



CANADA

Debates of the Senate

1st SESSION

•

37th PARLIAMENT

•

VOLUME 139

•

NUMBER 116

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Tuesday, May 28, 2002



THE HONOURABLE DAN HAYS
SPEAKER

CONTENTS

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

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

Published by the Senate
Available from Communication Canada – Canadian Government Publishing, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S9.
Also available on the Internet: <http://www.parl.gc.ca>

THE SENATE

Tuesday, May 28, 2002

[Translation]

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

Prayers.

THE LATE HONOURABLE RENAUDE LAPOINTE, P.C., C.C.

TRIBUTES

Hon. Lise Bacon: Honourable senators, I would like to say a few words in connection with the recent passing of a great lady, the Honourable Louise Marguerite Renaude Lapointe.

Like many others here I have had the pleasure of knowing and working with her and have had the opportunity to really appreciate her immense talent, her numerous qualities, her exceptional energy and, above all, her sense of devotion. I was greatly saddened to learn of her death on May 11.

Renaude Lapointe was a great lady and, above all, a great Canadian.

[English]

First as a journalist, then as a senator, on through to her retirement years, Renaude Lapointe remained a true Canadian, dedicated to the service of her country and of her countrymen and, I should say, countrywomen.

[Translation]

Renaude Lapointe was first and foremost a truly great journalist. She began to build her reputation in the 1940s and 1950s at *Le Soleil* in Quebec City.

In 1959 she joined the staff of Montreal's *La Presse*. At a time when the large majority of women reporters were relegated to the "society pages," Renaude Lapointe's byline appeared on articles that were extremely popular because, as many of you will recall, they invited people to think.

In particular, she contributed some 30 articles on Monsignor Joseph Charbonneau, Archbishop of Montreal. This prelate supported the asbestos strikers in defiance of both his religious superiors and Maurice Duplessis. She earned many honours and awards for this and other such series.

Later on, she wrote a book on this, and her research also eventually served as the basis for a play, *Charbonneau et le chef*, which was a great hit in the 1970s.

Over the years, Renaude Lapointe was a correspondent for both *Time* and *Life* magazines, as well as the CBC International Service. Appreciated by both her peers and her readers for her talented pen, it was no surprise that she was chosen "Canadian journalist of the year" in 1965.

[English]

While she always remained a journalist at heart, Renaude Lapointe was also active in other fora. On November 10, 1971, she was summoned to the Senate by Pierre Elliott Trudeau. Throughout her 15-odd years as a senator, Renaude Lapointe kept herself very busy. She sat on important senatorial committees, such as the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Legal and Constitutional Affairs Committee. She was particularly active and vocal in fields such as Senate reform, Old Age Security, women's rights, bilingualism, foreign affairs and the United Nations. She also served as an active member of various parliamentary associations, including the Canadian World Federalist Parliamentary Association and the NATO Parliamentary Association, to name only two.

On September 12, 1974, Renaude Lapointe was appointed Speaker of the Senate. She was the first francophone woman to ever preside over the affairs of the upper chamber. In that, too, I would point out, Renaude would prove to be quite the pioneer.

Renaude Lapointe retired from the Senate on January 3, 1987, at the age of 75, much to the chagrin of her colleagues whose respect and affection she had earned during her years in office.

[Translation]

I would be remiss if I did not also mention that Renaude Lapointe was a member of the Group of 78, which, in 1982, signed a joint statement on Canada's foreign policy. This statement sought to put assistance to the world's poorest at the core of our country's international action.

This is a true reflection of the values of our late colleague. Throughout her life, whether through her writings, her speeches or her political activism, Renaude Lapointe showed that she was a most remarkable woman and a Canadian dedicated to protecting her country's unity and the well-being of her fellow countrymen.

[English]

Honourable senators, we lost a formidable woman and Canadian in Renaude Lapointe, but I dare say that we are perhaps the better for having known her.

• (1410)

[Translation]

Hon. Gérald-A. Beaudoin: Honourable senators, last Wednesday, during the funeral of the Honourable Renaude Lapointe, who was the Speaker of the Senate from 1974 to 1979, the Honourable Maurice Riel, himself a former Speaker of the Senate, spoke in the presence of the former Governor General, the Right Honourable Roméo Leblanc, the current Speaker of the Senate, the Honourable Daniel Hays, and Mrs. Aline Chrétien.

In his eulogy, Senator Riel referred to a book written by Renaude Lapointe entitled *L'histoire bouleversante de Monseigneur Charbonneau*, published in 1962 at the Éditions du Jour.

Some of us remember the events that took place in Quebec in the middle of the past century.

The resignation of Monsignor Charbonneau as archbishop of Montreal, following the infamous asbestos strike, was a major event that is now part of our history. This was a different era in Quebec. It preceded the Quiet Revolution of 1960, which left a deep imprint on our country. I did not want to miss this opportunity to point out this fact for our national archives.

Honourable senators, I speak for all of us in wanting people to remember this work written by Speaker Renaude Lapointe about an era which some of us experienced and which Senator Maurice Riel has done a wonderful job of evoking these past few days.

Hon. Marcel Prud'homme: Honourable senators, it is no secret that for many years I spent the weekends with our friend, Senator Renaude Lapointe. We lived in the same building. I had the great honour of visiting with her and being stimulated by her stories about all sorts of people, including senators.

She did ask me not to elaborate on this in any tributes on her death. I will therefore respect this final wish expressed when she was in better health.

I helped to organize the funeral. I was very honoured, as I was supposed to be the one to do the eulogy. I preferred to get Senator Riel to take this on. In fact, he sent me a note today. Up until the last minute, I thought that the Prime Minister would be able to attend. We were honoured to see the service attended by Mrs. Aline Chrétien, the Right Honourable Governor General Roméo Leblanc, and many other notable persons who made a point of coming.

At Senator Riel's request, I will forward the complete text of his eulogy to senators. Senator Maurice Riel delivered this eulogy at the funeral service on May 22, 2002, at the Sacré-Coeur church in Ottawa. He had some very kind words to say about our friend Renaude. I will simply quote three sentences. She was, he said:

Fearless and above reproach...

She always told us:

...Do not be afraid...

In this, she was echoing His Holiness, Pope John Paul II. The senator also said:

Her weapon of choice was her disarming smile and a few words that always rang true.

Those who knew Mme Lapointe know how well I have just described her. She did not beat around the bush. She was direct and frank, a wonderful, friendly person. She was our friend.

[English]

SENATORS' STATEMENTS

NATIONAL ACCESS AWARENESS WEEK

Hon. Catherine S. Callbeck: Honourable senators, this week, Canadians across the country will take part in National Access Awareness Week: a week to examine the issue of access for people with disabilities; to ensure that they are able to participate fully in all aspects of life, including education, leisure, transportation, housing and employment. National Access Awareness Week is also a time to pay tribute to the thousands of people who volunteer their time to work with people with disabilities.

It is encouraging to see the advances that have resulted from the cooperative efforts of people with disabilities, of organizations, business leaders, unions, governments and others. However, in spite of these advances, it is important to note that there is still much to be done to ensure that those living with disabilities are able to participate fully in Canadian society. This is especially true when we consider the situation of women living with disabilities.

According to the DisAbleD Women's Network, 52.3 per cent of all women living with disabilities will experience three or more forms of abuse, 34.8 per cent will experience abandonment, and 51 per cent will live in isolation. Compounding the situation, the vast majority of women with disabilities live on an annual income that is well below the poverty line.

There is also much to be done to improve the situation of Aboriginal people living with disabilities. Thirty per cent of Canada's Aboriginal adult population have a disability, more than double the national rate. In addition, the disability rate among Aboriginal young adults is three times higher than it is for the non-Aboriginal population. As noted in the Human Resources Development report, entitled "In Unison 2000: persons with disabilities in Canada," disabled persons, especially those from the communities I have just mentioned, are at the greatest risk of being marginalized.

This risk becomes even greater if members of these communities come from a rural or remote area. People with disabilities who live in rural or remote areas often do not have the same access to transportation and disability support as those living in urban areas.

It is important that we continue to work towards improving access for those who are disabled and to uphold Canada's commitment to diversity. As policy-makers, we are in a unique position to promote and protect the citizenship rights of those living with disabilities, recognizing that full citizenship depends on equality, inclusion, rights and responsibilities, and empowerment and participation.

UNITED NATIONS SPECIAL SESSION ON CHILDREN

Hon. Landon Pearson: Honourable senators, in the week before the break, I was in New York at the United Nations General Assembly Special Session on Children. It was a remarkably positive experience, the significance of which I will expand upon later, in the course of an inquiry.

In the short time I have today, I should like to share some brief segments of the message from the Children's Forum, delivered to the UN General Assembly by two child delegates, Gabriela Azurduey Arrieta, aged 13, from Bolivia, and Audrey Cheynut, aged 17, from Monaco.

This was the first time children under the age of 18 ever spoke in the General Assembly, and their voices were both firm and eloquent. Their message is entitled "A World Fit for Us." This is, in part, what they had to say:

We are the world's children.

We are the victims of exploitation and abuse.

We are street children.

We are the children of war.

We are the victims and orphans of HIV/AIDS.

We are denied good-quality education and health care.

We are victims of political, economic, cultural, religious and environmental discrimination.

We are children whose voices are not being heard: it is time we are taken into account.

We want a world fit for children, because a world fit for us is a world fit for everyone.

In this world,

We see respect for the rights of the child...

We see an end to exploitation, abuse and violence...

We see an end to war...

We see the eradication of HIV/AIDS...

We see the protection of the environment...

We see an end to the vicious cycle of poverty...

We see the provision of education...

We see the active participation of children

raised awareness and respect among people of all ages about every child's right to full and meaningful participation, in the spirit of the Convention on the Rights of the Child...

We pledge an equal partnership in this fight for children's rights. And while we promise to support the actions you take on behalf of children, we also ask for your commitment and support in the actions we are taking, because the children of the world are misunderstood.

We are not the sources of problems; we are the resources that are needed to solve them.

We are not expenses; we are investments.

We are not just young people; we are people and citizens of this world.

Until others accept their responsibility to us, we will fight for our rights.

We have the will, the knowledge, the sensitivity and the dedication.

We promise that, as adults, we will defend children's rights with the same passion we have now, as children.

We promise to treat each other with dignity and respect.

We promise to be open and sensitive to our differences.

We are the children of the world, and despite our different backgrounds, we share a common reality.

We are united by our struggle to make the world a better place for all.

You call us the future, but we are also the present.

• (1420)

TWO-HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF SAINT MARY'S UNIVERSITY

Hon. Wilfred P. Moore: Honourable senators, one week ago, I had the honour to attend an historic ceremony in Halifax, Nova Scotia, on behalf of our Prime Minister, the Right Honourable Jean Chrétien, and to bring greetings from him and in his behalf from the people of Canada. The occasion was the unveiling of a plaque in celebration of the founding of Saint Mary's University 200 years ago in the Glebe House, at the corner of Barrington Street and Spring Garden Road. As a member of the 1964 commerce class, it was a special treat for me to participate in this event.

The unveiling of this commemorative marker denotes a wonderful milestone in the life of Saint Mary's University, this venerable institution that has been an integral part of the life of Halifax and Nova Scotia for 200 years. We are most grateful for the work of our founder, Father Edmund Burke, and for the efforts of the governors, administrators and students who have gone before, and we heartily champion those who have taken up their torches.

From those humble beginnings and an opening class of four young men studying theology, Saint Mary's has relocated to its Robie Street campus, where more than 8,000 coeducational students now study business, science, engineering, criminology, the arts and humanities. At Saint Mary's, where tradition meets the future, students continue to earn national and international academic and athletic honours.

I should note that, yesterday, Canada Post Corporation issued a handsome stamp in commemoration of the two-hundredth anniversary of Saint Mary's University.

In closing, we say, "Well done, Saint Mary's!" and "Bonne Chance" as you launch into your next millennium.

MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS AWARENESS MONTH

Hon. Yves Morin: Honourable senators, May is Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Month. Canadians have one of the highest rates of multiple sclerosis in the world. Most people are between 20 and 40 years old when diagnosed. It is an autoimmune disease. The body's own immune system attacks the myelin sheath that surrounds and protects nerve fibres. Its course is unpredictable and its symptoms variable. We do not know what causes it, and we do not know how to cure it.

[Translation]

Fortunately, research is changing that. Thanks to research, there are now drugs that slow the progression of the disease, and studies indicate that early treatment has a positive effect.

[English]

Today, research is focusing on repairing and re-growing myelin, including looking at whether stem cells could be used to generate myelin-producing cells.

Both the Multiple Sclerosis Scientific Research Foundation, established by the Multiple Sclerosis Society, and the Canadian Institutes of Health Research support the research of Dr. Samuel Weiss of the University of Calgary. Dr. Weiss and his colleagues were the first in the world to discover neural stem cells and how to grow them in culture.

[Translation]

Honourable senators, research is giving hope to those living with the unpredictable nature of multiple sclerosis. It is allowing us to better understand this disease and will lead to the discovery of more effective treatments, such as embryonic stem cells. One day, research will lead to a cure.

HEARING AWARENESS MONTH

Hon. Jean-Robert Gauthier: Honourable senator, I would like to make a few comments in the context of Hearing Awareness Month in Canada. As you can imagine, having a hearing impairment is not easy.

Three million Canadians, some 10 per cent of the population, live with a hearing impairment. These people are unable to follow a conversation, watch a television program, or hear what is said in

a room. I have been fortunate, because here in the Senate we have stenographers, guardian angels if you will, who type in real time, which allows me to read what I cannot hear. It involves a great deal of effort, but it is worth the trouble, as they say.

Hearing impairment is a real problem for more than one million Canadians. It is not easy to understand, nor is it easy to hear sometimes. I have been pressuring the CRTC to require national broadcasters to provide closed captioning for Canadian programming. I have not yet been successful, but it is coming along. I am patient.

I would also like the debates of the Senate and the House of Commons to be broadcast with real-time closed captioning. There is a difference between the two. Closed captioning in real time is what is happening right now. These are my guardian angels who type, as I talk, everything that you hear. This makes it possible to read everything that is said on a computer screen. It is very useful for someone like me who wants to participate fully in a parliamentary debate such as this.

Why not? It is not rocket science. It is a technique that needs development, but there is a major problem: training stenotypists. This is taught in English all over Canada: Vancouver, Edmonton, Toronto, but there is no school at this time giving the course in French. The technique is different depending on which official language is involved. Something must be done. I approached la Cité collégiale, a post-secondary institution here in Ottawa, proposing the formation of an advisory committee made up of people who use captioning services. I am thinking of Radio-Canada, national radio stations, films, the courts and so on. There are a lot of groups that have to provide captioning.

Honourable senators, it is high time something was done. A Canadian association for the hearing impaired is lobbying for it at this time. I hope that senators will understand how essential it is, for people like myself and so many others, to understand what is going on.

[English]

TOXIC LEVELS OF FARMED SALMON

Hon. Jim Tunney: Honourable senators, I rise today to express a serious concern resulting from a scientific paper prepared by Michael Easton, a Vancouver geneticist who led a study on farmed salmon. His findings were that farmed fish contain nearly 10 times the toxic levels of some types of PCBs found in wild salmon. The feed used to grow and fatten these farmed fish comes from the offal of fish previously caught and processed. It enhances their growth and enhances their maturity.

Women of child-bearing age and young children are the most susceptible to the risks of PCBs that have been linked to immune system suppression and reduced mental development. Mr. Easton suggests that it would not be advisable for people in this group to frequently consume farmed salmon. He is quoted as saying, "The fish and the oil from the fish meal in feed," that is, feed for the live fish, "serves not only to produce high energy feeds with good growth performance and qualities but also acts as a pipeline for contaminants into the human food chain."

[Senator Moore]

The Canadian Food Inspection Agency disputes the view that farmed fish contain enough PCBs to pose a human health hazard. Surprisingly, however, that agency has been quietly conducting its own studies, similar to those of Mr. Easton, and intends to post its findings some time next week.

Canada has no current standards on the amount of PCBs allowed in products fed to fish and livestock. It is my opinion that this should be addressed and changed immediately.

• (1430)

[Translation]

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

CHIEF ELECTORAL OFFICER

ANNUAL REPORT TABLED

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, pursuant to section 72(2) of the Privacy Act, I have the honour of tabling the annual report of the Chief Electoral Officer.

[English]

EXCISE BILL, 2001

FIRST READING

The Hon. the Speaker informed the Senate that a message had been received from the House of Commons with Bill C-47, respecting the taxation of spirits, wine and tobacco and the treatment of ships' stores.

Bill read first time.

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

On motion of Senator Kroft, bill placed on the Orders of the Day for second reading two days hence.

[Translation]

CANADIAN NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

MEETING OF STANDING COMMITTEE AND SECRETARIES OF NATIONAL DELEGATIONS OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY, APRIL 5-7, 2002— REPORT OF CANADIAN DELEGATION TABLED

Hon. Shirley Maheu: Honourable senators, I have the honour to table the fourteenth report of the Canadian NATO Parliamentary Association. This is the report of the official delegation that represented Canada at the meeting of the Standing Committee and Secretaries of National Delegations of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, held in Granada, in Spain, from April 5 to April 7, 2002.

[English]

CANADA-EUROPE PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

SECOND PART OF THE 2002 ORDINARY SESSION OF THE PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE, APRIL 22-26, 2002— REPORT OF CANADIAN DELEGATION TABLED

Hon. Peter A. Stollery: Honourable senators, I have the honour to table the report of the delegation of the Canada-Europe Parliamentary Association to the Second Part of the 2002 Ordinary Session of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe held in Strasbourg, France, from April 22 to 26, 2002.

[Translation]

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AUTHORIZE JOINT COMMITTEE TO PERMIT ELECTRONIC COVERAGE

Hon. Céline Hervieux-Payette: Honourable senators, I give notice that on Wednesday, May 29, 2002, I will move:

That the Standing Joint Committee for the Scrutiny of Regulations be empowered to permit coverage by electronic media of the public proceedings of its meeting of Thursday, May 30, 2002, with the least possible disruption of its hearings.

[English]

QUESTION PERIOD

NATIONAL DEFENCE

POSSIBLE REVIEW—REQUEST FOR TABLING OF PLAN

Hon. J. Michael Forrestall: Honourable senators, it is in a different world, as someone once said about another event, that we come together in this chamber and in the other chamber.

I wish to ask a question of the Leader of the Government in the Senate. In February, as I am sure the minister will recall, as will most of us, the then Minister of National Defence announced at a meeting of the Conference of Defence Associations that the government would conduct a review of defence and foreign policy. Obviously, that was taken very seriously at the time and, by now, should be several months advanced. As a matter of fact, it is now almost three months since the day of that announcement. Could the minister tell us the government's timeline on conducting the defence review?

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, to the best of my knowledge no such review has commenced. When I learn that it has begun, I will inform the honourable senator, as well as indicate its exact mandate.

Senator Forrestall: Honourable senators, leaving aside the issue of national defence for the time being, will the Leader of the Government table the defence review work plan so that we might know how it was conducted over the past three months? As well, could the minister give us a general idea of the government's plans for the future?

Senator Carstairs: As I indicated in my first response to the honourable senator, to the best of my knowledge no policy review has commenced. When that plan is developed, I will be delighted to share it with the honourable senator.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

POSSIBLE POLICY REVIEW

Hon. J. Michael Forrestall: Honourable senators, as the Leader of the Government in the Senate will know, the report on the question of the foreign policy review has been deferred. We are unsure as to whether that was because the minister was travelling to other parts of the world in pursuit of the Canadian initiative, which is a worthwhile one. In any event, the report was deferred from May 15 to May 30, which is two days hence. Could the minister tell us whether she is aware of the timetable concerning this review?

While the minister is standing, could she either give us an explanation or undertake to give us one as to just what Canada as a nation does when it finds itself with a foreign policy review that is out in front?

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, there are a number of parts to the honourable senator's question. As the honourable senator knows, Senator Roche has asked questions in the past about the need for a foreign policy review conducted at the same time as a defence review; or, if anything, foreign policy first and defence policy second. At this time, I know of no set timelines for either policy review.

However, while I am on my feet, at the excellent suggestion of Senator Banks, which I received earlier this week, I will hand deliver, this week, a copy of the Senate's report by the National Security and Defence Committee to the new Minister of National Defence.

PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE

INDEPENDENT ETHICS COUNSELLOR

Hon. Marjory LeBreton: Honourable senators, my question is for the Leader of the Government in the Senate. It concerns the question of government ethics.

The events of the past few months since the Gagliano shuffle, which followed on the heels of several other ethically challenged events, namely, the Human Resources boondoggle, the Grand-Mère affair and other dubious projects in Shawinigan, all point to a very grave situation indeed. There has been a severe erosion in public confidence having to do with the behaviour of certain elected politicians and their arrogant style of political leadership.

Many promises have been made and broken over the years; they are too numerous to list. However, one is looming large and bears repeating. It appeared in that now infamous Liberal Red Book, which should be renamed the "Liberal Red-Faced Book."

• (1440)

I am reading from the book now:

...a Liberal Government will appoint an independent Ethics Counsellor to advise both public officials and lobbyists in the day-to-day application of the Code of Conduct for Public Officials. The Ethics Counsellor will be appointed after consultation with the leaders of all parties in the House of Commons and will report directly to Parliament.

I respectfully ask the Leader of the Government in the Senate whether she will use her influence at the cabinet table to urge the Prime Minister to keep at least this one promise. This great Parliament of Canada and the Canadian public deserve no less.

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, let me begin my response by dissociating myself entirely from the comments my honourable friend made at the beginning of her question.

Last week, the Prime Minister made a substantive announcement on the issue of government ethics, an eight-point plan as to the development of a number of issues: everything from the first annual report of the Ethics Counsellor to Parliament, to the need for changes to the Lobbyists Registration Act and, of course, to conflict of interest policies for members of the House of Commons and this chamber.

PRIME MINISTER

COMMENTS ON APPOINTMENT OF NEW CABINET MINISTERS

Hon. Marjory LeBreton: Honourable senators, the Prime Minister's so-called eight-point plan did not get very good reviews from people who watch Parliament closely, including many professors of various universities and media columnists.

The Prime Minister, in a media scrum following his shotgun ceremony at Government House on Sunday evening, attempted to explain why one minister was deemed to have been in conflict and the other was not. Since we, as parliamentarians, cannot judge the guidelines, which are secret, I was interested in his response. He used the word "nuanced." The *Webster* definition of "nuance" is:

1. a subtle distinction or variation
2. a subtle quality: nicety
3. sensibility to, awareness of, or ability to express delicate shadings...

Can the minister attempt to enlighten us, therefore, as to what was nuanced here? Why was Art Eggleton fired and Don Boudria simply demoted?

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government): Clearly, the honourable senator did not read the eight-point plan as carefully as I would have liked her to do. Among the statements the Prime Minister made was that the guidelines will no longer be secret, but that they will be very much public. That will be one of the initiatives undertaken.

As to the honourable senator's specific question, the Ethics Counsellor, who examined both the actions of the former minister, Mr. Eggleton, and the present minister, Mr. Boudria, made two entirely different decisions. He indicated that according to the guidelines signed by all ministers of cabinet, Mr. Eggleton was in breach of those guidelines and Mr. Boudria was not.

Senator LeBreton: The minister is asking us again to make a leap of faith. Therefore, Mr. Eggleton was fired and Mr. Boudria was kept because of some guideline that the Prime Minister will make public sometime in the future.

Again I ask: Why the double standard? In many respects, both ministers were doing things in support of their friends. Will the Prime Minister apply the same guidelines to himself?

Senator Carstairs: Honourable senators, there is a clear distinction between the activities of the two ministers. In the case of Mr. Boudria, I think he has himself admitted quite openly that he made an error in judgment. The reality is that he paid for the nights that he spent in this home, and that, to do it again, he would not have made that error in judgment. This was not an infringement of the guidelines that all ministers are asked to follow.

In the case of the Minister of National Defence, he was in clear conflict in the view of the Ethics Counsellor.

PUBLIC WORKS AND GOVERNMENT SERVICES

USE OF MANSION OF PRESIDENT OF GROUPE EVEREST BY FORMER MINISTER

Hon. Marjory LeBreton: Honourable senators, I have a further comment on Minister Boudria. The minister says he paid for the nights that he spent in the mansion back in March. The cheque was not cashed and it went through a circuitous route, as we have read in the newspapers. First, he talked about a going rate. How can there be a going rate for a luxurious mansion? Apparently six people stayed there. That is \$400 a night divided by six, which works out to about \$65 a night. That is cheaper than Motel 6. Where can we all sign up? That is what the Canadian public will be asking.

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government): The senator asks: What is a fair price? Rental of a house at \$12,000 a month, which would equal \$140,000-plus per year, is a rather large sum of money. That would be the equation if one took the rental of this house over a period of 365 days. To the best of my knowledge, and certainly my experience, when one rents a house, one is not usually asked how many people will be residing there at any given time.

Senator St. Germain: Supplementary!

Senator Carstairs: The important issue here is that the minister has admitted clearly that he made an error in judgment. He made an error in judgment.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: After he got caught.

Senator Carstairs: The reality is that he understood that he had paid for these two nights of accommodation. I have written cheques that sometimes have taken many months to be cashed by the individuals to whom I have given them. They were not for rental accommodation but for many other things. In fact, I recently sent a cheque to the Receiver General that seemed to take an inordinate amount of time to cash.

Senator Stratton: You are falling on the sword.

Senator Carstairs: We all have bank accounts where we can point to that kind of thing.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: Senator Graham is blushing.

Senator Carstairs: Mr. Boudria made an error in judgment. He has admitted that error. The Prime Minister has taken an action that reflects his recognition that there was an error in judgment. In the case of the other minister, there was a breach.

Senator Stratton: More, more!

Senator LeBreton: The fact of the matter is that Mr. Boudria should not have been there in the first place, whether or not he paid, which is still in question.

Senator Maheu: What would Brian do?

Senator LeBreton: Whether or not he paid is not the issue. The issue is that he was brought to the Department of Public Works supposedly to clean up the mess. We are told that there are no problems in this government, so what was there to clean up? Mr. Boudria went there in the midst of everything that had happened to Mr. Gagliano. The issue is not whether he paid. That is debatable. The issue is that he should never have been there in the first place.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: Hear, hear!

NATIONAL DEFENCE

CIRCUMSTANCES OF RESIGNATION OF FORMER MINISTER

Hon. Gerry St. Germain: Honourable senators, my question is with regard to an error in judgment. An error in judgment was only brought forward by Minister Boudria when he was challenged. He did not volunteer the information on his own.

Had the Minister of National Defence declared an error in judgment, he should then have been treated the same way as Minister Boudria has been treated. Is that not correct? Is this what the honourable leader is saying? She is saying that Mr. Boudria made an error in judgment and that is why the Prime Minister allowed him to keep a ministerial post; whereas the other minister did not hide behind an error in judgment and said that he figured he had done nothing wrong. He was fired and the other minister was kept. Why?

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, as I have said I think four times now, the former Minister of Defence was in breach of the guidelines that all ministers sign.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: Where are the guidelines? What guidelines? The invisible guidelines?

Senator Carstairs: If Senator Lynch-Staunton wishes to ask a question, I would be more than pleased to answer it, but I am answering Senator St. Germain's question right now.

The breach of the guidelines was clear in the mind of the Ethics Counsellor. That was the advice he gave to the Prime Minister. There was no breach of the ethical guidelines by the Honourable Don Boudria.

• (1450)

Hon. Laurier L. LaPierre: Is the honourable leader aware that the practice of putting an unendorsed cheque in the collection plate is followed in the province of Quebec? It is particularly common in the part of the province I come from.

[Translation]

They would go around with the collection plates to collect money and they would tell people that if they needed it, they could take the cheque.

[English]

Many cheques were found in the collection plate the following Sunday. That is probably what happened in this instance. Is the honourable senator aware of that practice?

Senator Carstairs: I must tell the Honourable Senator LaPierre that when I have given a donation to the church it has always been a cash donation.

Hon. J. Michael Forrestall: Honourable senators, I have a supplementary question. As the minister just indicated that she would do so, would she care to table those guidelines, and if not, why not?

Senator Carstairs: Honourable senators, the Prime Minister announced last week that the guidelines would be public, and they would be holding the matter over for the next while, perhaps two weeks.

I will now quote from the eight-point plan, as I think it is important. They will, "Make public guidelines to govern ministerial fundraising for personal political purposes." They will, "Release revised rules for ministerial dealings with Crown corporations," and they will, "...make public the Guide for Ministers and Secretaries of State which outlines the standards of ethical conduct that should guide them."

When those are available within the next two weeks, as announced by the Prime Minister, then, of course, they will be available to all honourable senators.

Senator Forrestall: Honourable senators, I would like to see tabled the guidelines upon which the Ethics Counsellor based his judgment the other day.

Senator Carstairs: Considering they will make public the guide for ministers and secretaries of state, which outlines the standards of ethical conduct that should guide them, I believe we are talking about exactly the same thing.

Senator Forrestall: I do not think they are the same thing. There were no guidelines and that is why they cannot be tabled. They do not exist.

[Translation]

TREASURY BOARD

PUBLIC SERVICE UNIVERSAL CLASSIFICATION STANDARD

Hon. Roch Bolduc: My question is for the Leader of the Government in the Senate. Mrs. Robillard recently informed us that the job classification project in the public service — a project begun in 1991 and still going on — has cost an estimated \$100 million. This week, we learned that the new project cannot be implemented and that the government must therefore start the process all over again.

This bothers me for two reasons. How can it have taken 10 years to discover that the universal classification standard will not work? Even more serious is the fact that the job classification plan is designed to bring public servants under one pay scale. Staff are classified within the plan.

For some time now, the government has been implementing a policy on pay equity in order to fight discrimination. We know that the existing classification system does not work because the government has tried to create a new one.

In my view, this is a serious matter. We are talking about \$5 million or \$10 million dollars, not a small amount of money. We are talking about pay for the entire federal public service, which consists of 190,000 individuals paid between \$40,000 and \$50,000 a year.

[English]

It is a lot of money. If they are not well classified, it would be a huge mistake to use that to compensate for equality of payment. We are talking about billions of dollars here.

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government): The honourable senator has raised some extremely important points. However, I must indicate to him that it was several weeks ago when the actual announcement was made, not this week. Therefore, I do not have those details before me at the present time. Announcements were made and justifications were given. I will obtain that information for the honourable senator and present it to him as quickly as possible.

PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE

REGISTRATION OF LOBBYISTS

Hon. Terry Stratton: Honourable senators, I should like to go back to the business about the new "eight commandments."

If you go back to 1993, on page 95 of the Liberal Red Book Canadians were promised, "We will also take measures to better regulate the activities of lobbyists, particularly in the awarding of government contracts." Why, nine years later, has this promise not been kept?

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government): In fact, there have been changes to the way in which lobbyists register in this country since 1993. As part of this eight-point plan, there will be further changes.

Senator Stratton: I am quite sure that if the scandals had not occurred, the new eight-point plan would have stayed on the shelf gathering dust just like the 1993 Red Book promise.

The Red Book also promised:

The Ethics Counsellor will have the power both to require reporting of lobbying fees in relation to government procurement contracts and to disclose publicly any contract, fee, or activity that may be contrary to the Code of Conduct for Lobbyists.

Honourable senators, I have not seen a word about this in the proposed ethics package. Here we have a promise from 1993. Will this born-again promise be introduced in the form of a bill, only to die on the Order Paper when the house prorogues?

Senator Carstairs: Honourable senators, with the greatest respect to the honourable senator, he, in fact, participated in the debate and the passing of significant amendments to the Lobbyists Registration Act. That act increased the transparency and cast the light of day into the lobby industry for the very first time. It now appears that further reforms may be necessary, and the Prime Minister has announced that those reforms will be introduced as part of an eight-point plan in the fall.

JUSTICE

OATH OF ALLEGIANCE—AMENDMENTS TO CONSTITUTION—REQUEST FOR ANSWER

Hon. Lowell Murray: Honourable senators, on another matter, does the honourable leader know whether the government's legal advisors have been able to get their minds around the question I

asked on April 23 as to which amending formula would apply to any changes in the provisions of the 1867 Constitution concerning the oath of allegiance?

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government): I have been advised that there is room for debate on which amending provision would apply. It would likely involve section 41 or section 44 of the Constitution Act, 1982, but in the broader context I certainly agree with the honourable senator that there are dangers in individual improvisations, and it is an initiative that we, as senators, should strongly discourage.

Senator Murray: Honourable senators, I presume the debate has taken place among the law officers of the Crown, and it will be resolved one way or another before long.

Will the leader undertake to have the government give us a definitive reply as to which of those amending formulae, 41 or 43, would apply to any amendment to those provisions?

• (1500)

Senator Carstairs: The amending formulae are in sections 41 and 44. The opinion that I have been given is that there remains some question as to which one it would be. I shall try to obtain a definitive answer for the honourable senator.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

UNITED STATES— RENEWAL OF SOFTWOOD LUMBER AGREEMENT

Hon. Gerry St. Germain: Honourable senators, my question is for the Leader of the Government in the Senate and concerns the softwood lumber dispute. An absolute crisis has been created in softwood lumber, which is a \$10-billion industry in British Columbia and in other parts of Canada. I understand that the government has appropriated some funds for relief in various areas. Can the Leader of the Government in the Senate elaborate on that subject so that British Columbians may have some idea of what additional action is being taken to resolve this crisis?

Softwood lumber is a \$5-billion industry in British Columbia alone. I do not have to explain the severity of this situation because the honourable senator is aware of it. Can she enlighten us as to what is being done on a diplomatic and political level with the Americans to resolve this matter? Since the Senate last sat, the tariff has been imposed.

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, a number of initiatives have been announced by the government. Minister Pettigrew announced just yesterday \$20 million to help Canada's softwood lumber industry raise awareness in the United States of the punitive duties that will be imposed.

As the honourable senator well knows, perhaps our best allies in this dispute are those who are building homes in the United States. All of them will pay higher prices for those homes because of the tariffs imposed to appease the interests of a narrow group.

The \$20 million will complement the \$75 million in funding announced on May 16, 2002, by Minister Dhaliwal to ensure the long-term prosperity and competitiveness of Canada's forest industry.

In respect of the honourable senator's specific question about the ongoing negotiations with the United States, it is very difficult to negotiate with individuals who do not wish to negotiate, which appears to be the current situation. That is why we have moved forward through the international community.

Senator St. Germain: Will that funding of \$20 million and \$75 million go to an advertising agency in the same way that other funds were spent on various programs in the province of Quebec? Huge percentages of funds went to advertising agencies in that province and then possible donations were made to various organizations in the country. Can the Leader of the Government in the Senate explain how these funds will be administered? Will these funds be provided to the industry and not to the advertising agencies?

Senator Carstairs: Honourable senators, as per the announcement made by Minister Pettigrew, \$17 million will be provided to Canadian lumber associations led by the Forest Products Association of Canada. The money will go directly to them. It is thought that, on this issue, they would be our best advocates.

In terms of the initiatives announced by Minister Dhaliwal, \$29.7 million will go to Canada's wood export program, \$30 million to support research and development activities, and \$15 million for the value-added research initiative for wood products.

Senator St. Germain: Is the Leader of the Government in the Senate saying that there is no advertising group or other group of people between the government provider of the funds and the final destination of the funds?

Senator Carstairs: Of the monies that I indicated, \$17 million will go to the forest products industry, which will conduct advertising campaigns. There is no question about that because that is the point of this entire initiative.

Senator St. Germain: I realize that.

Senator Carstairs: The forest products industry will set up the contracts for that advertising.

[Translation]

DELAYED ANSWER TO ORAL QUESTION

Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I had a delayed answer to present, but it was given orally by the Leader of the Government in the Senate earlier today.

[Senator Carstairs]

JUSTICE

OATH OF ALLEGIANCE— AMENDMENTS TO CONSTITUTION

(Response to question raised by Hon. Lowell Murray on April 23, 2002)

Senator Murray asked me to obtain information on the general question of which amending formula would apply to amending the constitutional provisions relating to the Oath of Allegiance. This came about as a result of a matter that has since been resolved but I can respond briefly to his question.

I have been advised that there is room for debate on which amending provision would apply. It would likely involve section 41 or 44 of the *Constitution Act, 1982*.

In the broader context, I certainly agree with Senator Murray that there are dangers in individual improvisations and it is an initiative that we as Senators should discourage.

I thank the Honourable member for his question.

[English]

ORDERS OF THE DAY

PAYMENT CLEARING AND SETTLEMENT ACT

BILL TO AMEND—MESSAGE FROM COMMONS

The Hon. the Speaker informed the Senate that a message had been received from the House of Commons returning Bill S-40, to amend the Payment Clearing and Settlement Act, and to acquaint the Senate that they have passed this bill without amendment.

BUSINESS OF THE SENATE

Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, we passed by Government Business on the Order Paper rather quickly. Did I miss something? Perhaps the Deputy Leader of the Government could describe for honourable senators his expectations for the government business to be dealt with by this chamber. There is none today, but does the honourable senator expect any government business tomorrow?

[Translation]

Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, in response to my opposition colleague, today we received a message from the House of Commons with a bill that we will consider next Thursday.

We must not leave people with the impression that all of the work of the Senate is done here in the chamber. It is important to explain that much of this work is done in committee. Several bills are at the committee stage. When this sitting is adjourned, the committees will resume their work. Next week, some of these bills will be referred back to the chamber in order to begin debate at third reading.

[English]

Senator Kinsella: Honourable senators, would the Deputy Leader of the Government consider it a better use of time if senators focused on the work of the committees? For example, Bill C-47, which received first reading today, could be dealt with and sent on to committee. Perhaps next week could be a committee week, rather than have the Senate sitting. There is a paucity of government business and many senators are anxious to work in committees.

[Translation]

Senator Robichaud: Honourable senators, we are always prepared to consider proposals from the opposition. I have no problem with disposing of the bill proposed for Thursday as early as tomorrow.

Should we only sit in committee next week? If we do committee work and receive other reports, other bills will come back for third reading, in my opinion. I believe that senators will be able to do a certain amount of work here in the chamber.

[English]

FOOD AND DRUGS ACT

BILL TO AMEND—THIRD READING—ORDER STANDS

On the Order:

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

Hon. Jeremiah S. Grafstein: Honourable senators, Senator Cordy is not in the chamber today. I would anticipate concluding the debate with a speech at the next sitting, if there are no other senators who wish to debate this issue either today or tomorrow.

The Hon. the Speaker: Before Senator Grafstein commences, there is no right of reply here. Accordingly, leave would be necessary for the honourable senator to proceed.

Is leave granted, honourable senators?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Senator Grafstein: Honourable senators, I do not intend to speak to Bill S-18 today, but I do intend to speak to it tomorrow, if no other senators wish to participate in the debate. I would hope that tomorrow's interventions will conclude third reading of the bill.

Order stands.

• (1510)

HERITAGE LIGHTHOUSE PROTECTION BILL

SECOND READING—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. J. Michael Forrestall moved the second reading of Bill S-43, to protect heritage lighthouses.—(*Honourable Senator Forrestall*).

He said: It is my pleasure, honourable senators, to speak today to Bill S-43. This is not a particularly partisan issue; nor is it a money issue. However, steps must be taken to preserve and protect Canadian heritage for future generations, whether it be heritage properties, railway stations, lighthouses or, perhaps someday soon, our Western Canadian grain elevators. These are all monuments to the Canadian way of life.

I ask all honourable senators familiar with Nova Scotia and the beautiful tourist trails throughout my home province to imagine the Lighthouse Trail without one lighthouse or its outlying structures. Imagine no more Peggy's Cove; imagine no more Grand Manan Island; imagine no more Gannet Rock Lighthouse. Forget about West Point Lighthouse in P.E.I. or Cape Spear Lighthouse in Newfoundland; forget about Langara Point Lighthouse in British Columbia, probably one of the most beautiful, remote and historically important lighthouses in our structure.

Honourable senators, every day we sit idle, coastal communities throughout Canada — whether on our beautiful East Coast or along the scenic St. Lawrence or on great Lake Winnipeg — face the loss of their historic lighthouses. Lighthouses have been sources of salvation to sailors in littoral waters for hundreds of years and have served as the centres of our coastal communities. Beautiful pictures of lighthouses from around the world adorn many a prominent wall. They are symbols of man's conquests of the high seas and oceans, and in the past have captured the hearts and souls of people world round, as they were the first sight of land upon return to the homeland. No question exists of their place in the human heart or of their simplistic beauty set against the rugged, dark seas. One does not have to hail from the shores of the Atlantic or the Pacific to be attracted to lighthouses.

The Lighthouse Preservation Society, based in Nova Scotia but with representatives from across Canada, has done much work to examine the plight of Canada's lighthouses and has attempted to save them from destruction. There are other groups on the West Coast that have also attempted to preserve this valuable part of Canadian maritime history.

Our colleague and a strong supporter of this bill, Senator Pat Carney, has worked tirelessly with lightkeepers on the West Coast to protect the stations, the keepers and their families. I cannot tell honourable senators how many times I have followed Senator Carney up a spiralling staircase, sometimes to dizzying heights, to

help her in this valuable cause. It is a cause that brings credit, I might add with some pride, to the Senate because it is a cause that lets isolated coastal communities know that someone in government cares — that indeed government does care.

At the last accurate count, there were just over 500 lighthouses in Canada. Of these, only 19 have full heritage protection; 101 have partial protection and recognition as heritage sites. The rest sit in no man's land at the present time.

What does protection and heritage status mean in real terms? I bring honourable senators' attention back to Bill C-62, the Heritage Railway Stations Protection Act, 1988, upon which this bill, to some degree, is modelled. If heritage sites are so special, why was it necessary to protect our heritage railway stations, found in most of our Canadian communities? The answer, sadly, is that even with a "heritage" designation these historic railway stations — some dating to Confederation — could be sold, transferred, altered or destroyed with little recourse to the public. The Heritage Railway Stations Protection Act set up a process of public consultations prior to any action being taken with regard to these valuable heritage sites and imposed stiff penalties in the event precipitous action was taken that in any way damaged an historic railway station.

Our research determined that Canada's 19 heritage lighthouses and the 101 partly recognized sites are in the same vulnerable position as Canada's historic train stations were prior to the passage of Bill C-62. Clause 3 of Bill S-43 reads, as follows:

The purpose of this Act is to preserve and protect heritage lighthouses by

- (a) providing for the selection and designation of heritage lighthouses;
- (b) preventing the unauthorized alteration or disposition of heritage lighthouses; and
- (c) requiring that heritage lighthouses be reasonably maintained.

Let me explain, honourable senators, why, as I said at the beginning of my intervention, this bill does not contemplate the expenditure of money. This bill defines "heritage lighthouse" as follows:

...a lighthouse designated as a heritage lighthouse under section 6, and includes any related site or structure that is included in the designation.

Bill S-43 defines "alter" as follows:

...includes to restore or renovate, but does not include to perform routine maintenance and repairs.

The bill defines "Board" as follows:

...means the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada...

Under Bill S-43, "Minister" means the Minister of Canadian Heritage.

Clause 4 of Bill S-43 reads as follows, honourable senators:

This Act applies to lighthouses within the legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada.

Clauses 6 through 10 of Bill S-43 enable the Governor in Council, on the recommendation of the Minister of Canadian Heritage, to designate lighthouses and their related properties as heritage lighthouses and to set out a process for their designation as heritage lighthouses.

Clauses 11 through 16 protect heritage lighthouses, and I draw your attention in particular to clause 11(1), which reads:

No person shall remove, alter, destroy, sell, assign, transfer or otherwise dispose of a heritage lighthouse or any part of it, unless authorization to do so has been given by the Minister under this Act.

• (1520)

Clauses 11 through 16 also lay out a process for public consultation with regard to the disposition of heritage lighthouses.

Clause 17 simply requires that the owner of a heritage lighthouse keep it up in a condition in keeping with its heritage character. I return to the fact that this bill does not imply the expenditure of money. I suggest to honourable senators that this is nothing more than municipalities in our country require of homeowners. Who wants an eyesore next door? If you do not keep up your property, the municipality can require you to do so.

Clause 18 empowers the Governor in Council to make regulations. It simply amends the Department of Canadian Heritage Act by giving the minister jurisdiction over heritage lighthouses.

In the end, this bill will enhance the powers of the Minister of Canadian Heritage and will allow for the designation, the preservation, public consultation on, and the general upkeep of Canada's heritage lighthouses.

Honourable senators, I believe this is a bill worthy of the support of all of us, and I ask for your consideration in this regard.

On motion of Senator Callbeck, debate adjourned.

STUDY ON MATTERS RELATING TO FISHING INDUSTRY

REPORT OF FISHERIES COMMITTEE— DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

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

Hon. Janis G. Johnson: Honourable senators, I rise today to draw your attention to the most recent report of the Fisheries Committee entitled "Selected Themes on Canada's Freshwater and Northern Fisheries."

Fresh water, of course, is a subject close to all our hearts. I grew up and live in the Town of Gimli, Manitoba, on the shores of Lake Winnipeg, Canada's fourth largest lake and the tenth largest in the world. This inland sea sustains the biggest commercial freshwater fishery in Western Canada, to the tune of \$15 million per year.

Lake Winnipeg receives water from three American states and four Canadian provinces. It is larger than either Lake Erie or Lake Ontario, but still I suspect many Canadians would be hard-pressed to place it on a map. Before 1999, scientists had not examined Lake Winnipeg since 1986. The number of conferences, reports and papers assembled on the subject is dismally low compared with those focusing on Canada's other Great Lakes.

The report before us examines the situation in Lake Winnipeg and its massive basin, which stretches from south in the Dakotas, all the way north to Hudson Bay, and as far west as the Alberta-B.C. border, as part of the broader context of the central and Arctic regions of our country that hold vast amounts of Canada's fresh water. Anecdotal evidence suggests that Lake Winnipeg's water quality and the long-term viability of its ecosystems are declining rapidly. However, little baseline or current data are available to diagnose the causes of this deterioration.

The Lake Winnipeg Research Consortium, coordinated by my friend Allan Kristofferson and headquartered in Gimli, was founded in 1998 to address this lack of research. The consortium is made up of 24 members, including government departments at the federal, provincial and municipal levels, Manitoba Hydro, Lake Winnipeg commercial fishermen, the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation, the University of Manitoba and the University of Winnipeg. Each of these members stands to gain, as do all Canadians, from a better understanding of the condition of Lake Winnipeg.

In 1999, the consortium managed to secure a surplus Coast Guard vessel, the *Namao*, as a platform for studying the lake. I was on the *Namao* this weekend. It will cruise the lake for three weeks this summer, as it cruised the lake for three weeks last summer and in 1999, when it ran diagnostic water tests at 47 sites. The tests revealed that Lake Winnipeg is approaching a critical point of deterioration that may affect the survival of its ecosystems.

Problems indicated by the research included increased eutrophication, which is caused by excess nutrients like farm fertilizers, and the invasion of new, exotic species, including rainbow smelt and a foreign species of zooplankton, as well as other changes to the lake's transparency and sediment chemistry. These changes can have unforeseen effects on the native ecosystems as the dynamics shift to incorporate new predators, sources of food for native fish species and new conditions.

The findings of the 1999 cruise were important, but it was clear that they were only a starting point for understanding the complex changes taking place in Lake Winnipeg. Unfortunately, the *Namao* was not available the following summer because the vessel needed maintenance. The Coast Guard agreed to make the *Namao* available to the consortium on the condition that it paid for the repairs to make the vessel seaworthy.

In the fall of 2001, the consortium finally succeeded in securing funds for the necessary maintenance, to the tune of \$326,000, from the Canada/Manitoba Economic Development Partnership Agreement. I am happy to report that the ship was recently passed by Transport Canada and is, as I speak, embarking on its first cruise of the summer.

During this and the two other cruises set for 2002 — one in late July and August, and another in October — the *Namao* and its crew will visit each of the established sampling stations three times. At each site, the crew will take samples of the lake bottom to be analyzed for bottom organisms and toxic contaminants. Plankton and algae will be captured and examined for species type, abundance and presence of contaminants, and the crew will take water samples at the surface, at various depths and at the bottom, for quality assessment.

Researchers will use satellite imagery of the lake and correlate it with chlorophyll and suspended sediment samples to map algal bloom. The crew will also trawl for rainbow smelt to better understand its abundance and distribution in the lake. It is hoped that the three planned, consecutive trips will help us gain a better understanding of biological and chemical processes as they develop during the open water season.

The consortium has also inked an agreement with the Coast Guard to crew the *Namao* on a cost-recovery basis for the next three years. With \$165,000 maximum, yearly, donated by Manitoba Hydro to help cover costs for these three years — contingent on equal contributions from both the federal and Manitoba governments — the *Namao*, with additional small funding, should be able to carry out its three-year study mission that will provide some of the most comprehensive and continuous data ever collected on Lake Winnipeg. If the Lake Winnipeg Research Consortium can cover those vessel operating costs by fundraising in this manner, those using the *Namao* as a platform for their work will be free to use their own funding exclusively for their research, which, of course, will mean better quality data.

I have spoken to honourable senators before about North Dakota's controversial Devils Lake diversion project, which proposes to dump enormous volumes of foreign water into the Red River system, which would then flow down into Lake Winnipeg. This will likely have negative impacts on Lake Winnipeg as it opens the door to invasion by new foreign species and water contaminants. I am confident that this next round of tests conducted by the crew of the *Namao* will add scientific emphasis to the chorus of environmentalists opposing the Devils Lake project.

• (1530)

In conclusion, honourable senators, I must say that I am encouraged by these developments, and must commend both my fellow senators on the Fisheries Committee and the Lake Winnipeg Research Consortium for their excellent work. Canada's other "Great Lake" is finally getting the scientific attention it requires, and I look forward to reporting back to you in the fall with the preliminary test results.

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

KYOTO PROTOCOL

INQUIRY

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the inquiry of the Honourable Senator Taylor calling the attention of the Senate to the necessity of Canada ratifying the Kyoto Protocol, which was signed on December 10, 1997.—(*Honourable Senator Spivak*).

Hon. Mira Spivak: Honourable senators, I am pleased to be taking part in this inquiry. I congratulate Senator Taylor for his fine address on this subject.

In January, I addressed the Asia Pacific Parliamentary Forum, where I spoke briefly about Canada's position on the Kyoto protocol. I expressed my hope that Canada would ratify it.

At the time, the domestic debate on ratification had barely begun. Since January, it has grown more fractious than many people could have imagined. Senator Taylor is to be commended for drawing the attention of the Senate to the looming decision. I trust that we can draw more light than heat on the subject matter.

My position is clear: Canada should ratify the protocol, and should make every effort to do so before the World Summit on Sustainable Development to be held in Johannesburg in September. Why? The time to reduce greenhouse gas emissions is long overdue.

A decade and a half has passed since scientists gathered in Toronto and warned that a 20 per cent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions was urgently needed. A decade has passed since world leaders came together at the Rio Earth Summit and agreed to work together. It has been almost five years since the Kyoto protocol was created and Canada's first ministers agreed that our country must do its part to address climate change.

I attended the Toronto conference in 1986; Senator Fairbairn accompanied me. At that conference, we heard the scientists' evidence; we were persuaded. I have seen successive scientific panels grow more certain that mankind is causing the warming we already experience. I have watched Nobel laureates exert their intellectual and moral authority to warn us of the price of delay — all to little effect.

Meanwhile, the professional doubters, obstructionists and other opponents of government policy on climate change have had their way for far too long. First, they attacked the science and denied that there was, or could be a problem. When the UN's expert panel found that the balance of evidence supports the concept of human-induced climate change, the naysayers demanded certainty — something few business leaders would offer shareholders.

Five years later, when the panel assembled more evidence, including rising sea levels and decreasing snow cover, the opponents changed course. Then the problem became a matter of cost. It would be cripplingly costly, they allege, to keep the commitments under the Kyoto protocol.

The Worldwatch Institute has seen the global trend and has written of it in the *State of the World 2002* report. Multinational corporations that oppose changing the world's energy mix tend to apply the same strategy everywhere.

Canada is not unique, either in the type of opposition to the protocol or the specific arguments. Canada still comes off poorly in the Worldwatch Institute report, for what we have failed to do, but Canadians' good work in select areas is recognized. The City of Toronto is seen as leading other cities worldwide with measures to reduce emissions by 20 per cent. Premiers in Atlantic Canada are lauded for joining with governors of New England states in promising to go beyond the Kyoto targets.

What of Canada's efforts as a whole? We contribute a disproportionate amount of carbon into the atmosphere — more than Australia and New Zealand combined. We have signed the protocol, pledging to reduce emissions by 6 per cent on 1990 levels; in fact, however, we have increased them by almost 13 per cent. We have cajoled the European Union to let us off the hook for about 10 per cent of our commitment, through emission credits for our "carbon sinks" — our forests and farmlands that absorb carbon from the atmosphere. The government suggests that ratification might depend on credit for exports of natural gas and clean power to the U.S., which would eliminate another 30 per cent of the emission reductions required of us.

Nevertheless, the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, Canadian Manufacturers & Exporters, the Alberta premier and the new leader of the Canadian Alliance, Stephen Harper, have Canada on the road to ruin if we ratify the Kyoto protocol.

The public discourse is worse than appalling. The focus is on one thing only — that is, the macroeconomic cost of ratification. Is it a \$40-billion annual loss, as the Alberta government has projected, or is it a \$2-billion annual gain, as Boston-based Tellus Institute has predicted? Is it 450,000 jobs lost, as Canadian Manufacturers & Exporters say, or is it the net addition of 52,000 Canadian jobs, as Tellus forecasts?

No one has the gift of prophecy. We could face a \$23-billion bill by 2012, or we could be looking at a \$5-billion benefit. It depends on the policy measures the federal and provincial governments choose to meet the Kyoto targets and the assumptions about what those measures will cost.

[Senator Johnson]

I do not want to dwell on this futile argument. We will know the cost, once we do it, just as we discovered the real costs and benefits of deficit reduction and only now are beginning to see the real costs of the war on terrorism. We can be reasonably assured that there will be a short-term cost, that it will be greater than what the supporters of the protocol suggest and far less than the inflated cost predicted by the opponents. It will be higher in the initial years, as we make adjustments, and there will be benefits that increase in the long term.

The costs would have been less had we already begun. Had we begun when we said we would, we would be selling technology to European and Asian countries that will ratify the protocol and, as such, will need those solutions.

• (1540)

Honourable senators, we do not need another number-crunching report, and we do not need the Leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons decrying that the Kyoto protocol is a job-killer. He does not know; he is just talking. It may turn out to be a job creator.

As Canada makes the decision in the months ahead, I hope that we will know more and remember more about what is important in this debate. I told our Asia-Pacific colleagues that Canada understands the importance of the Kyoto protocol because we are already experiencing the impacts of global warming. I know that I was incorrect about melting permafrost in the North. I know that most Canadians have learned that polar bears are growing leaner and meaner. Senator Adams or Senator Watt said that he sleeps with a gun under his bed because the polar bears are in town. The hunting grounds are changing rapidly.

Some honourable senators may have heard of Quebec's contingency plans to move northern villages where houses are sinking into the permafrost. The government's discussion paper informs us that Canada has just completed the nineteenth consecutive season of above normal temperatures. That is well beyond the range of natural climate variability.

How many of us know what the Inuit and Cree of the Hudson Bay bio-region know? They know that the colour of the sky has changed and that the sun is blocked by haze. They know that cold weather persists into the spring, as it did in the South this year. They know that the currents are weaker and that rivers have less water. These are profound changes for people who travel over sea ice and live off the land. They are taking climate change seriously.

However, are our business leaders taking weather change seriously? The very people who should be viewing challenges as opportunities and who have the most to gain in the energy-change sweepstakes are the people who are leading the charge against the Kyoto protocol, but not all companies. BP, Shell Canada and Suncor think green. Suncor is investing \$100 million in alternative and renewable energy products. Royal Dutch/Shell projects that renewable energy resources will meet up to half the world's energy requirements by 2050. In early May, Royal Dutch/Shell

announced a \$43-million investment that will allow a Canadian company, Iogen Energy Corporation, to develop the world's first commercial scale ethanol plant to make fuel from wood and straw.

Among our manufacturers, Robert Schad, founder and CEO of Husky Injection Molding Systems, has broken ranks with the Canadian Manufacturers & Exporters Association to spearhead a lobby in favour of the protocol. The voice of reason, David Schindler, recent winner of the \$1-million Gerhard Herzberg Canada Gold Medal for Science and Engineering, has also injected some sanity into the debate. He pointed out that manufacturers and politicians who decry the costs never look at the other side of the balance sheet. Dr. Schindler asked:

What is it going to cost to have cities without water? What is it going to cost for increased water treatment?...The warning signs are there that we are already overtaxing our water. We have politicians saying that we can't afford Kyoto. Do they think that greenhouse warming doesn't affect water supplies? We are in dire straits and it's going to get worse.

The Queen of Sweden acknowledged Dr. Schindler's immense knowledge of water by awarding him the first ever Stockholm Water Prize, the equivalent of a Noble Prize for limnologists.

It is high time that business leaders, provincial leaders and federal government leaders heed the sane warnings he gives about what our country faces. If we must reduce the potential disaster that is climate change until it fits into a ledger book, then we should listen to the real experts in that field — the insurers.

Paul Kovacs is Senior Vice-President and Chief Economist for the Insurance Bureau of Canada and Executive Director for the Institute for Catastrophic Loss Reduction. Here is what he says:

Early action to address climate change is essential, in part, to address the growing threat of rising losses from extreme weather. Others are better qualified than insurers to determine the specific actions that will be most effective, but the insurance community does believe in the importance of action now, ideally within an international framework that is widely accepted.

This is not a radical environmentalist speaking.

Why does the insurance community hold that view? It has seen damage around the world caused by natural disasters increase nine-fold since the 1960s and insured losses increase fifteen-fold. In Canada, property damage in the last decade exceeded \$6 billion. Flash floods, ice storms, coastal flooding — these are some of the things that insurers predict will increase as the world warms.

Not surprisingly, it is the insurers who talk about public investment in infrastructure. They talk about the need to have adequate storm sewers and to think about road design. It is the insurers who talk about climate-appropriate building codes and investment in structural safety measures such as dams, levees and sea walls. The Winnipeg floodway is singled out as the most visible Canadian investment in adapting to extreme events.

Are those who oppose the protocol crunching the numbers on building more mammoth floodways and other “adaptation measures”? What will prairie droughts cost? The Canadian Wheat Board last year estimated that the droughts would cost the Canadian economy about \$5 billion.

Canadians thankfully have digested much information in the last one and a half decades. When the question is put to them, they overwhelmingly say, “Yes, Canada should ratify Kyoto.” A Decima Research poll in March found that 78 per cent of Canadians want our country to take part in the international effort. Even two out of three Albertans believe that the protocol should be ratified. The vast majority of Canadians are prepared to give their approval to the protocol without knowing down to the dollar what it will cost their families. They are prepared to approve it because it is the life-affirming thing to do.

Perhaps they have heard the government say repeatedly that there will be no carbon tax and believe it. Perhaps they recognize that government has choices and many of the things we can choose to do fall into the category of “no regrets” options. Climate change benefits aside, these things are worth doing, as Senator Taylor told us in his address.

The options identified in the Tellus Institute report, for example, include a national program to improve energy efficiency in public buildings, commercial buildings and housing. Energy conservation measures quickly pay for themselves and keep on paying back in savings.

In the transportation sector, there are measures to promote telecommuting, car sharing and ride sharing. These things will reduce, not increase, the cost of getting to work. Incentives to move employees from cars to public transit and intercity travellers from cars to buses are also on the books.

For much of the 1990s, the federal government has resisted the pleadings of the Canadian Federation of Municipalities to simply change tax law to make tax-exempt transit passes legal and on an equal footing with free parking. Is this a measure that will cost Canadians billions, or is it just common sense?

Many of the measures are practical, cost-saving and efficient things to do that were proposed during the energy crisis of the 1970s. They were not put into place because oil prices fell. It matters not whether oil cartels or climate change drives the transition to alternative energy. Canada and individual Canadians will benefit from becoming more energy efficient and using less of a non-renewable resource.

Other so-called targeted measures are found in the government’s recent discussion paper. They are so numerous that they would more than achieve our Kyoto target if Canada gets credit for clean energy exports. Enforcing speed limits on the highways, reducing idling by trucks, blending ethanol into all gasoline and capturing CO₂ released by coal plants in Alberta and Saskatchewan would move us another 10 per cent of the way.

I want to commend the authors of that discussion paper for clearly setting out the science of climate change and giving everyone the benefit, in broad strokes at least, of the work of the Analysis and Modelling Group and the 16 Issue Tables, as well as

the Canadian Council of Chief Executives. It is helpful to have a single reference point for the choices we have and an estimate of what each choice will achieve, although unfortunately costs are not broken down.

The folly, of course, is that after five years we still have a discussion paper and not a plan. We have a discussion paper and a process of further consultations that take us through the summer and into the fall. Of the four so-called options, only one has a clear shape. You do not have to read between the lines to know that the government favours the fourth option, the one that is least formed and most complex. The paper says it explicitly:

The government is interested in receiving input on whether this option provides the basis for a workable approach in meeting Canada’s Kyoto target.

The paper gives us broad estimates of the “costs” of two options. Option one — the “broad as practical” domestic emissions trading system — would put carbon emissions into the marketplace and let the market decide who wins and who loses. Not surprisingly, it would have an overall positive effect on the economy but would be felt unevenly across the country.

• (1550)

Canada’s GDP would be about half a percentage point higher by 2012 than it would be without the trading system, but Alberta’s GDP would be half a point less than the 27.3 per cent increase projected under a business-as-usual scenario. No region of the country or any sector of the economy would be ruined. Yet, free marketers are opposed.

The cost of the third option, a mixed approach, is far greater. Canada’s GDP would suffer slightly and Alberta’s would suffer disproportionately. Sectors that would benefit under the first option would slip into a negative position.

Option four is much the same as option three but would have a much more complex system of allocating emissions permits that could address inequities and be the focus for endless discussion, debate, allegations of unfairness, challenges, appeals and, perhaps, legal action.

For five years, this government’s approach to climate change could be subtitled “The Never-ending Story.” The discussion paper, sadly, is more of the same.

In recent weeks, we have seen several political leaders suggest that we should follow the U.S. example, that we should opt out of the protocol and develop our own plan.

The Hon. the Speaker *pro tempore*: Honourable Senator Spivak, I am sorry to interrupt you, but your allotted time has expired.

[Translation]

Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I am inclined to give the Honourable Senator Spivak the time required for her to finish her remarks.

[English]

The Hon. the Speaker *pro tempore*: Please proceed, Senator Spivak.

Senator Spivak: The reason most often cited is that we must find ways to remain competitive with the U.S. There are very persuasive counter-arguments to that fear.

First, we can become more competitive by responding proactively to technological change. In Japan, a study by Shonan Econometrics predicts that proactive implementation of Kyoto would increase the country's GDP by 0.9 per cent, or \$47.3 billion. In Europe, studies of the costs and benefits of EU ratification, without the United States, also suggest an overall gain. European industries would get a head start in developing innovative technologies that reduce emissions.

Professor Kornelis Blok, co-author of a report by the Dutch firm ECOFYS, states the following:

If the U.S. does not ratify Kyoto and the EU and Japan do, they will gain a competitive advantage.

As Michael Porter said to Canada a decade ago, to be green is to be competitive; if you are not green, you cannot be competitive.

There is no reason on earth that our nation should miss out on that benefit — unless we respond passively to the challenge and refuse to use energy more wisely.

Second, we have an obligation that goes beyond our desire for a GDP that outperforms other nations. It is greater than our last-gasp defence of technologies that in time must be replaced. It is our obligation to people everywhere on our small planet and to our own future generations.

Third, as Americans know well, our competitiveness is influenced by many factors, not the least of which is the value of the Canadian dollar. The government's competitiveness review also considered whether investment would flow out of Canada if we ratified the protocol. It concluded that there might be an impact, but it saw other factors at play, such as labour skills, tax levels, investment incentives and many others.

The Kyoto protocol, for all its detractors, is the only game in town, globally. It offers the best hope for low-cost emissions reductions through the Clean Development Mechanism, the CDM, which allows us to get credit for work with Canadian technology in developing countries and through a worldwide emissions trading system. It is, to be blunt, a meagre first step. To stabilize greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere and secure a healthy climate, we will have to ratchet back to carbon emission levels of the 1950s by the end of this century. Then the world will have to cut levels in half again and return to the levels of the early 1900s. What hope have we of doing that if we cannot honour a commitment for a 6 per cent cut in 1990 levels after a decade of discussion?

We have a good example of what can be done. Under the 1987 Montreal protocol, the use of ozone-depleting chemicals has declined 90 per cent globally, at a modest cost, far less than what was predicted. In 1980, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency proposed that the U.S. go it alone on chlorofluorocarbon emissions and gave advance notice of regulatory methods of control. In response, the Alliance for Responsible CFC Policy, a consortium of producers and industrial users, lobbied so effectively that the plan was defeated. A year later, the Chemical Manufacturers Association released a study that claimed that ozone levels had increased during the 1970s. In the mid-1980s, the chief manufacturer, DuPont, admitted that it had given up looking for alternatives to chlorofluorocarbons five years earlier. In fact, the company was expanding CFC production in Japan and introducing it in China.

It took a Canadian minister of the environment to convene the Toronto conference on climate change. It took the conference and the discovery of an ozone hole in the Antarctic to propel world leaders to sign and signify the Montreal protocol. Once there was the will, the way proved less difficult and less costly than industrial opponents led anyone to believe.

Honourable senators, has our government lost the will to lead? If we opt out of the protocol, will the climate change treaty enter into force and the protocol become an instrument of international law? In all likelihood, it will, because of the countries that have already announced their intent to ratify and have come close to meeting the requisite 55 per cent of emissions of industrial and former East Bloc countries that it takes to put the protocol into effect. The U.S. aside, Canada's 3.3 per cent contribution is the next largest on the list and could be required in the event that Poland or other European nations retreat from the protocol.

How will history judge us if we refuse to cooperate with other nations in taking modest first steps? We could lead by example and be deserving of the good international reputation that our ministers of the environment and our prime minister earned in the 1980s and the early 1990s. We could allow our current minister, who is doing a fabulous job trying to get this through, to hold his head high in Johannesburg next September. After all, he is the first Canadian ever elected President of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme. For those who value optics, there is ample reason for us to ratify sooner rather than later.

In closing, I should like to leave you with these thoughts from Christopher Flavin and Seth Dunn of the Worldwatch Institute: "There is growing awareness, even in traditional foreign policy circles, that climate change shares characteristics with terrorism: it is a new and looming threat to global security and human well-being of which experts have warned for more than a decade. It requires a response with short-term costs that are worth bearing and it cuts across borders and thus merits greater international collaboration."

The Johannesburg summit provides an extraordinary opportunity to move ahead. If Canada and other nations have the will to ratify the protocol before the summit, we can signal all governments and all industries, no matter where they reside, that the energy future is here and the global effort to face climate change is at last on the advance.

Hon. Nicholas W. Taylor: Honourable senators, may I be permitted to ask the honourable senator a question?

The Hon. the Speaker *pro tempore*: Senator Spivak, will you take a question?

Senator Spivak: Yes.

Senator Taylor: The honourable senator mentioned my home province, which probably has a bigger “Flat Earth” membership than any other province in Canada.

Nevertheless, is the honourable senator aware that a survey done last week by the *Edmonton Journal*, which is Southam’s northern branch, showed that the oil and gas industry was split 50-50 on whether its members wanted Kyoto, possibly because they found out that carbon dioxide is pushed into the ground to get the oil out? They are now importing CO₂ from the U.S., and the U.S. is subsidizing it. They thought, perhaps, that they could manufacture their own CO₂ to get out their own oil.

Was the honourable senator aware that this happened?

• (1600)

Senator Spivak: I was not aware of that, but I did forget to mention one thing about Alberta. Emissions have decreased to some extent in Alberta and no jobs have been lost. All kinds of jobs have been created. The whole argument about jobs is full of hot air.

The Hon. the Speaker *pro tempore*: Honourable senators, if no other honourable senator wishes to speak, this inquiry is considered debated.

CHALLENGES IN FOREIGN POLICY

INQUIRY—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. Pierre De Bané rose pursuant to notice of March 21, 2002:

That he will call the attention of the Senate to what he regards as the top ten foreign policy challenges facing Canada.

He said: Honourable senators, it is my pleasure to address you today on a subject of considerable importance to our country: the top foreign policy challenges facing Canada.

As honourable senators know, Canada’s international relations are of ongoing concern to the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I am a proud member. My colleagues on the committee all share the view that Canada’s destiny is inextricably linked to the destiny of the rest of the world, for better or for worse. We believe that no one in Canada will enjoy prosperity for long if the rest of the world is not stable and at peace. For this reason, an enlightened foreign policy is very definitely in the interest of Canadians. We on the committee and

in the Senate as a whole are dedicated to contributing to the formulation of that policy. This is the spirit in which I offer my comments today.

In this regard, I should like to pay special tribute today to the Honourable Bill Graham. All of us who have had occasion to admire his superb work as Chairman of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade know that he is clearly one of our best-prepared foreign ministers ever. I have no doubt that we will have many occasions to admire his achievements as our country’s Minister of Foreign Affairs. I know I speak for all honourable senators in wishing him well. The decisions that Minister Graham has made since assuming his responsibilities as head of Canadian diplomacy promises a foreign policy bearing the stamp of the Canadian values of idealism, humanism and solidarity that reflect the principles that made the foreign policy of Lester B. Pearson deserving of the Nobel Peace Prize. I wish to pay tribute here to the visit of Minister Graham last week in the Middle East.

Beyond the contribution we can make to the minister and to foreign policy development, there is a second reason that I encourage honourable senators to raise their voices on the subject of foreign affairs. It is my belief that one of the most important services senators can render their fellow Canadians is to show their awareness, consideration through debate of the serious international challenges facing our country and the world so that as many Canadians as possible may participate in national dialogue on these issues. These are the issues that, above all, will determine the kind of country we bestow to our children and grandchildren; yet, they are too often treated as the exclusive preserve of elites.

It is for these reasons that I should like to share my views with honourable senators today on what I regard as the top 10 foreign policy challenges facing Canada. Let me explain that I have chosen the top 10 challenges because that number seems to include most of the major issues and because I am aware that top 10 lists are popular these days with the young. It is to young people most importantly among all Canadians that I direct my comments. As they would expect, I will approach the list from the bottom and work my way up to the top.

As the rules of the chamber do not allow me to deliver the full text of each of those 10 priorities, I will endeavour to make a special printing of the complete text of them.

[*Translation*]

The tenth challenge, honourable senators, is reforming our instruments of foreign relations. In observing the world scene and the way most governments are organized to deal with the ever-shifting global tableau, I am sure I am not the only person to marvel at the significant change that has taken place over the years on the world stage and the very limited corresponding change in the instruments and processes governments use in defining foreign policies and managing international relations.

We just have to think about some of the incredible changes that have taken place that were unimaginable even 20 years ago; for example, using the Internet to communicate with someone who lives around the corner or at the opposite end of the world. Each takes the same amount of time and costs the same amount of money.

Our traditional approaches, like those of most countries, continue to be based for the most part on Metternichian concepts that date back beyond the Congress of Vienna. In my schooldays, the period introduced by the Congress was sometimes called "modern history"—I think we have to recognize that it should now be re-labelled "pre-modern"—and foreign policy instruments and processes for today may have to be radically transformed to reflect that fact.

Does it serve a purpose for us to distinguish between a foreign department and domestic departments in a world in which every domestic department has substantial international interests? Are domestic departments and agencies properly equipped and organized to meet their inter-related international and domestic challenges—which might be called "inter-mestic" challenges? Are the processes of interdepartmental and intergovernmental cooperation sufficient to meet the international challenges facing every level of our federation? Are embassies and the protocols of traditional international relations still relevant, useful and worth their high cost? Are the international multilateral fora up to the challenges facing them? Should all the domestic and international instruments of foreign affairs not be "reinvented" or at least refreshed to counteract the natural sclerosis that afflicts all unchanging or unchangeable institutions? Should we change our structures and approaches in order to deal just with the superpower next door, or with China, or with Europe and, if so, how should we go about it?

[English]

The ninth challenge deals with Latin America and the Caribbean. It relates to a strengthening of Canada's relations with our hemispheric friends and partners beyond the United States. Relations with the latter come up as a separate item later in my list.

Canada has special historical ties with the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean, which have been reflected recently in the Prime Minister's initiatives to strengthen our political and economic ties with them. They include the Summit of the Americas held in Quebec City last year and the efforts to achieve a free trade of the Americas agreement.

The free trade agreement initiative by itself demands a good deal of Canadian attention and effort, but my thinking about what Canada has to do with its hemispheric partners involves much more than just trade issues. Worldwide economic uncertainty may have serious and negative consequences for many of these countries. Argentina is a major example of the hardship and instability that can be unleashed by uncertain economic times. Other countries in the region may face similar difficulties in the months ahead.

In my view, the role of Canada must, in part, be one of leadership—the leadership of the honest broker. It may mean leading the Americans who, while having the deciding weight in the hemisphere, cannot always be counted on to muster the vision or moral credibility to achieve cooperative and positive outcomes. The U.S. has significant "baggage" in the area, and Canada is in a special position to help lead and broker constructive policies in a time of international stress. To do this, we need the right people, the right resources and a long-term strategy reflecting one of our highest foreign policy priorities.

• (1610)

Within this high priority, the government must, in my opinion, place particular emphasis on political and economic developments in Mexico, Venezuela and Brazil, where the long-term stakes are high and where failures would have intercontinental repercussions. Because Mexico is our next nearest neighbour and NAFTA partner, I think we must give it the highest priority of all and be prepared to go to considerable lengths to support its continuing political and economic evolution.

However, the recently attempted coup in Venezuela, a country with strategic importance in oil markets, shows that Canada must also be on guard against anti-democratic forces that lurk in the background whenever economic trends turn negative.

Also, we should not forget our Caribbean neighbours, most of whom have strong links with Canada and Canadians. We should continue to offer all the assistance we can to encourage social development and growth in the islands.

We must be especially alert to the possibility of change and sudden crisis in Cuba. Democratization of its political structures and social conditions is long overdue, and the United States has political difficulties dealing with it. There may be a need for Canada to play a special role in a transitional Cuba, and we should be prepared for it.

The eighth challenge concerns international development assistance. After the selfish "me first" 1990s, it is refreshing to see the world once again turn its attention to the plight of the poorest countries and human beings. I applaud our own Prime Minister's leadership and growing attention to the particularly desperate plight of many parts of Africa. I am delighted that he will focus on this issue at the Kananaskis meeting of the G8.

In a speech in this chamber before Christmas, I suggested that Canada should try to play a special role in the G8 on behalf of the medium-sized and smaller countries that are not represented there. Prime Minister Chrétien's leadership on African issues is an excellent example of what Canada can achieve through this important institution.

Poverty and human misery have long been part of the human condition. It has been tempting to conclude that our previous international development efforts have amounted to nothing more than throwing money into a bottomless pit. Donor fatigue set in following the well-intentioned efforts of Canada and others in the 1960s and 1970s. Canadians are idealists and internationalists at heart, but sometimes it is hard to keep up one's idealistic hopes when success is not achieved quickly.

The situation is turning around for many reasons. For one thing, the government's success in calming the fiscal crisis has meant that there is more money available for aid, as was reflected in the December budget. Another factor may be recognition that globalization, which can bring humanity so many benefits, will go nowhere if the effect of it is to accentuate global economic disparities.

The Deputy Secretary General of the Commonwealth Secretariat, Winston Cox, said recently, "If we don't address poverty, we will become its victims..." Mr. Cox's comment reminded me of the view strongly underscored on many occasions by that distinguished internationalist and Canadian, Ivan Head, when he was President of the International Development Research Centre, IDRC, and in his 1991 book, *On the Hinge of History*. He believed "mutual vulnerability" to be a concept vital to understanding the world in which we live. The view was summed up by one of his successors at the IDRC, Mr. Keith Bezanson, when he said:

There is a growing recognition that the development of the South and the survival of the North are merely two sides of the same coin.

Maureen O'Neill, the current President of the IDRC, reinforced this idea when she said at the Kroeger College Leadership Forum at Carleton University on February 8, 2001, in a lecture entitled "Globalization — Is Canada Ready?":

Canadians have an opportunity, I would say an obligation, to influence those decisions in ways that will improve the world, and improve our own future. Contributing to those improvements will serve our best interests. When we help to build a safer, more prosperous, more democratic world, we enhance and enrich the lives of Canadians.

A recent article in the February 2002 issue of the *Atlantic Monthly* by senior editor Jack Beatty pointed out that recent studies by Oxfam (Britain) and the World Bank have noted that:

...developing countries lose about \$100 billion a year owing to Western export subsidies and trade barriers. For agriculture alone these subsidies and trade barriers amounted to (i.e. cost the West) \$245 billion in 2000 — about five times what the West spent on development assistance that year.

[Translation]

The seventh challenge is strengthening the framework for international commerce.

The Hon. the Speaker *pro tempore*: I am sorry to have to inform Honourable Senator De Bané that his 15 minutes is up. Is he seeking leave to continue?

Senator De Bané: Yes, honourable senators.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Senator De Bané: My fellow senators need not be reminded of the importance of Canada's continuing work on law-based global free trade. As a trade-dependent nation, we benefit more than most from globalized trade. Thus, the Doha Round of trade negotiations will present an important challenge for Canada. So will the continuing work I mentioned earlier on the Free Trade Area of the Americas Agreement.

[Senator De Bané]

This does not mean that we should not take very seriously the various debates worldwide on the merits of globalization. There are honest and legitimate reservations about the emergence of forces and conditions that seem to intensify economic and social disparities and political polarization both within and among countries.

The article I just referred to in the *Atlantic Monthly* made the serious charge that "the West has failed to live up to its promises...(it) has required the rest (of the world) to open their markets without reciprocating commensurately." If this is true or seen to be the case in the Third World, we should not be surprised if globalization is seen as a threat and not a blessing by much of the world, notwithstanding the clear benefits it offers to a trading country like Canada.

This means that we must put a high priority on building and using international multilateral fora like the WTO to establish and enforce objective legal trading rules and standards. Canada must also focus on the strengthening of the international regulatory system outside the realm of trade, which will lead to the creation of a structure in which globalization will benefit not just the rich and powerful, but everyone.

Here, I wish to pay tribute to the recent election of the Honourable Sergio Marchi as Chairman of the General Council of the WTO. This is eloquent proof of the exceptional talent of Mr. Marchi and of Canada's ability to provide leadership in the world when it comes to liberalization.

The sixth challenge is undoubtedly that of Asian economic and security issues. As I look at the huge expanse, population, creative energy and wealth of Asia, I keep returning to a realization that was commonplace 10 years ago before it was somewhat eclipsed by temporary economic developments. It is a realization that, in my opinion, remains true; it is that Canada's long-term economic and security interests are principally bound up in Asia. Whither Asia, thither Canada.

The Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs carried out a major study of the situation in Asia in 1997-98 in connection with Canada's Asia-Pacific policies and the disappointments arising out of economic crisis in the region. It was hard to be optimistic about the situation then. The area continues to hold as many concerns as it does hopes for Canadians. The Japanese economy is the second largest in the world. We can now see that China's gross national product will soon eclipse all others. Then there are the multiple security issues — nuclear arms and tension between Pakistan and India, instability in Indonesia, a starving missile-exporting North Korea and the armed stand-off between China and Taiwan, just to mention some of the most frightening.

• (1620)

Clearly Asia is important for Canada and for the stability and prosperity of the entire world.

I wish to elaborate on one of the points that I mentioned: the tension between India and Pakistan, each the homeland of many Canadians. They are rattling their nuclear sabres. Tensions between them are once again running high over the festering sore of Kashmir, aggravated by vicious terrorist attacks in New Delhi.

Both countries have been remarkably cautious in dealing with this explosive mixture, and their governments are to be congratulated. It is, however, a potentially dangerous flashpoint and its potential for destabilization reaches far — as far as Canada.

[English]

Challenge number five is our transatlantic relations. Canada's traditionally close relationship with Europe has been considerably strained for many years and gradually eroded. Some of the stresses are natural and unavoidable — facts of life — and our foreign relations task is to make the necessary adjustments in response to them. However, other stresses and their repercussions are not inevitable and may be influenced by clear vision and wise policy. The underlying question is whether our transatlantic relations are important enough to us and to the Europeans to justify the considerable bilateral efforts required to arrest and reverse the erosion.

I have five strong reasons for believing that Canada needs to strengthen its transatlantic relations and that doing so should be one of the top priorities for our foreign policy.

First, we can never forget that over the course of four generations, Canada has been drawn into two ghastly world wars, almost into a nuclear conflict with the Soviet Union, and into several peacekeeping missions, because of our European relations. Canadian soldiers are buried all over Europe because we saw a connection between the threat of tyranny in Europe and the security of the rest of the world. Canada cannot turn its back on a region with that kind of history and that kind of potential for trouble.

A second reason to revive our relations with Europe is our historic and cultural ties with it and the fact that it is the ancestral home of many Canadians. Canadians clearly share this view. Their strong support for Canadian military and peacekeeping efforts in Bosnia and Kosovo has shown their attachment to the transatlantic relationship.

The third and perhaps most important strategic reason for Canada's interest in the transatlantic relationship is our traditional role as "mid-Atlantic" intermediary between the United States and Europe. We have been able to play this role, sometimes at critical moments, since our size enables us to understand and empathize with the European perspective, and our proximity to the United States and our shared interest have earned us their trust.

The emergence of the United States in the post-Cold War period as the sole superpower has been accompanied by a tendency to interpret that role by unilateral methods that have put substantial strain on its relations with Europe. Indeed, a recent commentary by senior *New York Times* writer Thomas Friedman, reflecting unofficial but high level comments from within the Bush administration, suggests that the U.S. approach to its Afghanistan campaign has virtually brought an end to NATO. The end of NATO would have serious consequences for Canada. Canada's mid-Atlantic brokerage skills are perhaps more in demand right now than ever before. We must be prepared for such an important role in terms of foreign policy.

The fifth and final reason Canada should give high priority to its transatlantic relationships is the importance we must attach to the future of that other colossus, Russia. Last week, of course, President Bush was in Russia and a historic, albeit imperfect, agreement to reduce nuclear armaments was signed between him and President Putin. The agreement signed by Presidents Bush and Putin to radically reduce nuclear inventories was a very important and welcome step towards a more secure world, one that I very much hope will be backed by further action to eventually rid the world of those threats to the planet.

We should not forget that Russia is our next-door neighbour to the north. With good fortune and a continuation of current positive trends, we may be able to take pride in having not just one, but two of the longest undefended borders in the world.

Prime Minister Jean Chrétien's visit to Russia, where he met for over seven hours with President Putin, was definitely a major achievement in his foreign policy.

I will now turn to the fourth most important challenge to Canada's foreign policy, the Kananaskis meeting of the G8. There is no need to speak at any length about this priority, since it is evident that Canada's hosting of the G8 summit at Kananaskis is automatically a major foreign policy challenge. It is a challenge that the Prime Minister — the longest-serving head of government in the G8 — has already shown he can meet. However, there are reasons this year's summit will be more challenging than any previously hosted by Canada.

I alluded to the first distinct challenge at this year's G8 summit in my earlier comments about development assistance. Being one of the relatively less powerful G8 countries, Canada has an important role, that is, to reflect and represent other peaceable non-powers of the world, including countries marginalized by a globalizing world. I am delighted to see the Prime Minister fulfilling this role in the G8 by raising the problems of Africa as a major item on the agenda of the summit.

[Translation]

Priority number three is the issue of international security and cooperation in this area. One of the stark lessons of September 11, 2001 is that terrorists, criminals and madmen can do great damage by taking advantage of a globalized, interconnected, "horizontal" world in which governments have been slow to adapt their traditional "vertical" security and policing practices. Finding new ways to cooperate across traditional international boundaries will continue to be a major foreign policy challenge for Canada this year.

A few years ago, I was elected co-chair of a joint parliamentary committee that was to review our defence policy. The Honourable Senator Rompkey was the other co-chair from the House of Commons. He was my tutor, given that it is a field that he knows much better than I.

Our report warned about the emergence of new threats from non-traditional, non-state adversaries. Since then we have seen how the pace of communication and air travel has far outstripped our systems' ability to control and supervise large movements of

people, including relatively disorganized groups intent on doing harm as criminals or terrorists. Thus, the technological blessings of our age, with all their benefits, have also strengthened society's adversaries.

We are not accustomed in Canada to considering security and policing a category of foreign policy, in part because of peculiarly Canadian attitudes, but mainly because we considered them primarily domestic matters, which indeed they once were. However, what we have been seeing as the world globalizes is a radical reformulation or extension of the concept of national space. The traditional dichotomy between international matters and domestic matters, which has given rise to our concepts of constitutions and governance, no longer fully describes reality. There is what might be called a new combined international/domestic — or what I called earlier an “inter-mestic” — reality, which is both domestic and international at the same time.

• (1630)

It is a sign of the times that Parliament may have to invent new words to represent the new categories of reality. However we may describe it, our institutions and policies are struggling to come to terms with the new realities, especially in the areas of security, intelligence, defence and law enforcement.

[English]

The second highest priority for Canadian foreign policy is the Middle East. In my opinion, the most serious threats to the peace, security and future happiness of Canadians comes out of the sad and troubled Middle East. Addressing these threats and contributing to effective long-term solutions to the incredible misery in the region must be a very high priority for Canadian foreign policy. For this reason, I was pleased and impressed to read reports of our foreign minister's visit over this past week to that area.

Broadly, I see three major types of problems in the region, each of which has direct implications for Canada and Canadians. First, the continuing violence and hatred between Israel and Palestine is by far the most volatile and has the most far-reaching effects. This past year has been truly catastrophic for those of us hoping for a just and peaceful settlement to that conflict. The peacemakers made a major effort, but unfortunately they failed. As we have seen in the last few months, the warmongers on both sides took over, risking not only the future of both peoples, but also the security of the rest of the world, and we have seen that extremism on both sides polarizes opinion, forcing moderate and reasonable people to choose one bloodthirsty faction or the other. Countries like Canada, wishing the best for both peoples, are torn between two untenable alternatives.

Born in Haifa, Palestine, in 1938, to parents born in Egypt with roots in Lebanon and Syria, I had the privilege of arriving as a child in Canada as it was emerging from World War II and generously opening its doors to so many people affected by the upheavals of the time. As a result, I had the opportunity to grow up in this welcoming, free and truly democratic country where respect for differences is an integral part of the natural culture of Canadians.

[Senator De Bané]

For many months now, daily images of violence, and the attendant processions of dead and wounded, have brought the suffering of the people living in Israel and the Palestinian territories home to us. Who could suggest that mothers, fathers, children, husbands, wives and families who have lost those dear to them, their own flesh and blood, are not all suffering just the same on both sides of the conflict?

However, we realize as we look at the two peoples, the Israelis and the Palestinians, that the Palestinians have lived for over half a century in an intolerable situation which flies in the face of human dignity. I am not sure that Canadians, who enjoy the benefits of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, have any sense of the situation in the Palestinian territories, where the people have been living for several generations with no rights whatsoever. I do not think we are as aware as we ought to be of the heartbreaking misery in which the Palestinian people live. This is a cancer of the body of world affairs and, if it is not cured, it will continue to kill for generations to come.

While I am bound to have strong feelings about developments in the region, I want to emphasize that I try to see them as a Canadian, with sympathy for the people on all sides of what sometimes seems to be an insolvable historical conflict. My sympathy and basic optimism, despite the gloomy evidence to the contrary, that peace and an end to the suffering is possible comes from my personal knowledge of good people on both sides of the conflict. Both sides of the Arab-Israeli conflict are involved in propaganda and demonization, but at the heart of it all, on both sides, lies the suffering of people with much in common and their mutual hopes of building a secure life for their families and communities. These are the fundamental needs of all humanity and they can generate solutions.

It is in this hopeful light, despite all the violence, that I viewed the reports of a major proposal for a peaceful solution from Crown Prince Abdula of Saudi Arabia, which was endorsed earlier this year at the Arab summit in Beirut. I visited Lebanon last week and had the honour to meet some of the people who made that summit possible, and I wish to take this opportunity in the Senate of Canada to pay tribute to the Government of Lebanon and its efforts as a peacemaker in the region.

The Saudi proposal remains of fundamental importance because it addresses the two central issues of the conflict: land and security, not just for Palestine but the entire region. Although overshadowed by the violence in the area, I hope, nonetheless, that these proposals will provide a basis for an eventual solution.

In proceeding with them, I hope that the community of nations to be represented at the upcoming meeting of foreign ministers of Israeli, Palestine, the United States, Russia and the European Union will resist the temptation to address the issues in a fragmented way, because I am convinced that peace in the region is not possible if it is not approached in a comprehensive manner. This is why the issues of the Golan Heights and South Lebanon must be included in the negotiations that will, hopefully, be held soon.

Consequently, I can only strongly encourage the Canadian government to give its fullest support to these and any other ideas that offer some prospect for an end to the cycle of violence, revenge and hatred which has been holding the region in its grip for far too long.

Therefore, it is clear that Canada's foreign policy focus on this problem must be intensified at this crucial point, while continuing to keep a balanced, "made-in-Canada" perspective in our dealings with all parties to the dispute. Our policies and actions in the region must reflect Canadian values and interests, not America's or those of anyone else.

This is exactly the spirit in which Bill Graham, our foreign minister, astutely approached his meetings with Chairman Arafat and Prime Minister Sharon last Sunday. He made it absolutely clear that the Palestinians must acknowledge, without reservation, the right of Israel to exist within secure borders, and he did not hesitate to reflect the view of most Canadians, that Israel must understand it is absolutely essential that the Palestinians be allowed to live in dignity in their own economically and geographically viable country, and that the Palestinians must be allowed, without delay, to resume their lives and their businesses without further impediments.

Honourable senators, to conclude this point, our goal must be to end the conflict on a sustainable basis. This can only be done if justice, peace, honour and security can be guaranteed to the long-suffering peoples on both sides of the conflict. After all the recent destructions of communities, homes and social infrastructures, it can only be done with significant flows of assistance, including assistance from Canada.

A second and related issue for Canadian foreign policy in the Middle East stems from the fact that many of the countries in the region are literally breeding grounds for global insecurity. Fifty per cent of their populations are below the age of 20, and most lack basic needs. Many peoples who will become future Canadians are living in this situation and will bring its consequences with them to our shores. It is therefore in our interest, and in the interest of goodness, to address these heart-rending situations. If the problems of poverty and lack of opportunity for large populations of young people cannot be greatly alleviated, we cannot expect to find a peaceful solution to the race and belief based conflicts of the region.

The third focus for strategies in the Middle East must be of the threats to the region's energy resources. Two or three not necessarily friendly countries control the primary long-term sources of oil currently extractable for world markets in that region. They do not have complete control by any means, and North America has substantial alternatives, so I do not wish to exaggerate the potential problem. Nonetheless, a major disruption in the flow of Middle East oil would have huge economic repercussions around the world and would even drive us into a full global depression, the likes of which has not been seen for 70 years. If that disruption were to take place next autumn, imagine the possible implications for Canada in the winter.

• (1640)

These are three of the most important reasons Canadian foreign policy must give high priority to the Middle East, and why

Canadians must be encouraged to understand and to contribute to solutions to these festering and frightening challenges.

Honourable senators, challenge number one is Canada's relations with the United States. This is at the top of my list of the foreign policy challenges facing Canada this year. I was tempted to put the Middle East at the top of the list, or international cooperation on security, because both of these are of extreme importance and urgency for Canada. However, in the end, I have concluded that Canada's relations with its great neighbour to the south will remain its top foreign policy challenge in 2002 and beyond.

As honourable senators know, the U.S. is no ordinary country. Indeed, we may need to invent special language and special categories for dealing with it. In this respect, I am reminded of a *New Yorker* cartoon that showed two people sitting at a table looking at one another. One said to the other, "You look so familiar but so different — are you Canadian?" We could turn that around for foreign policy purposes — the U.S. is both familiar and different. The familiar should not lull us into mistaking the significance of the real differences that exist in some of our interests, perspectives and traditions.

This reality has been severely underlined by unilateral American policies, notably, as they affect Canada, on softwood lumber — which, in my opinion, constitute a complete denial of the principles of NAFTA — and its recently adopted immense agricultural subsidies, which will do great harm to Canada and distort trade in food products all over the world. These do not seem to be the policies of a friend or of a country concerned about global trade liberalization. Worse still, they are policies that can only heighten the cynical view that much of the world seems to be adopting about the good faith of the United States. As their closest friend, we must do what we can to influence Washington to steer a wiser course for its own good.

Honourable senators, I will leave more detailed comments about our relations with the United States to another occasion. References to the U.S. throughout this presentation give ample expression to the range, importance and complexity of some of the issues on which we have to deal with the Americans this year and in the future.

However, while the myriad dimensions of our U.S. relationship present an ongoing foreign policy challenge for Canada, we must take careful note that it is not a matter of business as usual in 2002. September 11 and its aftermath in Afghanistan and elsewhere have had an enormous and understandable psychological impact on our American friends. It remains to be seen if it will be long-lasting. In the meantime, and certainly throughout this year, I believe that we should expect many unprecedented issues, much less patience, and much greater danger to our national interests in our dealings with Washington.

It is even conceivable that the U.S. has been propelled, by September 11, out of its constructive post-Second World War phase. It may have entered a new and less benign long-term phase in its international relations and policies. Unlike tigers, countries can and do change their stripes under adversity. Certainly an impatient, unilateralist and self-centred United States would be a matter of great concern for Canada.

However, friends are supposed to help friends through hard times. Helping the Americans to restore their long-standing ideal of working for a better world, which has done so much for humanity since 1945, and helping them to rebuild their sense of confidence in team solutions should be seen as a major and distinct role for Canada this year. It is a role that we, as their closest friends, are almost uniquely positioned to perform.

Honourable senators, gearing up for and staying ahead of these challenges in our relations with the United States, rather than simply responding to them as they arise, should be the single highest priority in our foreign relations this year.

[Translation]

So, honourable senators, you have my list of the top ten challenges facing Canadian international relations. I invite you to give them some thought and share your comments with me.

When you combine the ten challenges I have discussed, a few things become very clear. The first, as I mentioned at the outset of my remarks, is the importance of enlightened foreign policy for Canada and for the future of all Canadians.

Clear, too, is the fact that formulating and delivering our foreign policy objectives will challenge every component of the government, but especially the Honourable Bill Graham, our Minister of Foreign Affairs, and his officials in the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade.

Again, I want to say how pleased I am with the choice made by the Prime Minister when he appointed a person as exceptionally competent as Bill Graham to lead Canada's diplomacy.

It is also clear that Canada needs broad and ongoing public debate on its foreign challenges and corresponding policies. However, a much better informed public is vital to real public debate of these truly crucial issues.

Finally, I think it is clear that the Senate has a special contribution to make both in helping to build much needed public awareness and in advising the government on the enlightened foreign policy Canada needs to protect and promote the welfare of Canadians for generations to come.

In short, honourable senators, this discussion shows that we, in this beautiful Red Chamber, have foreign policy challenges of our own to meet. I consider myself very privileged and, indeed, challenged to be able to work with you in carrying out this important responsibility. Only in Canada could a child of an immigrant family possibly hope for such a privileged and vital challenge.

I thank you, honourable senators, for listening to my thoughts with your customary kindness and attention.

On motion of Senator Prud'homme, debate adjourned.

The Senate adjourned until Wednesday, May 29, 2002, at 1:30 p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 28, 2002

| PAGE | PAGE |
|---|---|
| The Late Honourable Renaude Lapointe, P.C., C.C. Tributes. Hon. Lise Bacon 2853 Hon. Gérard-A. Beaudoin 2853 Hon. Marcel Prud'homme 2854 | Foreign Affairs Possible Policy Review. Hon. J. Michael Forrestall 2858 Hon. Sharon Carstairs 2858 Prime Minister's Office Independent Ethics Counsellor. Hon. Marjory LeBreton 2858 Hon. Sharon Carstairs 2858 Prime Minister Comments on Appointment of New Cabinet Ministers. Hon. Marjory LeBreton 2858 Hon. Sharon Carstairs 2859 Public Works and Government Services Use of Mansion of President of Groupe Everest by Former Minister. Hon. Marjory LeBreton 2859 Hon. Sharon Carstairs 2859 National Defence Circumstances of Resignation of Former Minister. Hon. Gerry St. Germain 2859 Hon. Sharon Carstairs 2860 Hon. Laurier L. LaPierre 2860 Hon. J. Michael Forrestall 2860 Treasury Board Public Service Universal Classification Standard. Hon. Roch Bolduc 2860 Hon. Sharon Carstairs 2861 Prime Minister's Office Registration of Lobbyists. Hon. Terry Stratton 2861 Hon. Sharon Carstairs 2861 Justice Oath of Allegiance—Amendments to Constitution— Request for Answer. Hon. Lowell Murray 2861 Hon. Sharon Carstairs 2861 International Trade United States—Renewal of Softwood Lumber Agreement. Hon. Gerry St. Germain 2861 Hon. Sharon Carstairs 2861 Delayed Answer to Oral Question Hon. Fernand Robichaud 2862 Justice Oath of Allegiance—Amendments to Constitution. Question by Senator Murray. Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Delayed Answer). 2862 |
| <hr/> | |
| <h3 style="text-align: left;">SENATORS' STATEMENTS</h3> | |
| National Access Awareness Week Hon. Catherine S. Callbeck 2854 United Nations Special Session on Children Hon. Landon Pearson 2855 Two-hundredth Anniversary of Saint Mary's University Hon. Wilfred P. Moore 2855 Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Month Hon. Yves Morin 2856 Hearing Awareness Month Hon. Jean-Robert Gauthier 2856 Toxic Levels of Farmed Salmon Hon. Jim Tunney 2856 | |
| <hr/> | |
| <h3 style="text-align: left;">ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS</h3> | |
| Chief Electoral Officer Annual Report Tabled 2857 Excise Bill, 2001 (Bill C-47) First Reading. 2857 Canadian NATO Parliamentary Association Meeting of Standing Committee and Secretaries of National Delegations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Assembly, April 5-7, 2002—Report of Canadian Delegation Tabled. Hon. Shirley Maheu 2857 Canada-Europe Parliamentary Association Second Part of the 2002 Ordinary Session of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, April 22-26, 2002— Report of Canadian Delegation Tabled. Hon. Peter A. Stollery 2857 Scrutiny of Regulations Notice of Motion to Authorize Joint Committee to Permit Electronic Coverage. Hon. Céline Hervieux-Payette 2857 | |
| <hr/> | |
| <h3 style="text-align: left;">QUESTION PERIOD</h3> | |
| National Defence Possible Review—Request for Tabling of Plan. Hon. J. Michael Forrestall 2857 Hon. Sharon Carstairs 2857 | Payment Clearing and Settlement Act (Bill S-40) Bill to Amend—Message from Commons 2862 Business of the Senate Hon. Noël A. Kinsella 2862 Hon. Fernand Robichaud 2863 |

ORDERS OF THE DAY

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| Food and Drugs Act (Bill S-18) | |
| Bill to Amend—Third Reading—Order Stands. | |
| Hon. Jeremiah S. Grafstein | 2863 |
| Heritage Lighthouse Protection Bill (Bill S-43) | |
| Second Reading—Debate Adjourned. | |
| Hon. J. Michael Forrestall | 2863 |
| Study on Matters Relating to Fishing Industry | |
| Report of Fisheries Committee—Debate Continued. | |
| Hon. Janis G. Johnson | 2865 |

| | PAGE |
|-------------------------------------|------|
| Kyoto Protocol | |
| Inquiry. | |
| Hon. Mira Spivak | 2866 |
| Hon. Fernand Robichaud | 2868 |
| Hon. Nicholas W. Taylor | 2870 |
| Challenges in Foreign Policy | |
| Inquiry—Debate Adjourned. | |
| Hon. Pierre De Bané | 2870 |



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