hon. Fernand Robichaud . . . . .	2802
from St. Francis Xavier University.		<b>Federal Nominations (Bill S-20)</b>	
Hon. B. Alasdair Graham . . . . .	2796	Second Reading—Speaker's Ruling—Order Stands.	
<b>Mental Health Week</b>		The Hon. the Speaker . . . . .	2802
Hon. Yves Morin . . . . .	2797	<b>National Anthem Act (Bill S-39)</b>	
<b>Presidential Election in France</b>		Bill to Amend—Second Reading—Debate Continued.	
Hon. Lise Bacon . . . . .	2797	Hon. Jean Lapointe . . . . .	2802
<b>Visitor in the Gallery</b>		Hon. Jim Tunney . . . . .	2803
The Hon. the Speaker . . . . .	2798	<b>Federal Nominations Bill (Bill S-20)</b>	
<hr/>			
<b>QUESTION PERIOD</b>			
<b>International Trade</b>		Second Reading—Speaker's Ruling.	
Renewal of Softwood Lumber Agreement.		The Hon. the Speaker . . . . .	2803
Hon. Gerry St. Germain . . . . .	2798	<b>Competition Act</b>	
Hon. Sharon Carstairs . . . . .	2798	<b>Competition Tribunal Act (Bill C-23)</b>	
Hon. Pat Carney . . . . .	2799	Bill to Amend—Report of Committee—Debate Adjourned.	
<b>Distinguished Visitor in the Gallery</b>		Hon. E. Leo Kolber . . . . .	2804
The Hon. the Speaker . . . . .	2799	Hon. John Lynch-Staunton . . . . .	2804
<b>Business of the Senate</b>		Hon. David Tkachuk . . . . .	2804
Hon. Michael Kirby . . . . .	2799	Hon. Noël A. Kinsella . . . . .	2804
Hon. John Lynch-Staunton . . . . .	2799	Hon. Marcel Prud'homme . . . . .	2805
<hr/>			
<b>ORDERS OF THE DAY</b>			
<b>Criminal Law Amendment Bill, 2001 (Bill C-15A)</b>		Hon. Fernand Robichaud . . . . .	2805
Message from Commons—Referred to Committee.		Hon. Roch Bolduc . . . . .	2807
Hon. Noël A. Kinsella . . . . .	2800	Hon. Richard H. Kroft . . . . .	2807
Referred to Committee.		Hon. Jim Tunney . . . . .	2808
Hon. Noël A. Kinsella . . . . .	2800	<b>Legal and Constitutional Affairs</b>	
<b>Competition Act</b>		Budget—Study on Implementation of Statutory Review	
<b>Competition Tribunal Act (Bill C-23)</b>		Provisions—Report of Committee Adopted.	
Bill to Amend—Report of Committee—Order Stands.		Hon. Lorna Milne . . . . .	2808
Hon. Fernand Robichaud . . . . .	2800	<b>Study on Matters Relating to Fishing Industry</b>	
Hon. Noël A. Kinsella . . . . .	2801	Report of Fisheries Committee—Debate Continued.	
<hr/>			
		Hon. Charlie Watt . . . . .	2809
		Hon. Nicholas W. Taylor . . . . .	2810
		<b>Issues in Rural Canada</b>	
		Inquiry—Debate Continued.	
		Hon. A. Raynell Andreychuk . . . . .	2811
		Hon. Jim Tunney . . . . .	2813





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