



CANADA

# Debates of the Senate

---

2nd SESSION

•

37th PARLIAMENT

•

VOLUME 140

•

NUMBER 10

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Thursday, October 24, 2002**



THE HONOURABLE LUCIE PÉPIN  
SPEAKER *PRO TEMPORE*

## 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 Communication Canada – Canadian Government Publishing, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S9.  
**Also available on the Internet: <http://www.parl.gc.ca>**

## THE SENATE

Thursday, October 24, 2002

The Senate met at 1:30 p.m., the Speaker *pro tempore* in the Chair.

Prayers.

[Translation]

### QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

#### SPEAKER'S RULING

**The Hon. the Speaker *pro tempore*:** Honourable senators, yesterday, October 23, Senator Murray rose on a question of privilege to object to the announced intention of the Social Affairs, Science and Technology Committee to deposit a report with the Clerk of the Senate this Friday. Despite an admitted authorization from the Senate granting the committee this power, Senator Murray argued that this was not the intent of this authorization and that the report ought to be tabled as soon as possible while the Senate is sitting since, as he put it, the report "is ready."

[English]

By way of reply, Senator Kirby, Chair of the Social Affairs Committee, expressed sympathy with Senator Murray's position. He went on to explain, however, that the 300-page report is with the printer and that bound copies, sufficient for distribution, will be ready Thursday; that is, today.

Despite the circumstances of this case, Senator Kirby suggested that the practice of tabling reports with the clerk should be studied by the Standing Committee on Rules, Procedures and the Rights of Parliament so that any ambiguities with respect to it could be clarified.

[Translation]

Several other senators made comments on the merits of the alleged question of privilege. Senator Bolduc explained that a report is normally seen by senators first and that, in this instance, since the report may not be ready before Thursday afternoon after the Senate rises, it should not be released until the Senate next sits, likely next Tuesday. Senator Lynch-Staunton, the Leader of the Opposition, echoed this view. As he put it: "I think the committee has an obligation to those who mandated the terms of reference to report first to the Chamber." This position was also supported by Senator Cools, who proposed, like Senator Kinsella afterwards, that the matter be resolved by allowing Senator Kirby to table one copy of the report when it is available before the end of the sitting today, Thursday.

At the conclusion of these exchanges, I agreed to take the matter under advisement. Given the pressing nature of the situation, it would be inappropriate to defer a decision on the *prima facie* merits of this question of privilege. Accordingly, I am prepared to rule now.

Honourable senators, I think it is only right to inform you that I was a member of the Social Affairs, Science and Technology Committee during the last session and I was just reappointed to it for this session, until I resigned yesterday.

Rule 43 of the *Rules of the Senate* states that a question of privilege must involve "a matter directly concerning the privileges of the Senate, of any committee, or any Senator." In addition, it must "be raised to correct a grave and serious breach." Do these criteria apply in this case? Senator Murray has acknowledged that the Senate itself did confer on the Social Affairs Committee the authority, notwithstanding usual practices, to deposit any report with the Clerk if the Senate is not then sitting. This permission was granted less than two weeks ago, on October 8. The senator maintains that it was only intended to apply when the Senate was facing a prolonged adjournment. However, there is nothing in the motion to explain the circumstances or qualifications by which this permission is to be exercised. In addition, there are recent precedents to suggest that a prolonged adjournment is not a necessary requisite or precondition. The most relevant of these precedents occurred on April 18 this year and it involved the Social Affairs Committee. As recorded in the *Journals of the Senate* that day, at page 1425, Senator Kirby moved the consideration of the seventeenth report of the Committee which "he had deposited with the Clerk earlier today." Although Senator Murray commented on the event at the time, no objection was raised. A similar incident occurred the previous month. This one involved a report of the National Security and Defence Committee. A complaint was made, though not as a point of order, about the fact that the media had knowledge about a report that had been deposited with the Clerk before members of the Senate.

[English]

Honourable senators, aside from these precedents, there is another more fundamental reason to find that there is no *prima facie* question of privilege. To be valid, a question of privilege or contempt must involve, as I have already explained, a grave or serious breach of our parliamentary practice. It has been argued that senators are entitled to receive the report of one of its committees first. Normally, this is true. It is admitted in the standard parliamentary authorities that the premature release of a committee report can constitute a question of privilege or a contempt. In this case, the Senate, exercising its undoubted privilege of governing its own internal proceedings, has waived this right, or at least qualified it, by granting permission to the committee to deposit any report with the clerk. The Senate cannot now pretend that the exercise of this permission is a breach of the privileges of the Senate. To think that it can is to contend that one privilege can trump another. The Senate has given licence to a committee to deposit its reports with the clerk whenever the Senate is not sitting. This permission was granted without qualification. Under these circumstances, I find that there can be no *prima facie* question of privilege, and I so rule.

---

• (1340)

## SENATORS' STATEMENTS

### LITERACY ACTION DAY

**Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Honourable senators, today is Literacy Action Day — a time to remind parliamentarians and all Canadians that not all adults in our nation have the literacy skills that most of us take for granted. In fact, over 20 per cent of our adults — approximately 10 million people — lack basic literacy skills, thus preventing them from engaging in any number of commonplace activities.

The scope of literacy has steadily widened over the years. In our society today, these needs have evolved and literacy is now recognized as a universal human right. UNESCO, in the 1950s, interpreted literacy as being the ability required to use print to function in everyday life. In 1959, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of the Child included principle 7, which states that the child is entitled to receive free and compulsory education in the elementary stages.

I am certain that all honourable senators would agree when I say that the abilities to read, to write and to communicate have been fundamental elements of our lives that have led directly to our ability to be productive members of society. The literacy action movement stated the following:

Literacy is not just for understanding but also for thinking critically and responding. To participate fully in civic life, citizens must have the skills necessary to access and act upon information. Literacy is more than just a tool. It is a necessity for citizenship.

**Hon. Joyce Fairbairn:** Honourable senators, I wish to echo the spirit of Senator Kinsella's comments today. An army of 75 literacy activists from across the country is marching on Parliament Hill to try to educate and promote their cause in visits to approximately 100 members of the House of Commons, the Senate and their staffs. This is the ninth annual Literacy Action Day organized by the Movement for Canadian Literacy, MCL, and the Fédération canadienne pour l'alphabétisation en français. The activists are bringing the message from the grassroots of this nation, that over 40 per cent of Canada's adult citizens have difficulty, every day of their lives, doing routine tasks, which we all take for granted, because of inadequate reading, writing and numeracy skills. They are talking about some 8 million Canadians who are unable to fully participate in and contribute to our national life. This is simply unacceptable in the year 2002, in what we wish to think of as a prosperous and caring country.

We do not hear much about literacy in these hallowed halls, and so the movement is bringing the message to us directly. I thank all honourable senators who have participated with these people in support and in understanding. They have told us that a literate population helps our towns and strengthens our cities, which goes to the very heart of the future of our children and of our nation.

This is not about special treatment; this is not about privilege. It is about access to learning and literacy as a right and a responsibility of citizenship for every individual in this country, whatever their age or circumstance. It is the foundation of everything we do throughout each day of our lives.

Honourable senators, I urge you to take these messages to heart. Help us to succeed with this national effort.

**Hon. Ethel Cochrane:** Honourable senators, I too rise today in recognition of Literacy Action Day on Parliament Hill. Increasingly, literacy skills are attracting media attention in this country. Consider, for instance, that in the last month we have read headlines, such as: "New grads will not have to read," and "Nova Scotia set to allow illiterate graduates." Blessed be to God.

Recently, we have also learned that 25 per cent of Ontario high school students failed a basic literacy test. That is more than 32,000 students who have inadequate reading and writing skills.

Clearly, these stories indicate a serious problem that extends well beyond a provincial boundary. Make no mistake about it: This is not a provincial problem. It is a national problem that requires national resources and that requires all of our attention to come to solutions. The good news is that these solutions are within our grasp. What better vehicle to use to emphasize the importance of literacy than the federal innovation agenda? After all, without a population that can read and write, and seek and understand information, there will be no innovations. Last year, I spoke on this occasion and said that we must put literacy on the political agenda. One year later, it seems that little has been accomplished on this front.

Honourable senators, it is crucial that we develop a national strategy for literacy. We must ensure that literacy and essential life skills are policy goals of the federal government. The problem has been clearly identified, and now we must dedicate greater resources and funding to implement the solutions. It is time for Human Resources and Development Canada to re-evaluate literacy as a top priority and to expand upon its allocated resources. I humbly suggest that increasing the funding and broadening the mandate of the National Literacy Secretariat will serve as a good starting point.

Honourable senators, our literacy skills are like muscles: If we do not use them, they will continue to weaken until finally we lose them. We need to create a culture that makes literacy a priority by promoting lifelong learning and constant upgrading, regardless of current literacy levels. We need to make literacy a national priority and a lifelong goal of every Canadian.

[Translation]

### PHILATELY MONTH

**Hon. Jean Lapointe:** Honourable senators, it brings me great pleasure to point out to the chamber that October is stamp collecting month. As a stamp collector since the age of eight, and member, for many years now, of the Stamp Advisory Committee of Canada Post, I would like to suggest those who have never known the pleasures of this marvellous hobby, to try it at least once in his or her life.

Some of my greatest joys have been the discovery of a stamp with an anomaly, or the opportunity of purchasing a stamp collection at a great price, and all sorts of adventures, each one greater than the next, not to mention the hours of recreation.

• (1350)

You are all aware of my chronic allergy to wasting time; therefore I will be brief.

Senator Sparrow, in his brilliant and dynamic speech on the report of the Standing Senate Committee on Privileges, Standing Rules and Rights of Parliament to reduce the time for tributes, mentioned famous senators who have made an important contribution to our country and said that they deserved a tribute.

It is true that many senators have been great Canadians, devoted to the cause of their country. Today, I would like to make the following recommendation to Senator Sparrow, who has criticized me for being frequently conspicuous by my absence and who actually is not here himself today: draw up a list of the most important senators in history and request that Canada Post issue a series of stamps entitled "Eminent Senators." I would be very pleased to support this request, on the condition that we respect the time allocated for tributes as suggested by the committee.

Some of you think of me as a "timbré," but I want you to know that I am one who is happy to be here!

[English]

I should mention that the word "timbré" that I have used in my short speech has a double meaning in French. It can be either a "stamp nut" or a "nut," period. I am both.

#### LITERACY ACTION DAY

**Hon. Consiglio Di Nino:** Honourable senators, I would like to make a few comments about literacy.

As we know, since 1993 representatives from various literacy groups have come to Ottawa for Literacy Action Day, which provides parliamentarians with an opportunity to discuss Canada's literacy problems with those who work daily to improve them. Literacy skills play a vital part in our everyday lives, impacting upon health, social interactions and economic situations.

The influence of literacy on our economy is something of which to especially take note. Although people tend to think of it as an obvious relationship, it is important to always be mindful of our literacy skills and how they contribute to the stability and competitiveness of Canada's economy. There is a direct correlation between literacy and personal economic well-being. Canadians with low literacy skills are more likely to be unemployed or to have lower incomes. A recent study by Statistics Canada revealed that each additional year of education a person obtains is worth over 8 per cent of their paycheque. The impact of literacy upon economic position is no less important if we consider how it affects the country as a whole.

Only 10 per cent of Canadians believe low literacy skills to be part of our country's economic problem. This perception contradicts the truth, as was illustrated in 1997 by a report from the Organization of Economic Co-operation and Development that warned that Canada's future economic

competitiveness depended upon raising our literacy and learning skills, especially in the workplace, where we use our literacy skills the most. In the years since that report, we have worked hard as a country to promote lifelong learning and ongoing job training. The aging of our labour force, combined with the high number of jobs that will require at least 16 years of education in the future, demonstrates the fact that we will have to be vigilant in our encouragement of continuous learning.

Literacy Action Day affords the opportunity to keep public emphasis on all of the consequences of literacy problems in our country.

Honourable senators, I would like to salute Senator Fairbairn for her commitment to this cause and, as well, the literacy group represented here today, some of whom I believe are in the gallery, and all literacy workers across Canada for their continuing efforts.

**Hon. Bill Rompkey:** Honourable senators, I want to add my voice to that of Senator Di Nino's and to those of the other honourable senators who spoke on the issue of literacy, as well as concur in his congratulations to Senator Fairbairn. You heard Senator Kinsella, Senator Cochrane, Senator Fairbairn and Senator Di Nino clearly describe the literacy situation in Canada.

I had a visit this morning from an Aboriginal group from Conne River, Newfoundland. The situation among Aboriginals is far worse than in the population at large. We have to focus on that and see to it that while we attack literacy, to which we have not even been providing adequate lip service, we must make a special effort to see that funds are there for Aboriginal people. In my riding is a nickel mine on the border of land claims by two sets of Aboriginal people. Of course, if they do not have the education, they will not get the jobs the mine offers. There is a direct correlation between literacy and employment. We who want to have an input in the next budget must see that sufficient funds are made available in the country for literacy, particularly among Aboriginal people.

#### THE LATE YOUSUF KARSH, C.C., O.C.

##### TRIBUTE

**Hon. Raymond C. Setlakwe:** Honourable senators, several weeks ago a memorial service for Yousuf Karsh was held in Notre Dame Basilica. Much has been said about the tremendous talents of this great portrait artist, whose achievements, spanning the last six decades of the 20th century, have made him the most celebrated photographer of his time.

He was brought here from Mardin in Turkish Armenia by his uncle George Nakash, a notable photographer in his own right. He had a studio in Sherbrooke, Quebec, where Yousuf apprenticed. His uncle encouraged him to study in Boston with Garo, a well-known artist of his time. He subsequently chose, wisely, to set up his own studio in Ottawa and henceforth the names of Karsh and Ottawa became synonymous. The renown that Yousuf Karsh's work reflected on his adopted country and the city of Ottawa was, in time, recognized and appreciated by both. He was made a Companion of the Order of Canada and given the keys to the City of Ottawa. His great work is now the property of the National Archives of Canada, and a special section in the new Portrait Gallery of Canada will be devoted to him.

As Dr. Lilly Koltun, the director of the new Portrait Gallery of Canada, put it during the memorial service:

When we look at a Karsh portrait, we feel enlarged, a part of something more meaningful about humanity, about ourselves. He appeals to the best in us, not just in his sitters.

That unique feeling of great nobility that he engendered in us and the many moments of elusive truth that he uncovered will fill their place in the Portrait Gallery of Canada, alongside the other extraordinary portraits of the past 500 years that Canada's history has produced. Surely this is the most fitting tribute we can pay to Yousuf Karsh. As he has immortalized so many, his portraits will remain to grace his memory forever, reminding us of the sweeping continuum of history which was his unending joy to pursue and capture, and to offer it as a gift to all of Canada's and the world's future generations.

#### DISTINGUISHED VISITOR IN THE GALLERY

**The Hon. the Speaker *pro tempore*:** Honourable senators, I should like to draw your attention to the presence in the gallery of our former colleague the Honourable Lois Wilson.

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

[*Translation*]

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

---

• (1400)

[*English*]

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

#### ENERGY, THE ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

##### REPORT PURSUANT TO RULE 104 TABLED

**Hon. Tommy Banks:** Honourable senators, pursuant to rule 104 of the *Rules of the Senate*, I have the honour to table the first report of the Standing Senate Committee on Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources, which deals with the expenses incurred by the committee during the First Session of the Thirty-seventh Parliament.

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

#### SOCIAL AFFAIRS, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

##### BUDGET—STUDY ON STATE OF HEALTH CARE SYSTEM—REPORT OF COMMITTEE PRESENTED

**Hon. Marjory LeBreton,** Deputy Chair of the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology, presented the following report:

[ Senator Setlakwe ]

Thursday, October 24, 2002

The Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology has the honour to present its

#### SECOND REPORT

Your Committee, which was authorized by the Senate on Tuesday, October 8, 2002, to examine and report upon the state of the health care system in Canada, respectfully requests that it be empowered to engage the services of such counsel and technical, clerical and other personnel as may be necessary for the purpose of its study.

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

Respectfully submitted,

MARJORY LEBRETON  
*Deputy Chair*

(*For text of report, see today's Journals of the Senate, Appendix, p. 99.*)

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

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

[*Translation*]

#### INTERNAL ECONOMY, BUDGETS AND ADMINISTRATION

##### REPORT PURSUANT TO RULE 104 TABLED

**Hon. Lise Bacon:** Honourable senators, pursuant to rule 104 of the *Rules of the Senate*, I have the honour to table the second report of the Standing Senate Standing Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration, concerning the expenditures of the committee during the first session of the 37th Parliament.

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

##### THIRD REPORT OF COMMITTEE PRESENTED

**Hon. Lise Bacon,** Chair of the Standing Committee of Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration, presented the following report:

Thursday, October 24, 2002

The Standing Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration has the honour to present its

### THIRD REPORT

Your Committee recommends that an increase of 2.3 per cent to the salary ranges of the Senate senior management employees (Senior Executive Group level 1-3 and Middle Management Group level 2) be awarded effective April 1, 2002.

Respectfully submitted,

LISE BACON  
*Chair*

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

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

[*English*]

### BANKING, TRADE AND COMMERCE

#### REPORT PURSUANT TO RULE 104 TABLED

**Hon. E. Leo Kolber:** Honourable senators, I have the honour to table the first report of the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce, which deals with the expenses incurred by the committee during the First Session of the Thirty-seventh Parliament.

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

### TAX CONVENTIONS IMPLEMENTATION BILL, 2002

#### REPORT OF COMMITTEE

**Hon. E. Leo Kolber,** Chairman of the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce, presented the following report:

Thursday, October 24, 2002

The Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce has the honour to present its

### SECOND REPORT

Your Committee, to which was referred Bill S-2, An Act to implement an agreement, conventions and protocols concluded between Canada and Kuwait, Mongolia, the United Arab Emirates, Moldova, Norway, Belgium and Italy for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion and to amend the enacted text of three tax treaties, has, in obedience to the Order of Reference of Wednesday, October 23, 2002, examined the said Bill and now reports the same without amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

E. LEO KOLBER  
*Chairman*

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

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

[*Translation*]

### BUSINESS OF THE SENATE

#### ADJOURNMENT

**Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Deputy Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, I seek leave of the Senate to return to Government Notices of Motions after Orders of the Day, Inquiries and Motions, in order to discuss the adjournment motion.

**Hon. Lowell Murray:** Honourable senators, with all due respect, I withhold consent on this motion.

**The Hon. the Speaker *pro tempore*:** Leave is not granted.

[*English*]

### ABORIGINAL PEOPLES

#### NOTICE OF MOTION TO AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE TO CONTINUE STUDY ON ISSUES AFFECTING URBAN ABORIGINAL YOUTH

**Hon. Thelma J. Chalifoux:** Honourable senators, I give notice that on Tuesday next, October 29, 2002, I will move:

That the Standing Senate Committee on Aboriginal Peoples, pursuant to the input it has received from urban Aboriginal people and organizations, be authorized to examine and report upon issues affecting urban Aboriginal youth in Canada. In particular, the Committee shall be authorized to examine access, provision and delivery of services; policy and jurisdictional issues; employment and education; access to economic opportunities; youth participation and empowerment; and other related matters;

That the papers and evidence received and taken on the subject and the work accomplished by the Standing Senate Committee on Aboriginal Peoples during the First Session of the Thirty-seventh Parliament be referred to the Committee; and

That the Committee report to the Senate no later than June 27, 2003.

### BANKING, TRADE AND COMMERCE

#### NOTICE OF MOTION TO AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE TO ENGAGE SERVICES

**Hon. E. Leo Kolber:** Honourable senators, I give notice that at the next sitting of the Senate, I will move:

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

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE TO PERMIT ELECTRONIC COVERAGE

**Hon. E. Leo Kolber:** Honourable senators, I give notice that at the next sitting of the Senate, I will move:

That the Standing Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce be authorized to permit coverage by electronic media of its public proceedings with the least possible disruption of its hearings.

[Translation]

THE SENATE

AMENDMENT TO AUTHORIZE SOCIAL AFFAIRS, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE TO STUDY ACCESS OF HARD-OF-HEARING PEOPLE TO TELEVISION PROGRAMS—NOTICE OF MOTION

**Hon. Jean-Robert Gauthier:** Honourable senators, on October 9, when I tabled Notice of Motion No. 11, the Committee of Selection had not reported back and, as a result, I did not specify the name of the committee to which I wanted my motion referred. I seek leave to amend Notice of Motion No. 11, to include reference to the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology.

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

**Hon. Senators:** Agreed.

• (1410)

[English]

QUESTION PERIOD

PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE

RECRUITMENT OF INTELLIGENCE ANALYSTS

**Hon. J. Michael Forrestall:** Honourable senators, my question is for the Leader of the Government in the Senate, who, I report, is in good cheer and smiling.

It is pretty clear, honourable senators, that someone, somewhere along the line, dropped the ball in the Privy Council Office in the briefing to the Prime Minister, prior to his trip to the Francophonie Conference in Lebanon. This is a product of this government's aversion to national and international security matters.

In the past two months or so, the Privy Council Office, through the Public Service Commission Web site, has advertised for a

[ Senator Kolber ]

senior intelligence analyst, Middle East and Africa, and an intelligence analyst, Middle East and Africa. Thus, no one should be too surprised that this government does not seem to know that there is a group called Hezbollah, let alone who its leader is, because the government appears to have done next to nothing to beef up its own intelligence community, even though it is now in excess of one year since September 11.

Could I ask the Leader of the Government if this is true?

**Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, I wish to thank the honourable senator for his question.

I always smile at you, Senator Forrestall. There is nothing new with that.

**Senator Forrestall:** You have scowled on one occasion.

**Senator Carstairs:** As to Senator Forrestall's specific question in regards to Hezbollah, of course the Government of Canada is aware of Hezbollah. The Government of Canada, along with the United Kingdom, listed the external security organization of Hezbollah as a terrorist wing. There is no question about that. Canada has knowledge of who they are.

As to the question with respect to whether PCO is hiring, there is always hiring going on in PCO. That is nothing new. If you went through the Web site, you would see a list on practically every job aspect.

Let me be clear on the record that there are experts in Foreign Affairs to whom PCO, PMO, members of cabinet and even members of the opposition can go if they wish to seek information.

**Senator Forrestall:** I find that situation of passing interest.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

FRANCOPHONIE CONFERENCE, 2002—  
ATTENDANCE OF LEADER OF HEZBOLLAH

**Hon. J. Michael Forrestall:** Honourable senators, we are in the middle of a war on terror, admittedly a different kind of war, but it is one. There have been new terror attacks, they seem to be on the rise, and there have warnings that al-Qaeda has reconstituted itself, is once again in an attack mode and is likely undertaking, in conjunction with Hezbollah, the planning of something terrifying in nature.

Could the minister confirm that the government has been advertising for a senior intelligence analyst and an intelligence analyst? It takes a long time to recruit people with this particular type of training. I am curious as to why it has been only recently that we have got around to beefing up this side of our capacity to understand and to be aware of what is going on.

The government is looking for an analyst to tell the government what it could do or should be doing regarding softwood lumber, some three years after that horse was out of the barn. The RCMP is looking to beef up its analysis in these sections.

Why did we wait so long? How could we possibly send our Prime Minister to Lebanon as apparently ill-briefed as he was? How could that have happened?



**Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, to begin with, I reject the attitude that the Prime Minister was ill-briefed. I think he was well-briefed on his trip to Lebanon. Clearly, in his remarks to the conference, he had the knowledge and the expertise with respect to that particular file.

As to whether the Prime Minister knew everyone in the room, I believe it would be impossible for any leader of a country to know everyone who was sitting in a room on any given day at any given event. That is an impossible expectation to place on the Prime Minister.

As to hiring with respect to the Privy Council Office, hiring is ongoing. When people leave, they are replaced.

**Senator Forrestall:** Honourable senators, the minister apparently missed my point. That is not her fault; it is probably mine.

As a final supplementary question, if the Prime Minister is to be well briefed, he should be aware of who is in the room, not necessarily everyone in the room, but those of whom he should be made aware. Could someone have sent him a note and told him?

**Senator Carstairs:** Well, one could ask the question, "Why was the ambassador from the United States not told who he was sitting next to?" He apparently did not know who he was sitting next to either. The point is that this man was not on the official list of invitees of the organization. He was there, apparently, at the request of the President of Lebanon, who was the host of the conference.

It is not unusual that the host of a particular country might have a select group of invitees that he or she may invite to a particular conference, but they are not conference participants in the general sense of the word.

**Hon. David Tkachuk:** Honourable senators, the issue regarding the ambassador has been raised again, and this is the second time the minister has raised this point. The U.S. State Department said that he was not sitting next to the head of Hezbollah. If the senator has a picture, it should be tabled here so we can inform the State Department that it was wrong.

What happened was, a picture of the meeting was flashed on the screen showing him in attendance. The Prime Minister was not aware of his identity, not only at the beginning of the meeting, but some nine hours later, according to the news reports. No one had briefed him. This individual is not just head of the "good wing" of the Hezbollah, as the Liberal government would have us believe, but of the entire Hezbollah, which includes the terrorist organization, as well as the fundraising groups that this government allows to raise funds for in this country.

I agree with Senator Forrestall that it is shocking that the Prime Minister, when questioned, said he did not know him. What kind of security briefing was he given then?

**Senator Carstairs:** To answer the honourable senator's question, the Prime Minister was given the security briefing that was considered necessary in order to attend a meeting of this magnitude. He did attend that security briefing. He did get briefed on the files that were necessary for him to be briefed on. He represented us, as he always does, with a great deal of class, ability and competence.

**Senator Tkachuk:** Honourable senators, the Prime Minister may have been briefed. He either was not briefed on this particular organization or who was in attendance or, if he was briefed, he did not understand any of it. In either case, we have a serious problem here.

I have a follow-up supplementary question. What are the names of the other wings or branches of the Hezbollah? If the Prime Minister does not understand what Hezbollah is and does not know the name of the head of Hezbollah, could the government inform us of the names of the other organizations that are allowed to operate in this country?

• (1420)

**Senator Carstairs:** Honourable senators, I take great exception to the honourable senator indicating that the Prime Minister does not know what Hezbollah is.

**Senator Tkachuk:** Those are his words, not mine!

**Senator Carstairs:** Quite frankly, Canada listed the Hezbollah External Security Organization, which is the military terrorist wing of Hezbollah, on November 7, 2001, under Canada's UN suppression of terrorism regulations. Clearly, that matter went through the appropriate procedures. Clearly, all cabinet ministers, including the Prime Minister, are well informed as to the particular organization that was placed by Canada under our UN suppression of terrorism regulations.

**Senator Tkachuk:** Honourable senators, I have another follow-up question because the minister did not answer my question. It is somewhat like saying, "Who is Donovan Bailey?"

My question, to which I did not get an answer, is this: What are the names of the other wings or branches of Hezbollah that are allowed to operate in Canada and raise funds in Canada? In the previous line of questioning, the minister responded that there are two other branches, besides the military wing, that bomb and kill people. What are the names of the two organizations supposedly doing good works and raising money in this country?

**Senator Carstairs:** Honourable senators, the Government of Canada has taken a clear and honourable position, with which the opposition does not concur, but one in which we can take great pride.

**Senator Tkachuk:** What are their names?

**Senator Carstairs:** There is an organization called the External Security Organization that Hezbollah has formed and that the Government of Canada has listed as a terrorist wing under our United Nations commitments.

**Senator Tkachuk:** The killing wing.

**Senator Carstairs:** We did that in November of 2001. We have continued to allow other aspects of Hezbollah to function. I can tell the honourable senator, for example, that the IRA, which many regard as a terrorist organization, is also a legitimate political party in Northern Ireland.

**Senator Tkachuk:** No, it is not.

**Senator Carstairs:** It operates and it functions. Hezbollah is a legitimate political party in the country of Lebanon. It has elected 11 members to the democratically elected government of Lebanon.

**Senator Tkachuk:** Shame. That is a shame!

**Senator Carstairs:** It seems to me that it is entirely appropriate —

**Senator Tkachuk:** Why do we not have the mafia dons raising money here?

**Senator Carstairs:** — that arms of Hezbollah that perform good deeds and function in a democratic fashion should be allowed to continue to be recognized by the Government of Canada.

**Senator Tkachuk:** I think I am done.

## CANADA CUSTOMS AND REVENUE AGENCY

### WITHDRAWAL OF DISABILITY TAX CREDIT

**Hon. Marjory LeBreton:** Honourable senators, my question is for the Leader of the Government in the Senate and has to do with a disturbing situation.

The disability tax credit was designed to provide Canadians with disabilities who must, as a result of living with disabilities, incur expenses not incurred by Canadians without disabilities.

Earlier this year, 106,000 disabled Canadians received a letter from the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency saying that they are no longer disabled and that they would have to reapply for the tax credit. CCRA says that, as of the end of August, 85,000 files have been reviewed.

Can the Leader of the Government tell us how many of these 85,000 files that have been reviewed have resulted in denying disabled Canadians the disability tax credit?

**Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, that is a specific question asking for a specific number, and it is not possible for me to give her that number at the present time.

The overall philosophy of the program is that those who are most disabled in our country, those who need our help the most, should be the ones who get our help. There must be a clear distinction between individuals who may consider themselves to be disabled but who can function quite adequately in the country without the necessity of being given additional sums of money and those who are disabled to such a degree that their quality of life makes it impossible for them to function in the fullness and richness of Canadian society.

**Senator LeBreton:** Honourable senators, I guess it is all in the definition of the fullness and richness. The form disabled Canadians must take to their doctors to be filled out asks questions such as the following: "Can your patient see? Can your patient speak? Can your patient walk? Answer no only if all or almost all the time, even with therapy, medication or a device,

your patient cannot walk 50 meters on level ground or he or she takes an inordinate amount of time to do so." Those questions are on the form.

This means that if individuals can propel themselves 50 meters on a flat surface with the aid of a device, they do not qualify. In fact, there are newspaper reports of a gentleman in Nova Scotia who lost part of his leg after being run over by a train in 1979. He has been covered by Workers' Compensation and now collects a Canada disability pension. Yet, Canada Customs and Revenue Agency no longer considers him to be disabled, and he is now ineligible for the \$960 disability tax credit.

Can the Leader of the Government in the Senate possibly justify how that can happen to this man and why the government has decided to attack disabled Canadians? How much money does the government expect to save by denying this tax credit to disabled Canadians?

**Senator Carstairs:** The honourable senator knows that I cannot discuss individual cases in this chamber and will not do so because it would infringe upon the freedoms of an individual.

In terms of savings, there are to be no savings. The purpose of this program is to ensure that the money put in this fund is used for those who need it.

**Senator LeBreton:** Honourable senators, the gentleman in question obviously has no problem because it is his own story. I am sure he is appealing to people in public life to make his case known.

Many of these Canadians will not realize that they have lost this tax credit until they fill out their income tax form next spring. Can the Leader of the Government tell us what efforts are being made to contact those Canadians who did not reapply for the tax credit? Is any effort at all being made to contact these people?

**Senator Carstairs:** Honourable senators, if they have not reapplied, presumably they have been identified as not meeting that particular form of tax credit. If they have reapplied, they have resubmitted their applications. If they meet the criteria of having a severe and prolonged disability, then they will, of course, continue to receive a benefit.

**Senator LeBreton:** Who in the department decides what the criteria are? Does a departmental doctor look at the form, or is it just decided by a computer or some clerk whether the criteria are eligible?

**Senator Carstairs:** The evaluation process in place has not changed for many years at Human Resources Development Canada. The processes are the same that were put in place under the previous administration. There are medical personnel who can be contacted, and there are those who are trained specifically to identify those most in need.

## THE ENVIRONMENT

### RATIFICATION OF KYOTO PROTOCOL

**Hon. Leonard J. Gustafson:** Honourable senators, my question deals with the climate change draft plan that the federal government has been circulating.

Having seen the report of the draft plan in the newspaper, there does not appear to be a guarantee that no single region of the country or sector of the economy will bear a disproportionate cost of implementing the Kyoto accord. Could the Leader of the Government clarify this issue for senators?

**Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, a draft plan was made public this morning at 10 o'clock. That draft plan outlines how the federal government hopes to obtain its objectives to meet the Kyoto accord. That draft plan will be the basis of discussions that will take place in Halifax with ministers of the environment from coast to coast to coast. It is certainly the intention of this plan that no region shall bear an unbearable or unreasonable burden.

**Senator Gustafson:** Honourable senators, the climate change draft plan has also indicated that Ottawa will require consumers to change their behaviour. For instance, Ottawa will require Canadians to drive their vehicles 10 per cent less each year and to make their homes more energy efficient. Could the Leader of the Government tell us what measures the government will put in place to enforce these programs?

**Senator Carstairs:** Honourable senators, let us be honest. The government cannot limit an individual from driving as much as the individual wishes to drive. The government will encourage the use of procedures that will allow, for example, better use of our mass transportation systems.

• (1430)

It will provide encouragement to buy more fuel-efficient vehicles. It will encourage the use of ethanol in all automobiles and in the gasoline used for all automobiles. We know that all cars can now use a certain percentage of ethanol.

Those are some of the encouragements that will be provided by the Government of Canada.

**Senator Gustafson:** Honourable senators, will this measure automatically bring on an increased carbon tax to enforce the reduction of vehicle and gasoline usage?

**Senator Carstairs:** The government has been very clear — there will not be a carbon tax.

**Hon. Gerry St. Germain:** Honourable senators, I have a supplementary question for the Leader of the Government in the Senate.

In the spirit of the previous response, let us be honest. Let us do just that. Yesterday, Senator Buchanan avidly described his relationship with Senator Carstairs' father. I was remiss in not including Newfoundland and Labrador and Nova Scotia in my questions on Kyoto on Tuesday.

Premier Klein of Alberta told the Empire Club in Toronto that Kyoto was not a Canadian plan but one concocted by international theorists at the United Nations. Being one of the greatest premiers of one of the greatest provinces in this country, I am sure Premier Klein would not misrepresent the facts. In being honest, is he right?

**Senator Carstairs:** The honourable senator is certainly right in saying that Premier Klein is premier of one of the greatest provinces in this country, along with nine other great provinces. As I said yesterday, they form our great country.

There is some disagreement as to whether he is a great premier, but that is open to debate, as is of course the discussion of the qualities of every premier and every prime minister. We will probably continue to have some disagreements on the basis of political persuasion.

However, he is quite right — the Kyoto accord is not a Canadian plan. It is an international treaty to address the issues of climate change that do not just happen in Canada but which happen throughout the world. We have agreed, through our Prime Minister, to put the Kyoto accord through a ratification process in this country because we think we can make our contribution to climate change one which will impact not just Canadians but every citizen of the world.

**Senator St. Germain:** Honourable senators, it concerns me that we would enter into a program in which Canadians would have no input. Perhaps I misheard the Leader of the Government in the Senate in her response. If so, she can correct me if I am wrong. It does not make sense that we would do that.

Apparently, the federal government, the government which the minister represents, is talking about next generation technology for low-cost nuclear power. I think nuclear power is an irresponsible and dangerous way to go simply because there are not enough programs in place to dispose of nuclear waste. Will we have nuclear generation plants foisted on us as opposed to the hydroelectric plants that we now utilize?

**Senator Carstairs:** Honourable senators, since it was only tabled this morning, I can understand why the honourable senator has not had a chance to read the entire plan. However, it is clear in the plan that nuclear energy is not included in Canada's target to meet the provisions of the Kyoto accord.

Of course there will be input from Canadians. That is exactly what the ministers' meeting next Monday is all about. It is taking place so that the premiers' representatives, through their ministers of the environment, can meet with the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of Natural Resources to develop, together, a plan to meet our targets under the Kyoto Protocol.

**The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore:** I regret to inform honourable senators that the time for Question Period has expired.

#### VISITOR IN THE GALLERY

**The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore:** I wish to draw the attention of honourable senators to the presence in our gallery of Mr. Firoz Cachalia, Speaker, Provincial Legislature of Gauteng, Republic of South Africa.

[*Translation*]

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

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### BUSINESS OF THE SENATE

**Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Deputy Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, under Government Business, I would like to deal first with Motion No. 3, then follow with Motion No. 1, and then resume the order proposed in the Notice Paper.

### CODE OF CONDUCT AND ETHICS GUIDELINES

#### MOTION TO REFER DOCUMENTS TO STANDING COMMITTEE ON RULES, PROCEDURES AND THE RIGHTS OF PARLIAMENT—DEBATE ADJOURNED

**Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Deputy Leader of the Government),** pursuant to notice given October 23, 2002, moved:

That the documents entitled: “Proposals to amend the Parliament of Canada Act (Ethics Commissioner) and other Acts as a consequence” and “Proposals to amend the Rules of the Senate and the Standing Orders of the House of Commons to implement the 1997 Milliken-Oliver Report,” tabled in the Senate on October 23, 2002, be referred to the Standing Committee on Rules, Procedures and the Rights of Parliament.

**Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, I am pleased to speak to this motion today to authorize the Standing Committee on Rules, Procedures and the Rights of Parliament to examine the draft bills governing the conduct of parliamentarians.

[*English*]

These proposals relate to two aspects of the Prime Minister’s eight-point ethics plan, which I have recently tabled. The plan includes a draft bill to establish an independent ethics commissioner reporting to Parliament and a draft code of conduct for parliamentarians.

The motion before us today is straightforward. It would authorize the Rules Committee to review these draft proposals and to report to the Senate on its findings.

As honourable senators are aware, the issue of the conduct of parliamentarians and public office-holders has a long history, and parliamentarians have long been struggling to establish rules and institutions to govern our conduct. Attempts to establish a comprehensive code of conduct to govern parliamentarians dates back almost 30 years. Some honourable senators may recall our former colleague the Honourable Allan MacEachen’s green paper entitled, “Members of Parliament and Conflict of Interest,” tabled in the Senate in 1973.

[ The Hon. the Speaker *pro tempore* ]

Following the recommendations of the Senate and the House of Commons, the government introduced a bill in 1978. Unfortunately, that did not pass before Parliament was dissolved in 1979.

The previous government was also active on this issue. Between 1988 and 1993, four separate pieces of proposed legislation were introduced by the government. Unfortunately, all four bills died on the Order Paper. However, we did receive the valuable Stanbury-Blenkarn report of 1992.

More recently, we had the special joint committee chaired by the Honourable Senator Donald Oliver and the Honourable Peter Milliken, who is currently Speaker of the other place.

• (1440)

I should like to take this opportunity to note the leadership and work that the Honourable Senator Oliver undertook as joint chair of this committee. The Oliver-Milliken report was tabled in 1997, and the government believes that it is a sound, non-partisan basis upon which to proceed with establishing a code of conduct for parliamentarians.

As honourable senators will see, the government’s draft proposals on a code of conduct are based largely on the Oliver-Milliken report.

[*Translation*]

Honourable senators, we are here because we want to serve our country as best we can. We are not here to serve our own personal interests, but to fulfil our commitment and our sense of duty. However, it is not enough to know that we must comply with very high standards.

[*English*]

As the Prime Minister has indicated, all parliamentarians have a role to play in ensuring the trust of Canadians in our public institutions. We have tabled our proposals on the ethics commissioner and a code of conduct in draft form in order to give parliamentarians the earliest possible opportunity to debate, to discuss and to have input into them. That is why we are putting forth this motion to refer these proposals to the Standing Committee on Rules, Procedures and the Rights of Parliament. If appropriate, the Rules Committee may wish to join with the committee in the other place to hear particular witnesses and share thoughts on the best approach to be taken on these issues, and we would certainly support such a motion.

The Prime Minister has stated that the government will be open to changes recommended by the Senate and by the House committees. I look forward, personally, to working with the Rules Committee as it reviews the proposals.

I should like to take a moment to highlight some of the key aspects of these draft proposals. First, it is proposed that an ethics commissioner be established as an independent officer of Parliament. The ethics commissioner would administer the code of conduct for parliamentarians and, in addition, would provide advice to the Prime Minister on ministerial ethical issues. As well, the commissioner would report annually to both the Senate and the House of Commons.

As to the code of conduct for parliamentarians, many honourable senators will be aware of the Oliver-Milliken report which proposed the consolidation and modernization of the rules governing parliamentarians, a disclosure regime to provide for transparency in our work, and a process for the prevention and resolution of conflict of interest.

The proposed code of conduct is being put forward as rules of Parliament rather than legislation, which is consistent with the approach that the Senate and the House of Commons are responsible for their own affairs.

Adopting a code of conduct would strengthen Parliament by providing parliamentarians with an independent source of advice on ethical issues, modernizing outdated rules and establishing new rules on issues such as gifts and personal benefits, promoting transparency through disclosure of interests, providing a mechanism to resolve ethical issues and, finally, by modernizing Canada's Parliament in line with other parliamentary democracies, including those of the United Kingdom, Australia and most of our provinces.

As the code of conduct would replace existing conflict of interest rules, the draft bill on the ethics commissioner also includes amendments to the Parliament of Canada Act to repeal the redundant sections. This includes the repeal of sections 14 and 15 of the Parliament of Canada Act, which I know many senators believe to be very much outdated.

While the Oliver-Milliken proposals provide an excellent starting point, our proposed code has important modifications that address concerns raised by parliamentarians, including senators. First, there would be no disclosure of spousal interests. However, parliamentarians would be required to disclose conflicts with family member interests in exceptional cases, which builds on conflict of interest rules presently found in rule 94 of the *Rules of the Senate of Canada*.

Second, only parliamentarians would be able to bring complaints against other parliamentarians in their respective house. For example, a senator could, in fact, raise a complaint against another senator, but a member of the House of Commons could not raise a complaint with respect to the behaviour of a senator, and the reverse would hold true. This would respect, we believe, the independence of both of our houses.

Finally, each House of Parliament would be required to administer the code in its respective chamber. The Oliver-Milliken report recommended a joint parliamentary committee on official conduct. This particular draft set of proposals does not go in that direction. It does not recommend a joint parliamentary committee on official conduct. It recommends that we establish a separate Senate committee, or use an existing Senate committee, to guide the work of the ethics commissioner and to make recommendations to the Senate as it applies to senators. Of course, the same situation would exist in the House of Commons. Either a new committee or an existing committee could provide directions to the ethics commissioner with respect to the activities of members of the House of Commons.

[*Translation*]

Canadians expect the conduct of parliamentarians and the government to be exemplary, and rightly so. Given the efforts

made by the previous government and the work done by the Oliver-Milliken committee, this is clearly not a partisan issue.

[*English*]

I am confident that all senators will work in a non-partisan way on these proposals to ensure the adoption of a code and a bill on an ethics commissioner that can be supported by all parliamentarians.

On motion of Senator Lynch-Staunton, debate adjourned.

## SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

### MOTION FOR ADDRESS IN REPLY— DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Morin, seconded by the Honourable Senator Hubley, for an Address to Her Excellency the Governor General in reply to her Speech from the Throne at the Opening of the Second Session of the Thirty-seventh Parliament.—(*2nd day of resuming debate*).

**Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, I wish to begin by expressing gratitude to Her Excellency the Governor General of Canada for gracing us with her presence in this chamber on September 30.

[*Translation*]

I should also like to thank the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, Senators Yves Morin and Elizabeth Hubley, for the pertinence of their remarks.

[*English*]

I should also like to thank my colleague the Honourable Senator Lynch-Staunton, Leader of the Opposition, for his address here yesterday, although I certainly disagree with his statement that there were few specifics in the Speech from the Throne. I would point out, with the greatest of respect, that in all the Speeches from the Throne to which I have ever listened, brought down by whatever government happened to be in power, the rule seems to have been that there are very few specifics.

The whole purpose of a Speech from the Throne, I suggest, is to provide an overview of the direction a government plans to take in the next year or 18 months. It is not supposed to be a very specific document illustrating the exact plans, including the spending plans, of the government, which, of course, come down in the budget.

I would congratulate our Prime Minister on what will, in all likelihood, be his last Speech from the Throne. I am proud to be part of a government led by an individual who puts the care of our people at the top of his agenda.

That is why I would like to start my speech today with one specific aspect of the Speech from the Throne, because there was indeed at least one specific that sets the tone for this government's priorities in the remaining part of its mandate, that being, of course, palliative and end-of-life care.

As those in this chamber know, in addition to my role as Leader of the Government in the Senate, I am also minister with special responsibility for palliative care. Many of you have heard my personal reasons for advocating this issue, and several of you have worked on this issue with me on previous Senate committees, including Senator Beaudoin and our Speaker *pro tempore*.

• (1450)

The impact of palliative and end-of-life care is much bigger than each and every one of our personal experiences. It is universal. To my mind, end-of-life care is a barometer of the quality of our health care system and, more than that, of the values we hold as a nation. It measures how much we really value the quality of our lives and how much we respect our fellow citizens.

Canadians are world leaders in quality-of-life measures, and part of that is providing the best health care possible to our citizens. Quality end-of-life care addresses the same needs, which we have every day of our lives and which do not abate because of illness: medical care, spiritual care, family support and comfortable living conditions. Proper palliative care allows patients and their families to continue living with comfort and hope, and we must work to ensure that it is available to all Canadians.

A sea change is occurring in the way that Canadians and their representatives are understanding end-of-life care. In this Speech from the Throne, we heard:

The government will...modify existing programs to ensure that Canadians can provide compassionate care for a gravely ill or dying child, parent or spouse without putting their jobs or their incomes at risk.

This new protection for caregivers, which ensures that families can maintain their unity and dignity during times of great distress, creates a new dimension to our understanding of quality of life in Canada. I cannot sufficiently express my pleasure and sense of privilege that I serve in a government that views health care as a service that should encompass the entirety of life — from birth to living to death.

I have mentioned previously in this chamber that there is a secretariat within Health Canada responsible for creating a strategy for palliative care across the country. This will be a Canadian strategy, a uniquely Canadian response to providing better health care that this government has committed to in this Speech from the Throne.

In order to be assured that we can continue to benefit from current inroads being made on end-of-life care, we must expand our basis of knowledge and experience and fund further research in this area so critical to our health and welfare.

The Government of Canada has created the Canadian Institutes for Health Research, which have identified palliative and end-of-life care as key areas for further research. We have also created Canada Research Chairs and invested in the Networks of Centres of Excellence. This government's emphasis on funding research and innovation will benefit our health care system and

our economic development in immeasurable ways. It will create a solid foundation for government science and support universities so that they can continue to contribute to our economy and to the education of our society.

The education of our physicians and health care workers with respect to palliative and end-of-life care is another integral facet of a comprehensive health care system. I am not sure if many honourable senators know that until this September, there was not a single medical school in this country that had palliative care as a core part of a physician's training. I am pleased to announce that McMaster University, for the first time this September, has made education in the care of the dying a core part of its curriculum. I am hopeful and encouraged that other medical schools will follow the experience of McMaster University. Just as we have physician specialists who attend our births, we need access to physicians who understand the particular circumstances of people who require quality end-of-life care.

There is still remarkably little knowledge in the medical community about aspects of palliative and end-of-life care, such as the process of dying, the delivery of drugs to people at the end of their life, or the best way to address the physical and spiritual effects of chronic illness. Physicians should feel confident that their education has prepared them for the eventuality of treating a patient at the end stages of life whether that patient is a senior citizen, an adult or, all too often, a child.

Our attitude about end-of-life care is a gauge of how we measure the quality of our entire lifespan. This government considers end-of-life care only one constituent of a Canada that we want. The health of Canadians, of their environment and of their communities is paramount to preserving the way of life we are privileged to enjoy in Canada.

The fact that Canadians have repeatedly indicated their willingness to preserve and protect our health care system is, I believe, a testament to the import that we place on this service and the role it plays in shaping our very identity. We see national health care not merely as a social benefit, not just as a necessity, but as a moral obligation.

We are currently in the process of conducting two vital studies to review federal options in managing our health care system. One is by our honourable colleagues, members of the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology, which I understand will table its report tomorrow. Preliminary reports indicate that my honourable colleagues have conducted a thorough review of our health care options, and I expect that the final report will be received as a detailed and insightful analysis on restructuring our most important national service. The other report will be issued by the Honourable Roy Romanow, who is heading the Commission of the Future of Health Care in Canada. These reports signal a new approach to delivering better care across the country and to addressing the deficiencies by finding new methods to improve a service that is so vital to Canadians.

Honourable senators, Sir Winston Churchill once said that there is no finer investment for any community than putting milk into babies. Proper health care is an enduring value in Canadian society, as is our willingness to share the wealth of our nation with those who are less fortunate. The Government of Canada

continues to affirm that child poverty is an urgent matter, one that will define not only the future of those children affected but the future of us all, because if we do not fully realize the potential of all of our youngest generation, then we will not utilize the full potential of all of us.

This government is firmly committed to making Canada a healthy place to live, but also a safe and prosperous place for ourselves and for future generations. Our children need quality education service. They need support in their families and in their communities. Creating a better society for our children and their families is the best way we can sustain Canada's place as a world leader.

We will continue fighting child poverty. The government will continue to introduce a progressive and effective program, as it has in the past, by increasing the National Child Benefit to alleviate economic hardship for families with children. The government will provide increased funding for the National Child Benefit and begin new consultations to establish long-term strategies for eliminating child poverty altogether, and one could add, "none too soon." We made a commitment to do that by the year 2000, and although the numbers are somewhat better than they were then, they are not nearly good enough. The government, therefore, will continue to increase the Canada Child Tax Benefit, and we have increased benefits so that 90 per cent of all families with children are covered.

Our government will provide better access to early learning opportunities and to child care for low-income and single-parent families. Because early childhood is such a crucial stage of development, the government has committed \$2.2 billion to the Early Childhood Development Agreement, working with the provinces and territories to finance programs that assist in a child's development from pregnancy to family support. While caring for any child is a serious responsibility, caring for a child with special needs can be even more difficult for families in both emotional and financial terms. We will provide targeted assistance for families with severely disabled children.

We recognize that children's rights are too often subject to other being factors and that children need further protection with our justice system. We will toughen penalties for child abuse and neglect, and we will place more emphasis on the best interests of the child in situations dealing with justice and family court. That is an important phrase. Any of us who have watched family members get embroiled in the divorce courts of this nation sometimes realize that children seem to be the last ones considered in that kind of dialogue.

• (1500)

Where children are, however, personally involved in our justice system, we will adjust our approach to be more responsible to the needs of the child, whether that child is a victim of a crime or a witness to a crime.

[*Translation*]

The government is very concerned about Aboriginal children. The history of our Aboriginal peoples has evolved alongside that of Canada; in many respects, they are invaluable indicators of the

future of our country. Many of our past achievements are now producing tangible results that will continue to bear fruit in years to come.

For example, from 1991 to 2001, we increased the number of houses on reserves by 70 per cent; we helped nearly 30,000 students pursue post-secondary education; and we increased from \$25 million to \$125 million a year the funds earmarked for economic development on reserves.

[*English*]

Aboriginal families will benefit from a new First Nations health promotion and disease prevention strategy that will improve health care on reserves. Aboriginal families will receive more assistance for parental support, for fetal alcohol syndrome and Head Start programs.

The government will work with our First Nations to support education programs, economic development programs and health care programs to build healthier communities. We will expand pilot programs to help Aboriginal people live more successfully in cities. We will also expand community-based justice programs and work to enhance and preserve Aboriginal languages and cultures so that Aboriginal children will inherit a strong society that is self-sustaining.

Honourable senators, we cannot allow our cities to deteriorate if we want to maintain the strength and promise that Canada offers to its citizens. For this reason, the government has provided extensive investment to upgrade our cities' infrastructure, including over \$4 billion for urban renewal over the next decade, \$2 billion in major strategic projects, \$600 million for highways, \$600 million for border security, and \$3.5 billion to address homelessness. These programs will be maintained and expanded to include ways to improve the welfare of individual citizens.

A national drug strategy will be implemented that will include increasing the number of drug treatment courts, as well as consulting with Canadians and modifying our current drug policy, another initiative that was started here by my honourable colleagues in the Senate under the excellent leadership of Senator Nolin. I should like to take this opportunity to commend those senators who took part in this groundbreaking inquiry to reassess our priorities on national drug policies and to look at these issues from new perspectives.

New immigrants to Canadian cities will benefit from new measures to help their children learn our official languages and to help them settle into their new neighbourhoods. The federal government will work with provincial and municipal governments to develop environmentally responsible transportation systems to preserve our urban neighbourhoods. Better transportation systems are one way to improve our national environmental health and, yes, to meet our targets on Kyoto. Another is the preservation of our air quality, not just for ourselves, but for the benefit for everyone who shares our planet. That is why our Prime Minister has stated that, by the end of this year, we will bring forth a resolution to Parliament on the ratification of the Kyoto Protocol.

Honourable senators, this initiative is a historic accord that finally recognizes, on an international level, that we all inhabit the same planet and that we must all live in harmony with our environment.

[*Translation*]

Canada's heritage consists of its people, its geography, its green spaces and wide expanses. Because environmental issues know no boundaries, they affect us all. We are committed to cooperating with all levels of government, both within and outside federal jurisdiction, to foster environmental conservation.

We also made a commitment to create ten new parks and five new marine conservation areas. We will expand the legislation governing pesticides and the environment, and we will work together with our American neighbours and with the provinces to improve air quality, and tighten the guidelines for water quality.

[*English*]

The Canadian government is working to renew its relationship with other nations at home with the business community, with our educational institutions and with its own citizens.

The government will review corporate governance standards for federally incorporated companies and financial institutions to ensure that they, together with our securities and regulatory systems, remain sound. A new external advisory committee on smart regulation will be created to this end.

In a recent speech to the Toronto Board of Trade, the Honourable Maurizio Bevilacqua, Secretary of State for International Financial Institutions, indicated that the government will be looking to the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce to debate issues of corporate governance and investor confidence.

The government will strive to increase fair trade and commerce agreements and to resolve disputes with its trading partners. The government has also indicated it will expand its purview to take into account emerging issues such as research ethics concerning humans, new life forms and drug approvals, and will work to establish national standards on these challenges, which confront governments around the world.

A primary function of government, however, is to ensure the security for its citizens. The government has indicated it will set out before the end of this mandate a long-term direction on international and defence policy that reflects our values and interests.

With the New Partnership for Africa's Development, Canada remains at the forefront of attempts to redistribute our planet's wealth for a more equitable and, in my view, ultimately a more secure world.

The Government of Canada will make certain that Canada's military is properly equipped, although probably not to the expectations of every single member of this chamber, to fulfil the demands placed on it. We will continue to promulgate the values of pluralism, freedom and democracy that have defined us and our nation.

[ Senator Carstairs ]

For the last nine years, this government has worked to significantly increase the financial security and future prospects of its citizens. We have paid down over \$45 billion in our debt to such an extent that the debt has fallen from 72 per cent of GDP to under 50 per cent.

We have reduced personal and corporate income tax and employment insurance premiums by \$20 billion annually. Financial measures, such as these, have contributed greatly to increasing the standard of living of Canadians. This prudent fiscal management will allow the government to attain the priorities set out in the Speech from the Throne.

As my colleague Senator Lynch-Staunton mentioned yesterday, responsible management affects not only financial measures but encompasses responsible moral leadership as well. The government has already begun to introduce legislation to clarify and better enforce codes of ethics pertaining to elected officials and senior public servants, to lobbyists and to political parties and their candidates. This is a substantial undertaking, as my colleague, the honourable senator, knows. We will continue to review the working relationship between the legislature and its executive leadership.

As the honourable senator pointed out yesterday, he enjoyed the benefits of strong leadership for 14 years in municipal government, and we all know again for nine years under the former Prime Minister, the Right Honourable Brian Mulroney.

Honourable senators on both sides of this chamber can appreciate the prodigious effort that it takes to enact parliamentary reform of any sort. I believe that the ethics package the government introduced yesterday is a substantial measure of the importance we place on improving the functioning of Parliament.

Honourable senators, this country was built on tolerance, peace and a rich democratic tradition. We are a people full of hope for the future and for the future of our children and our grandchildren. Our history is one of respect, not of bloodshed. We instinctively search for solutions that are negotiated compromises, not autocratic impositions.

• (1510)

Some of us have arrived here in desperation, fleeing places where human rights and mutual respect are tenuous concepts, but we know that Canada will provide us with the necessities for a happy life: clean air and water, green spaces, freedom, tolerance and an access to health care and education.

As basic as these necessities are, they are rare commodities in the world, and each and every government that represents the people of Canada must recognize the critical importance of preserving these things for future generations.

The greatest women and men in our history did not honour Canadians with their leadership as much as they bore witness to what we already have. It falls to our leaders to see the brilliance of Canada and to express it. It is a difficult task to form a government worthy of this great country because Canadians have earned the respect of the world community and Canadians must remain vigilant in maintaining our place in the world as a peaceable and innovative country.



Together, Canadians have built a country that is a symbol of hope for people around the world. Together, we will continue to build the Canada we want.

**Hon. Lowell Murray:** Honourable senators, would the honourable Leader of the Government permit a question?

**Senator Carstairs:** I should be pleased to answer the question of the honourable senator.

**Senator Murray:** Honourable senators, I lost count at about a dozen and a half items that the Leader of the Government announced or mentioned that had not been included in the Speech from the Throne. I come to the conclusion, therefore, that what we have just heard was the first draft of the Speech from the Throne that the minister sent in, but that was not included, and she decided to announce it anyway. Am I correct?

**Senator Carstairs:** Honourable senators, I must confess that I sent in a draft request on only one particular item. That item was included in the Speech from the Throne, for which I am delighted; that is, the caregiver package for those who look after gravely ill members of their family or those members of their family who are dying.

With respect to the other aspect of the honourable senator's question, I have combined a group of programs already in effect that we will continue to build on and other new initiatives that were announced in the Speech from the Throne.

**Hon. Jack Austin:** Honourable senators, let me begin in the traditional way of parliamentary practice in participating in the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I wish to add that I do so in the conviction that the practice demonstrates, first, respect for Parliament itself, and for those whose responsibility is foremost, the integrity of the Senate and its institutional competence. The tradition also recognizes the symbolic inclusion of newer members and recognizes the promise those newer members offer to the future of parliamentary practice and principles.

On behalf of our parliamentary colleagues and myself, I offer Your Honour our respect for your high office and support in the discharge of your important responsibilities to this chamber of Parliament. I am happy to add my congratulations to you personally on your election by your colleagues as the Honourable the Speaker *pro tempore*.

My congratulations also go to Honourable Senators Yves Morin and Elizabeth Hubley for their competent discharge of their roles as mover and seconder of the motion for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. As supporters of the government, the Senate did not expect or receive from them a critical appraisal of the government's proposed program. What they demonstrated, however, in their presentations was their personal range of policy interests in the areas in which they are likely to make further interventions or contributions in the time ahead.

Honourable senators, Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II has visited Canada this month so that Canadians can join in the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of her ascension to the

Throne. Along with some honourable senators and members of the other place, my wife and I joined in a celebratory luncheon on Monday, October 7, in Vancouver, which was hosted by Prime Minister, the Right Honourable Jean Chrétien. It was a warm and delightful event that marked the great respect that British Columbians hold for the Crown and, in particular, for the extraordinary person who is Queen and sovereign. We wish her good health and long life.

I believe that British Columbians generally welcome the direction and emphasis that the government has outlined in the Speech from the Throne. New spending will be directed to the protection of the health of Canadians based on the recommendations of the Romanow commission and hopefully also on the work of the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology chaired by Senator Michael Kirby, whose final report and recommendations we should receive shortly; hopefully also on the recommendations of the various groups in the health industry; and not least on the results of first ministers negotiations at a meeting to be called in early 2003, as mentioned in the Speech from the Throne.

The continuing emphasis on the National Children's Agenda is critical. We must be more aggressive about dealing with the conditions of child poverty. It is simply not acceptable to abandon 20 per cent of our future population to dependency and desperation. If these policies require a more activist and interventionist government, so be it. I wish to commend the Leader of the Government for her comments earlier this afternoon in support of these programs relating to the development of children and, in particular, at the early stage in their development. These are absolutely essential, and no government should be without strong programs in this area.

The Canadian family includes within it the Aboriginal nations, communities and societies. They have not been well served by the policies and practices of the past. While progress in the economic and political sectors has accelerated in the past few years, the social condition of many Aboriginals remains a Canadian tragedy. This must be addressed through a greater emphasis on education and on the development of both individual and community initiative and responsibility.

In British Columbia, we have with the Nisga'a people an example of a new mutual and respectful relationship. I am confident of its success. However, little real progress has been made in building new working relationships with other Aboriginal entities. The Nisga'a example is the total settlement of all issues outstanding. It was not held out as a precedent and I doubt it will be. The future of other negotiations appears to be by incremental agreements that, over a period of time, may lead to a final definition. The current impasse in treaty negotiations in British Columbia is troubling and must be addressed.

Great support exists in British Columbia for the principle of a healthy environment. The Kyoto Protocol on climate change promises global action to meet a growing danger to the health of the world community, but for many the devil is in the details. The federal government has proposed negotiations with the provinces and territories on an implementation strategy and a first meeting of energy and environmental ministers is to be held shortly. Hopefully, rapid progress can be made so that the cost to industry and to the provinces can be better understood.

We need also to know more about our competitiveness in the United States and world markets as a result of the new cost structure and how the federal government proposes to ensure that no part of Canada will bear an unfair portion of the economic burden. We also need to know more about the benefit side of Kyoto to Canadian health and new industrial opportunities.

I confess a concern with the Prime Minister's proposal to ask both Houses of Parliament to endorse before the end of December a resolution approving of Canada's ratification of the Kyoto Protocol. I wonder whether the Canadian people will have been adequately consulted and a political consensus for ratification constructed as quickly as that, scarcely 10 weeks from now.

It is no secret that British Columbia has been through an economic slowdown over the last decade and has seen its growth lag behind the rest of Canada. Our population growth has slowed dramatically. The measures taken in the United States with respect to our softwood lumber industry and combined tariffs of 27 per cent have cost us thousands of jobs to date in that industry, and that figure is growing.

There is a multiplier effect that winds through shutdowns of mills and destruction of communities dependent on those mills. Schools and hospitals have been closed. People move out, many going to Alberta to find work. Pensioners are harmed when the companies for which they worked go bankrupt.

In spite of many efforts, for which I commend the work of the Honourable Pierre Pettigrew, Minister of International Trade, as well as the work of Premier Gordon Campbell and his cabinet, no resolution is in sight. It appears it will take many more decisions of the World Trade Organization and the NAFTA panels before the arbitrary protection of U.S. trade law and application is fully revealed. The federal government has announced ameliorative measures to assist forest-dependent communities to cope with U.S. trade sanctions. Nonetheless, these measures do not directly address the stresses in the forest industry itself.

Honourable senators, I am pleased that the Government of Canada will maintain its policy on fiscal issues; that is, balanced budgets, disciplined spending and a declining national debt. The Minister of Finance, the Honourable John Manley, has said that allocating money from existing programs will finance the government's policies outlined in the Speech from the Throne. On this question I admit to some confusion. As the Prime Minister stated in the other place:

The issue is not whether we will pay more as a society for health. We will.

The Prime Minister continued:

I know that Canadians will be prepared to pay that cost, but we will do so collectively as a society. No doubt we will learn more in due time.

• (1520)

Honourable senators, the Speech from the Throne gave a strong focus to the role of Canada's cities, another issue mentioned by the Leader of the Government whose comments I strongly

support. More than half the population of Canada lives in an urban environment. It is clear to all that our cities are under great stress to maintain their infrastructure and accommodate the continuous inflow of people. In support of the government's program for competitive cities and healthy communities, the Senate itself should give priority to an examination of the financial condition of Canada's cities, their ability to provide effective services to their residents, their changing demography, their dependence on their respective provinces and territories for their funding authority, and the role the federal government should play.

Speaking about cities, the 2010 Vancouver-Whistler Olympic bid was not mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. It would have been an encouraging gesture to a major effort by the community of British Columbia and by Premier Gordon Campbell and his provincial government. They seek to bring one of the world's first-ranking events to Canada.

According to a Mark Trend survey reported to *The Vancouver Sun* on October 17, 2002, 59 per cent of British Columbians support the Winter Olympic bid, which will be decided on by the International Olympic Committee in early July 2003. Interestingly, the strongest support from B.C. residents is from that group under age 45. Premier Campbell claims that the Olympic games will cost about \$1.3 billion to hold, but should generate up to \$10 billion in economic activity over the next 10 years.

Of principal concern to Canadians today, as it has always been, is the nature and state of the Canada-United States bilateral relationship. Since 1992, and the implementation of the so-called North American Free Trade Agreement, it is also germane to give attention to the trilateral relationship that includes Mexico. The United States has a population of about 10 times our own and an economy that is 20 times larger. Most Canadians know 85 per cent of our total goods and services exported goes to the United States, creating a two-way trade of nearly \$500 billion in 2001, the largest trading relationship in the world today. We are each other's number one trading partner, with the United States exporting 25 per cent of its total world exports to Canada. A little known fact is that Canada is the number one trading partner of 36 of the 50 states of the union.

Lately, the Canada-United States relationship has seen a fair amount of stress. From a Canadian point of view, damage has been done by a series of trade disputes, including the softwood lumber issue, questions about the Canadian Wheat Board, problems with potatoes and tomatoes, challenges to Canadian steel exports, and the impairment to the movement of goods and people across the border caused by the United States' reaction to security threats posed by the September 11, 2001 tragedy. The American farm bill, creating new agricultural subsidies to their producers in the range of U.S. \$110 billion over 10 years, threatens to distort market trade in agriculture for years to come.

I have never believed that Canadians are anti-American. There is no nation we more resemble, and herein lies our eternal dilemma. We admire the values and principles of democracy, freedom, and the emphasis on the role of the individual which found our neighbours. Those are also our values, although we have a different sense of how they should be balanced.

[ Senator Austin ]

There is no foreign nation Canadians visit more frequently than the United States or that we find more comfortable to be in. However, Canadians recognize that no people anywhere in the world have a better deal as a nation than we do. We have a beautiful and a bountiful geography with vast potential. We have strong national institutions to protect our rights and freedoms, including an independent judiciary, a Charter of Rights, and the rule of law in a democratic parliamentary context. We make a good living and the world considers us the best country in which to live.

In our relationship with the United States, we want both our independence and interdependence. The new word used by the academics is “intermestic” — a combination of international and domestic policies and circumstances, a balance between our international policies and interests, and the development of more harmonization of our respective domestic policies such as they apply to security concerns, “Smart Border” policies, and the reduction of tariffs and other barriers to trade and investment.

Is the time approaching for a new strategic bargain between our two countries — and perhaps including Mexico — which will involve deeper economic, security and defence integration?

At a meeting in New York last year, the Deputy Prime Minister, the Honourable John Manley, remarked that there are two cardinal rules for Canada in terms of United States relations: “Don’t get too close, don’t get too far.” Minister Manley went on to say:

The relationship is not a static one and there is little question that the degree of economic integration is going to continue. We need to do a lot of thinking about our medium and longer term objectives.

He added:

The country has to think in particular about what aspects of Canada we don’t want to see sucked down in the undertow of economic integration.

Here, honourable senators, is a task for which the Senate is particularly well positioned. No greater challenge exists for Canada than in its evolving relationship with the United States and, through NAFTA, with Mexico.

In the *National Post* for October 21, 2002, Michael Marzolini, the Chairman of Pollara, is quoted as saying that a solid majority of Canadians — 66 per cent — want to foster greater economic integration with the United States. Only 5 per cent are adamantly opposed. He said:

It is very clear that the level of fear that many have talked about with respect to our sovereignty, our culture and our economy is not as great as many have pointed out.

This story also supports the well-known efforts of Foreign Minister, the Honourable Bill Graham to expand North American integration beyond trade and tariffs into social policy and development in Mexico. Mr. Graham has asked whether NAFTA should be expanded to cover social, environmental, legal and other policy issues.

Honourable senators, I believe we should agree that these North American issues of the middle and longer term are the proper work of the Senate and quickly get down to that task.

One of the most exciting parts of the Speech from the Throne emphasizes the importance of making our public and our political institutions more open, transparent and accountable. When the Honourable Ralph Goodale was Government House Leader, he stated, as quoted from *The Hill Times* for Monday, January 21, 2002:

Many MPs are thrusting for an ever-increasing role, a more meaningful role. I certainly will be searching for the ways, in consultation with MPs on all sides of the House, to enhance the stature and role and the performance of Members of Parliament.

Honourable senators, it is every bit as important to the Canadian public that the Senate enhance its own stature, role and performance.

Almost from the time of Confederation, there have been calls to change the Senate. Nothing is more clear than that there is no political will to effect change, for a variety of reasons familiar to senators. However, the absence of reform from the outside does not hinder or excuse the ability of the Senate to conduct many necessary reforms of our internal operations. We can bring the Senate into more immediate contact with Canadians, enhance the Senate’s capacity to hold governments more accountable for the way in which taxpayers’ money is spent, and increase in some measure the independence of the Senate and its committees. It has never been more important that the Senate work well.

One of the phenomena of our times is the challenge faced by all of our traditional institutions.

Honourable senators, may I have leave to continue for a short time?

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

**Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Deputy Leader of the Government):** I give leave to Senator Austin to finish his remarks.

**Senator Austin:** Honourable senators, one of the phenomena of our times is the challenge faced by all of our traditional institutions — parliament, the churches, universities, the military — to prove their validity in the information age. Today, an extensive range of knowledge is available, which removes the mystery and special competence that supported the elites who previously governed these institutions.

The demands on our institutions, including Parliament itself, are for responsiveness in a timely way, for inclusion and acknowledged impact, and for transparency in the processes of lawmaking. The Senate must find ways of responding to these pressures, as must Parliament, both because the public demands it and because it can be a means to a better decision-making process in a very complex world.

The current state of things is illustrated by looking at voter participation. During the 1970s, voting in federal elections averaged 73 per cent, but in the election of 2000 it had fallen to 61 per cent, an all-time low. Other public opinion polls demonstrated an erosion of confidence in the trustworthiness of political decision-makers.

• (1530)

One need only look to a report by Dr. Judith Maxwell of the Canadian Policy Research Networks, issued last month, which finds in Canada an unease and frustration with the political system and how Canadians make themselves heard and hold governments to account. Therefore, the Senate and its committee system must move toward greater responsiveness to citizens and greater relevance to the issues concerning Canadians.

Many honourable senators will be aware that this is not a conclusion I have recently come to. Since assuming the role of Chairman of the Standing Committee on Rules, Procedures and the Rights of Parliament in November 1999, I have pressed on my colleagues such proposals as a Senate citizens' commission; regional sittings of the Senate; the election of committee chairs by secret ballot; the review of government spending by all Senate committees; and a new system for deciding the priority to be given to new policy studies and the funds to be allocated for such studies.

Any number of senators have spoken to me in agreement with some or all of these proposals: For example, the proposal to authorize the Senate to sit in a different region of Canada once in every session seems to me to be ready for adoption. Imagine the impact on the Canadian public and on the Senate of a sitting in Moncton or in Prince Rupert. Through contact between citizens and the Senate and its committees, a better knowledge of us and a better dialogue on public policy could occur.

The same is true for the proposed Senate citizens' commission. This would allow a committee of the Senate to add to its members for policy study purposes people with specific expertise and, when it thought appropriate, the direct representation of particular groups affected by the subject matter before the Senate committee. These Senate citizens' commissions would be organized for the fact-finding and analytical part of the work. It is not appropriate for anyone but senators to make recommendations to the Senate. Senate citizens' commissions are likely, in certain policy studies, to better respond to public interest and to be seen by the public to more effectively reflect the public consensus. Of course, the Senate citizens' commission is not appropriate in the consideration of legislation.

Honourable senators, I was recently reminded of an old adage of the Banff School of Management, "Adapt or perish." If we fail to address Senate reform from within and the Senate's relevance to the public, then this institution will surely perish as a viable, political institution. The priority study for the Senate is the Senate itself. How can we better represent the regions of Canada, our minorities and the national interest? How best can we include Canadians in our work and be seen to be open and responsive?

All of us recognize that the Senate is composed of two exciting but sometimes contradictory concepts. Under the Constitution we are a chamber with the responsibility of acting when necessary as a check and balance on the executive. As former Prime Minister John A. Macdonald described the Senate, the chamber is, "A saucer in which to let the passions cool." The Senate is, at the

same time, mostly comprised of partisans for or against the government, and we reflect the adversarial nature of the British parliamentary system. How are we to reconcile these roles? As I have said, the priority study for the Senate is the Senate itself.

On motion of Senator Kinsella, debate adjourned.

[*Translation*]

## BROADCASTING ACT

### BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Kinsella, seconded by the Honourable Senator Oliver, for the second reading of Bill S-8, to amend the Broadcasting Act.—(*Honourable Senator Robichaud, P.C.*)

**Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Deputy Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, yesterday when I asked for continuation of the debate to be carried over to today, I had received a message to the effect that another senator intended to speak.

I received no such message today, however. I believe that the bill has already received sufficient attention in this chamber, this being its second appearance here.

I therefore believe that honourable senators have had ample time to examine it and debate its contents. We would be ready for the question.

**Hon. Serge Joyal:** Honourable senators, I would like to ask a question. Did Senator Robichaud ask whether that senator was still interested in continuing the debate on the matter, or did he just decide to limit the debate at this point so that we could proceed with the vote on the motion?

**Senator Robichaud:** Honourable senators, yesterday's message did not come from a particular senator. It was just conveyed to me. If someone else wanted to speak or to adjourn the debate, I have no objection, but I think we are prepared to move on with this bill.

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

**Hon. Senators:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to and bill read second time.

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

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

On motion of Senator Kinsella, bill referred to the Standing Senate Committee on Transport and Communications.

[English]

**NATIONAL DEFENCE**

**AFGHANISTAN—MOTION TO RECEIVE FORMER  
COMMANDING OFFICER IN COMMITTEE OF  
THE WHOLE—MOTION IN AMENDMENT—  
DEBATE ADJOURNED**

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Kenny, seconded by the Honourable Senator Wiebe:

That the Senate do resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on Tuesday, October 29, 2002, in order to receive Lieutenant-Colonel Pat Stogran, former Commanding Officer, 3 Princess Patricia Canadian Light Infantry Battle Group, Canadian Forces Battle Group in Afghanistan, February to July 2002, for the purpose of discussing the preparation and training prior to deployment as well as the experiences of the Canadian Forces in Afghanistan in the war on terrorism.

That television cameras be authorized in the Chamber to broadcast the proceedings of the Committee of the

Whole, with the least possible disruption of the proceedings.—(*Honourable Senator Robichaud, P.C.*)

**Hon. Tommy Banks:** Honourable senators, I move, seconded by Senator Atkins:

That the motion be amended in the first paragraph thereof:

by replacing the words “Tuesday, October 29, 2002,” by the words “Tuesday, November 5, 2002, at 4 p.m.”; and

by adding after the words, “Lieutenant-Colonel Pat Stogran, former Commanding Officer, 3 Princess Patricia Canadian Light Infantry Battle Group, Canadian Forces Battle Group in Afghanistan, February to July 2002” the words “and Brigadier-General Michel Gauthier, former Commander Canadian Joint Task Force Southwest Asia, February to October 2002.”

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

On motion of Senator Robichaud, debate adjourned.

The Senate adjourned until tomorrow at 9 a.m.

---

## CONTENTS

Thursday, October 24, 2002

	PAGE		PAGE
<b>Question of Privilege</b>		Notice of Motion to Authorize Committee to Permit Electronic Coverage.	
Speaker's Ruling.		Hon. E. Leo Kolber . . . . .	182
The Speaker <i>pro tempore</i> . . . . .	177		
<hr/>			
<b>SENATORS' STATEMENTS</b>			
<hr/>			
<b>Literacy Action Day</b>		<b>The Senate</b>	
Hon. Noël A. Kinsella . . . . .	178	Amendment to Authorize Social Affairs, Science and Technology Committee to Study Access of Hard-of-Hearing People to Television Programs—Notice of Motion.	
Hon. Joyce Fairbairn . . . . .	178	Hon. Jean-Robert Gauthier . . . . .	182
Hon. Ethel Cochrane . . . . .	178		
<hr/>			
<b>Philately Month</b>		<b>QUESTION PERIOD</b>	
Hon. Jean Lapointe . . . . .	178		
<hr/>			
<b>Literacy Action Day</b>		<b>Privy Council Office</b>	
Hon. Consiglio Di Nino . . . . .	179	Recruitment of Intelligence Analysts.	
Hon. Bill Rompkey . . . . .	179	Hon. J. Michael Forrestall . . . . .	182
<hr/>			
<b>The Late Yousuf Karsh, C.C., O.C.</b>		Hon. Sharon Carstairs . . . . .	182
Tribute.		<b>Foreign Affairs</b>	
Hon. Raymond C. Setlakwe . . . . .	179	Francophonie Conference, 2002—Attendance of Leader of Hezbollah.	
<hr/>			
<b>Distinguished Visitor in the Gallery</b>		Hon. J. Michael Forrestall . . . . .	182
The Hon. the Speaker <i>pro tempore</i> . . . . .	180	Hon. Sharon Carstairs . . . . .	183
<hr/>			
<b>ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS</b>			
<hr/>			
<b>Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources</b>		Hon. David Tkachuk . . . . .	183
Report Pursuant to Rule 104 Tabled.		<b>Canada Customs and Revenue Agency</b>	
Hon. Tommy Banks . . . . .	180	Withdrawal of Disability Tax Credit.	
<hr/>			
<b>Social Affairs, Science and Technology</b>		Hon. Marjory LeBreton . . . . .	184
Budget—Study on State of Health Care System—Report of Committee Presented.		Hon. Sharon Carstairs . . . . .	184
Hon. Marjory LeBreton . . . . .	180	<b>The Environment</b>	
<hr/>			
<b>Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration</b>		Ratification of Kyoto Protocol.	
Report Pursuant to Rule 104 Tabled.		Hon. Leonard J. Gustafson . . . . .	184
Hon. Lise Bacon . . . . .	180	Hon. Sharon Carstairs . . . . .	185
Third Report of Committee Presented.		Hon. Gerry St. Germain . . . . .	185
Hon. Lise Bacon . . . . .	180	<b>Visitor in the Gallery</b>	
<hr/>			
<b>Banking, Trade and Commerce</b>		The Hon. the Speaker <i>pro tempore</i> . . . . .	185
Report Pursuant to Rule 104 Tabled.			
Hon. E. Leo Kolber . . . . .	181	<b>ORDERS OF THE DAY</b>	
<hr/>			
<b>Tax Conventions Implementation Bill, 2002 (Bill S-2)</b>		<b>Business of the Senate</b>	
Report of Committee.		Hon. Fernand Robichaud . . . . .	186
Hon. E. Leo Kolber . . . . .	181	<b>Code of Conduct and Ethics Guidelines</b>	
<hr/>			
<b>Business of the Senate</b>		Motion to Refer Documents to Standing Committee on Rules, Procedures and the Rights of Parliament—Debate Adjourned.	
Adjournment.		Hon. Fernand Robichaud . . . . .	186
Hon. Fernand Robichaud . . . . .	181	Hon. Sharon Carstairs . . . . .	186
Hon. Lowell Murray . . . . .	181	<b>Speech from the Throne</b>	
<hr/>			
<b>Aboriginal Peoples</b>		Motion for Address in Reply—Debate Continued.	
Notice of Motion to Authorize Committee to Continue Study on Issues Affecting Urban Aboriginal Youth.		Hon. Sharon Carstairs . . . . .	187
Hon. Thelma J. Chalifoux . . . . .	181	Hon. Lowell Murray . . . . .	191
<hr/>			
<b>Banking, Trade and Commerce</b>		Hon. Jack Austin . . . . .	191
Notice of Motion to Authorize Committee to Engage Services.		Hon. Fernand Robichaud . . . . .	194
Hon. E. Leo Kolber . . . . .	181	<b>Broadcasting Act (Bill S-8)</b>	
<hr/>			
		Bill to Amend—Second Reading.	
		Hon. Fernand Robichaud . . . . .	194
		Hon. Serge Joyal . . . . .	194
		Referred to Committee . . . . .	194
		<b>National Defence</b>	
		Afghanistan—Motion to Receive Former Commanding Officer in Committee of the Whole—Motion in Amendment—Debate Adjourned.	
		Hon. Tommy Banks . . . . .	195





*If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:*  
Communication Canada – Publishing  
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S9