



Debates of the Senate

1st SESSION

•

37th PARLIAMENT

•

VOLUME 139

•

NUMBER 12

**OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)**

Thursday, March 1, 2001

**THE HONOURABLE DAN HAYS
SPEAKER**

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

CONTENTS

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

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

Published by the Senate

Available from Canada Communication Group — Publishing,
Public Works and Government Services Canada, Ottawa K1A 0S9,

Also available on the Internet: <http://www.parl.gc.ca>

THE SENATE

Thursday, March 1, 2001

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

Prayers.

THE LATE HONOURABLE GILDAS L. MOLGAT

TRIBUTES

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, it is with a very heavy heart that I rise today to pay tribute to the life of a close colleague and personal friend, the Honourable Gildas Molgat.

Only a week ago I was reminiscing in this chamber about his time with us as Speaker of the Senate. He wrote to me about those remarks, and I received the letter immediately upon returning from the hospital after saying my goodbye to him.

Senator Molgat touched many people in his long and distinguished career. He was involved in political life for more than 45 years, and all of us here in this chamber, as well as Liberals in Manitoba and across the country, feel an immeasurable loss with his death. There are few who knew the Senate as well as he, and fewer still who commanded the respect and affection of so many of us on both sides of this chamber.

Senator Molgat spent more than 30 years in this place — a place he dearly loved. In the Senate, he served as Speaker *pro tempore*, Deputy Leader of the Opposition, Deputy Leader of the Government and, of course, Speaker.

His achievements were presaged by his student life, a time when he established the high standards that he maintained throughout his life. He was a gold medallist at the University of Manitoba, and later obtained an Honorary Doctorate of Law from his alma mater and the Collège universitaire de Saint-Boniface in 1998. He also became Governor Emeritus of Collège universitaire de Saint-Boniface. Throughout his life, he approached new experiences and new people as though he were still a student with an open mind and a willingness to listen.

[Translation]

Honourable senators, Senator Molgat's constant involvement in the Canadian constitutional process and his valiant efforts to help build our country was a reflection of his patriotism. As a fellow Manitoban, I can attest to the fact that residents of that province are well equipped to deal with regional disparities and cultural differences. Senator Molgat was a francophone and was married to an anglophone. Their children grew up in both official languages, but our colleague also had an interest in other

cultures. Senator Molgat was a member of the Société franco-manitobaine and of the St. Andrew Society. In 1995, he was appointed Grand Officier de la Pléiade, the highest honour bestowed by the Ordre de la francophonie.

[English]

His respect for all the nationalities represented in Manitoba was apparent in the enthusiasm he showed when discussing someone's heritage, or when attending community events which highlighted our multicultural Canadian heritage. Senator Molgat used his vast experience with people and with politics, and his natural diplomacy, in the service of furthering our understanding of each other.

[Translation]

Senator Molgat was deeply attached to nature, to his country and, in particular, to his native province. He was proud of Manitoba and he was always pleased to represent Manitobans. He was the founding president of the research foundation at St. Boniface Hospital and, in spite of all the time he had to spend in Ottawa in the performance of his duties, he always had a spot for Manitobans in his heart and his thoughts.

[English]

We know that Senator Molgat cared very much for the future of our country, not only because of his concern with the constitutional legislation which affected our nation, but also because of his ongoing interest in the young people who surrounded him. Our own Senate pages held Senator Molgat in high regard because he fostered in them a pride in their job and an appreciation of the Senate and its role in Parliament. Gil maintained high standards for all the young people he encountered, but he inspired them to achieve more and to ultimately maintain high standards for themselves.

My own executive assistant, Michelle MacDonald, a former Chief Page here in the Senate, was recommended to me by Gil when she moved to Manitoba. On the basis of his recommendation, she came to work for me.

• (1410)

We all knew Senator Molgat as an exemplary Speaker of the chamber and as a colleague; but, in some ways, his most substantial and authentic contribution to the lives of others was his work on behalf of the Canadian military, in the many positions he held which benefited the auxiliary organizations associated with the Canadian Armed Forces.

Senator Molgat served for 20 years in the Royal Winnipeg Rifles, affectionately called the Little Black Devils militia, and their esprit de corps was an integral part of the senator's character. The years he spent with the militia fostered an involvement in military associations thereafter, and a desire to share his love of the discipline, camaraderie and professionalism he himself learned with the Royal Winnipeg Rifles.

His contribution to the military and to military associations did not go unrecognized. Senator Molgat was decorated by the Canadian Forces, named Honorary Lieutenant-Colonel in 1966 and Honorary Colonel in 1985. He served as director of the Canadians Corps of Commissionaires. He became honorary president of the Army, Navy, and Air Force Veterans in Canada, of the Winnipeg Unit No. 1 and of the Royal United Services Institute of Manitoba. He was a member of the Royal Canadian Legion.

He was a founding president of the Manitoba Army Cadet League, president of the Army Cadet League of Canada and Governor-at-Large of the Army Cadet League of Canada. He did not confine himself to the cadet movement. Senator Molgat was very active with Scouts Canada, becoming an honorary member of the Manitoba Council of Scouts Canada. Senator Molgat was convinced that the scouting and cadet movements could make a lasting and significant contribution to the lives of young persons, especially those who came from disadvantaged backgrounds. He believed that the scouting and cadet movements inspired a love of country and a respect for others and that they instilled an appreciation for approaching life with an ordered and curious intellect.

Because of Senator Molgat's military knowledge and experience, the paintings on the walls of this very chamber held special significance for him. He was not a man who admired the apparatus of war; rather, he spent his life encouraging our young people to be knowledgeable and clear-thinking so that no further tragedies could befall our nation. He wanted to leave our country in a better state to future generations and have our future generations be more successful citizens than his own had been. He was a true optimist, and he believed that the future of Canada would be brighter if each one of us invested personally in our young people.

I will miss Senator Molgat in a very personal way. He was a friend and a mentor. We had both been Leader of the Liberal Party of Manitoba, and we had both served as Deputy Leader of the Government in this place. He taught me the value of the Senate — indeed, he persuaded me to come here. When Senator Doug Everett resigned from the Senate in January, 1994, Gil immediately called me before the matter was public knowledge and told me not to say I would not accept an appointment to the Senate, which he knew would be my first instinct.

Honourable senators, this place did not have good memories for me. When my father came here in 1955, I was only 13 years old. I saw this place as the place that took my father away from his family. In those days, when the only free transportation available to senators was train travel, my dad would be away for many weeks at a time. However, I followed Gil's advice on this

occasion, as I did on so many others, and I told the media I would certainly consider an appointment if it were offered.

On September 14, 1994, Gil called me. He was very agitated. He had heard that Senator Bacon and Senator Pearson were to be appointed the next day, but he had not heard my name being mentioned. He asked what was going on. He insisted that he would call the Prime Minister. I had to calm him down. Even though I had promised the Prime Minister's Office that I would tell no one about my impending appointment, I told Gil so that he could sleep that night, and also so that he would not give the Prime Minister a hard time.

I tell you this anecdote because it was so typical of the man. He advanced his friends whenever he could. There was only warmth and concern emanating from him.

It will now be a difficult time for Allison, Anne and Mathurin. Allison is also a very dear friend. She campaigned with Gil throughout all his campaigns, but she was also by my side during the 1984, 1986, 1988 and 1990 campaigns, and, yes, senators, they were every two years. She and Gil have been partners in every sense of the word. She and their family, and Gil's brother Daniel, as well as Ginette who worked so faithfully for Gil for so many years, and all those others who have worked also with him, have my and my husband John's deepest sympathy.

Hon. John Lynch-Staunton (Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, out of respect for Senator Molgat's repeated appeal that tributes to colleagues be kept brief and to the point, I have tried to keep the length of my remarks in accordance with his wishes, although it has been quite a challenge because there is so much to be said about this fine man and his distinguished public career.

My first impressions of Gil Molgat were, to say the least, not at all favourable. They were made during the infamous Senate GST debate in the fall of 1990, when he expressed both in word and deed not too subtle objections to more than one of the then Speaker's rulings, so much so that at one point he even appropriated the Speaker's Chair for himself — a hint of things to come, as it turned out.

It was only when he and I, in our respective roles as deputy leaders, met on a regular basis that I was able to understand that, while his behaviour at the time was out of character, it did arise from a strong and heartfelt belief in the parliamentary process and, in particular, the role and responsibilities of the Senate as an integral part of it.

Although not formally versed in matters legal, he had a particular interest in constitutional reform and an abiding commitment to improve our basic law in order that it better serve Canadians. In 1971, his co-chairing of the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and of the House of Commons on the Constitution of Canada and its report formed the basis for much of the constitutional discussion that took place during the 1970s and culminated in patriation and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms being adopted in 1982.

His tremendous love for this place and its evolution was no better demonstrated than when he co-chaired the Special Joint Committee on Senate Reform, which reported in 1983. During that period, Gil became an advocate of an elected Senate and was especially proud that his was the first committee to recommend an elected Senate.

He played a leading role as chairman of the Senate Committee of the Whole and the Senate Task Force on the Meech Lake Accord. His opposition to the accord was heartfelt and genuine, even passionate. He believed that it took too much power away from the central government and ignored the plight of Canada's Aboriginal peoples. While many disagreed with his position, one had to respect his views because of his experience and his caring for his country.

Again, during the discussions on the Charlottetown Agreement, his contribution to the debate displayed an understanding and familiarity with the parliamentary system matched by very few contemporaries.

He will be long remembered for how well he carried out the many responsibilities of Speaker of the Senate in this chamber as elsewhere. Whether receiving an ambassador, hosting a reception for a retiring senator, representing his country at international meetings or leading a delegation abroad, he always did so with distinction and self-effacing good humour, often supported with much affection by his delightful wife, Allison.

While the Speaker of the Senate gives the appearance of independence, in reality he or she is hard put to exercise it completely, given that the appointment to the position is a political one. For many years, Gil was faced with near-equal membership on both sides of this house, and he was called upon on a number of occasions to cast his vote, which he did out of a sense of duty, of course, but not without some discomfort. He certainly did not feel it appropriate for a Speaker to be so directly involved in a partisan decision, because he favoured an elected Speaker of the Senate, with the independence such a status brings. I am only sorry that this did not come about during his lifetime, as he would certainly have received my vote without hesitation.

• (1420)

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham: Honourable senators, I rise to pay respect to a personal friend, and to one of the finest Canadians that I have ever had the privilege of knowing — a man for all seasons, a man for all people, a gentleman of warmth and dignity and elegance, a man who loved his roots and his province and the world with equal passion. That was Senator Gildas Molgat.

He was a man who knew all the lovely contours, vistas and regions of this wonderful country like none other, a man who was at home wherever he travelled, a man who brought the reality of Canada abroad on all his foreign visits across this planet, a man whose dedication to people everywhere carried with it a complete egalitarianism.

[Senator Lynch-Staunton]

No one who ever came in contact with Senator Molgat was ever treated with anything but the fullest integrity and fairness. As Speaker of this chamber he brought us wit, civility, grace and courtesy. He brought us his rich bilingualism and an understanding of our history and our tradition, which was always a privilege to hear.

We must remember that Senator Molgat's intense and inspiring love for this country was shaped at the heart of a famous regiment mentioned by our leader, Senator Carstairs, a regiment that represented the finest qualities of the province of Manitoba, the Royal Winnipeg Rifles. It is one of the oldest regiments in Western Canada and also one of the most highly decorated regiments in our distinguished military history.

Although he was too young for active service in the Second World War, his life was in some ways changed forever when the ship he was aboard while returning from a visit to Europe was torpedoed by the Germans off the coast of Ireland on the first day of the war. I first heard of that story in the presence of Allison and Gil on the way from London to Birmingham, England to celebrate the one-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the British Liberal Party.

Gil served with the Royal Winnipeg Rifles for many years. Throughout his long and distinguished career he lived and breathed the life of a regiment that fought at Batoche, the Somme and Passchendaele, which served in the South African war and Vimy Ridge and the Falaise Gap. Gil lived and breathed the valour, courage and passion of a regiment that was so much at the heart of the history that made us one.

In many ways, those traditions, that spirit, have always been there in the remarkable career and the wonderful humanity of the late Senator Gil Molgat. Whether it was as soldier, diplomat or elected member of the Manitoba legislature, that spirit has always been there. Whether it was as a superb and distinguished Speaker of this chamber or ambassador for Canada at home and abroad, that spirit has always been there.

Gil's life was marked by an extraordinary commitment to public service, the kind of intense dedication that brought him into the centre of the great constitutional and political events and debates of our time. His honours and awards have been numerous.

Yet, to me, as I think about the sadness of his loss, I think more of the pure joy that we shared together as friends. I think of our laughter and the mischievous twinkle that one often saw in his eyes. I think of the honesty and the truth and the many wonderful times we had together.

We travelled together. Allison, those great memories will be with me forever.

Gil's life has touched every one of us in the most positive of ways. He loved his job as Speaker. He loved people, and we loved him.

He had a wonderful command and understanding of this place. Wherever he was, he exuded strength, warmth, charm and a charisma that made everyone feel at home in his presence. He gave you his undivided attention no matter who you were. He made us all so proud, no matter where he was.

He wanted so passionately to make this place the best it could possibly be. He wanted every member of the Senate family to work beyond their fingertips to do their best, and they responded in kind.

[Translation]

Honourable senators, he had great respect for the support staff. This is why, under his stewardship, we had the Speaker's BBQ and the breakfasts for Senate employees.

[English]

His loss has been felt by every employee in every corner of this institution. There has been a sadness that has permeated this place like no other.

If Senator Molgat could speak personally to all of us today, he would want to thank all members of the Senate family for their loyal and devoted service, most particularly, Ginette Lafrenière, who served with him with such dedication for so many years.

Right now I can also hear his voice admonishing me as he has on so many other occasions: "Senator Graham, your three minutes are up."

Gil, your life was a gift to all of us.

To the remarkable and much loved Allison Molgat, to Anne, Mathurin and your extended family and friends, please accept an expression of our deepest sympathy. Thank you from the bottom of our hearts for sharing your husband and father for so long.

[Translation]

Rest in peace, my dearest friend.

[English]

Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, it is good that we pause today to pay tribute to our colleague and friend Gildas Molgat. His sudden departure has caused a cloud of sorrow to envelop the Senate. We are all filled with sadness, and we all stand in solidarity with and support of Allison and the Molgat family.

A soldier, parliamentarian and a man of faith, Senator Molgat may have left this temporal house, but he has gone to that eternal house and the place that has been prepared for him. It is, therefore, with the realization of his faith that he would want us to overcome grief, and rather to celebrate the wonderful life's journey of our friend.

His journey is the story of a distinguished parliamentarian and a dutiful soldier, an active participant in public affairs, a great Canadian and a wonderful friend to so many. His story is an account of loyal service to the country he loved, Canada. Many individuals, from the barrack halls to this hall, have been the beneficiaries of his dedication and devotion to duty.

Honourable senators, there are so many of us on both sides of this chamber who, having benefited from his wise counsel, are able to give testimony to the appropriate choice of name made by his parents, who decided to call him after the 5th century Saint Gildas, the monk who was also surnamed "the Wise."

Onomastically, or like his namesake, Saint Gildas — who by the way was the earliest of British historians — Gildas Molgat was also a man of no ordinary culture and dignity. This senator's many contributions to Canadian parliamentary law within the British Westminster tradition are significant.

• (1430)

His erudite rulings as our Speaker indicate that he was thoroughly acquainted with the precedents and customs of Parliament, especially, I might add, those rulings that sustained some of our points of order.

Senator Molgat certainly brought great dignity to the office of Speaker of the Senate. For those who were fortunate to accompany him on missions to other legislatures, we witnessed the high esteem in which he was held by so many countries. This was particularly so for me on a mission to the House of Lords.

In bidding farewell to our friend, we draw on the words of the classical Latin ritual, *sub venite*: Come to Gil's assistance, ye Saints of God; Come to meet him, ye angels of the Lord.

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn: To honourable senators, to the family of Gil Molgat, and to those who worked with him and who loved him for so many years, this is an incredibly sad day for the Senate and for all who work and, indeed, live in these premises, as we say farewell to our colleague the Honourable Gildas Molgat, who passed away yesterday. He was a very special person, not just for this institution but for Canada, for Manitoba, for francophones outside Quebec, for new Canadians everywhere, for veterans and our young cadets, for farmers, for Aboriginal people, for young people and for Liberals everywhere. He was also a very special person for all of those in Canada who believe, in their hearts and their souls, in the fundamental unity of this country.

With great integrity, courage, kindness and an infectious sense of humour, Gil Molgat built a network of friends across Canada, which crossed over every barrier of party lines. This, I know, was felt on each side of this chamber, most poignantly today. He was courteous and he was generous with his heart, his time and his energy. Wherever Gil went, so very often with Allison at his side, he was always welcomed as one of the good guys. What a rollicking ride he had through that life.

We have often heard, with some warmth from our leader, about Gil Molgat's persistent vigour in the often lonely role as Leader of the Liberal Party in Manitoba and Leader of the Opposition in the Manitoba legislature. Then we have known him as President of the Liberal Party of Canada. In those roles, honourable senators, he raised to new heights the concepts of inclusion and dedication.

Senator Molgat was a fierce advocate for Canada's Armed Forces. He served with the Royal Winnipeg Rifles — the Little Black Devils — for 20 years, becoming their honorary lieutenant-colonel in 1966 and then, in 1985, their honorary colonel. He remained in that position until the day that he died. In recent years, I discovered and enjoyed this particular element of Gil's background as we worked together as honorary colonels to promote and preserve the strength of the reserves. He also, just to touch all bases, was the founding President of the Army Cadet League in Canada.

If there was a good cause to support, honourable senators, Gil was for it. In my case, it was literacy and the dedication of the statues of our Famous Five Canadian women near the Senate on Parliament Hill. As leader of the Senate in the sense of the speakership, he stepped aside from the Chair a bit to help us all, on both sides of this chamber, to make that happen. In addition to all this, it was his life here in the Senate, in the Parliament of Canada, which will remain forever as his legacy. Gil came to this house in 1970, and he gave his maiden speech as mover of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne that fall. Those were tense and difficult days at the height of the FLQ crisis.

Gil set out his ground as a new senator, declaring himself, and I quote, "first of all, as a Canadian, but most emphatically also as a Western Canadian, an enthusiastic, unrepentant Western Canadian." He made it clear that this was said not to be either parochial or negative, but rather "with the profound belief that Manitoba and Western Canada can and should contribute more to Confederation, that we want to play a greater part in the councils of our nation and that it is to Canada's advantage that all parts should grow and expand."

That maiden speech went on to note that much had been said and written over those past many years about Western discontent and that new words had been added to describe those feelings. Back then, in 1970, he noted that "we hear about Western alienation and then, much more recently again, about Western separatism." The new senator told this house firmly, "I reject these terms and I would rather speak about Western involvement and Western participation."

Senator Molgat noted the enthusiasm and the pride with which Manitobans had celebrated their one-hundredth anniversary in Canada that year and were not about to leave. However, that did not mean that Confederation could not be made to work better for all its partners. Now, that was over 30 years ago.

Honourable senators, Gil Molgat was spreading that same message just a week ago, reminding us in one of our party

[Senator Fairbairn]

caucuses that progress was slow and that there was much more to be done — that we should cut the chatter and get on with it. Those of us from that part of Canada will have these thoughts of his resonating in our minds and in our hearts for some time to come.

The country and its security as a united nation was never far from Gil's mind, and some of his finest work in this place was done to try to find the pathway to a better union. He co-chaired a Senate and House of Commons committee on the Constitution of Canada in 1972, which recommended patriation, a new Constitution, and a functional federalism based on a new distribution of federal and provincial powers. Indeed, much of that report was reflected in future constitutional agreements.

A decade later, he co-chaired a joint parliamentary committee on reform of the Senate, which advanced the prospect of an elected Senate with equalized distribution of seats across the country, limited, non-renewable nine-year terms and a double majority for issues involving francophone rights.

• (1440)

I see some of my colleagues shuddering and breathing hard; however, this report is still part of the groundwork for a total Senate discussion on our future. It is worth taking another look at that report, to see what the thinking was then, what the realities and difficulties were, and what the opportunities are today. Opportunities today is something Gil had been talking to us about.

Then again, he was called upon to chair the Senate Task Force on the Meech Lake Constitutional Accord and on the Yukon and the Northwest Territories, to travel to the northern territories and hold public hearings because territorial leaders were unable to find a way into the federal-provincial negotiating room to directly argue their concerns before a final decision was made on this important undertaking. I must say to you, honourable senators, that anyone from either side of this chamber who participated on that task force, of which I was a member — it was bitterly cold up there in those winter days — will remember the warmth of the response that met us. Perhaps it was because not many task forces or groups had travelled in that area, but the warmth of the response for us simply to have taken the time to go and to listen was absolutely overwhelming. I think that for those of us who were there and who watched Gil perform it must certainly be a highlight of our experience in this chamber.

Honourable senators, this was an extraordinary senator, one who fulfilled his responsibilities here with us, in Manitoba, and across the country, with ideas and words and vision. Here in this chamber he focused, among other things, on the rules and procedures that guide our work in this place. Indeed, he was looking forward to — he just spoke to me about this the other day — active participation in the efforts of our current Rules Committee, where his expertise would have played a significant role.

I believe he was a great Speaker for us all in these past six years, and I am right on side with Senator Lynch-Staunton — I would have given him my vote joyfully if we had been given the opportunity to do so. He cared about this institution, its history and its future. He was a superb representative of us and of Canada when he travelled abroad and welcomed visitors here.

For me, he was one of the wisest, kindest and most supportive friends and advisors I could ever have had, or hoped to have, in the Senate and in my own life. I first met Gil back in the 1960s, when I was a reporter in the Parliamentary Press Gallery, and that acquaintance grew into a firm and joyful relationship in the years that followed.

In 1993, he accepted the Prime Minister's suggestion to serve as Deputy Leader of the Government in the Senate when I became leader. I think probably both of them felt this would give me an edge in getting off to a good start. We were partners. I cannot ever acknowledge adequately what the strength of his support meant to this rookie, starting out in what was a new and challenging Parliament with an extremely challenging Leader of the Opposition on the other side of the house who, because this is, after all, the Senate, was also a good friend.

Honourable senators, if I feel a sense of overwhelming personal loss and grief with Gil's passing I cannot begin to imagine the sadness of his beloved life partner, Allison, and their children, Anne and Mathurin, and his brother, Daniel, and Ginette, who served him so loyally and with such skill for so many years. As he has left all of us with a great legacy here, I hope and I believe that their lives will always be enriched and enlivened with the warmth of their memories of a loving husband and father and colleague, a giant among senators, and a prince of a Canadian.

We offer his family our deepest sympathy and assurances that he will never be forgotten here.

Hon. Lowell Murray: Honourable senators, Senator Molgat came to the Speaker's Chair with experience and knowledge of the *Rules of the Senate of Canada*. That makes him almost unique among the Speakers I have served under during my 21 years here or have observed over a somewhat longer period. He was the first Speaker since Allister Grosart in 1979 to have taken an interest in the rules prior to, or indeed following, his appointment. Even when we disagreed with a decision, we knew that Speaker Molgat would have asked the right questions of the Table advisors and that he had brought an informed judgment to bear on the matter in question.

It is no disrespect to his predecessors to say that conversancy with the rules was not their most obvious qualification for office. They were men and women of great distinction in our country, and it was in recognition of their distinction that they were appointed Speaker. The Senate being what it is — or what it used to be — the Speaker's familiarity with the rules was rarely tested in our proceedings. Senator Molgat was no less

distinguished than his predecessors were, only more knowledgeable and experienced in parliamentary life.

For reasons that need not detain us at the moment, the role of the Speaker as presiding officer in this chamber has had to become more activist, more interventionist recently. This is a very fine line for Mr. Speaker to walk. Our Speaker does not enjoy the authority, nor is he vested in the impartiality, of his elected counterpart in the Commons. He is appointed by and serves at the pleasure of the Crown. He may vote on questions before the Senate. He need not be aloof from the affairs of his party. He can be, and on at least one occasion in Canadian history was, a member of the cabinet while serving as Speaker.

Speaker Molgat walked the fine line successfully because he had the personal qualities that make a good presiding officer. These include an innate dignity, good judgment, a sense of perspective and a sense of humour. These qualities Speaker Molgat possessed in abundance. They add up to the most precious asset a Senate Speaker can have, moral authority, and Speaker Molgat had that, too, in abundance.

The Speaker of the Senate ranks fourth in Canada's Table of Precedence, after the Governor General, the Prime Minister and the Chief Justice. Ceremony, protocol, and sometimes a more active diplomacy on behalf of Canada take up far more than people suppose of the Speaker's time, attention and effort. Several years ago, I was among a small delegation of senators headed by Speaker Molgat who visited China and met with political, economic, cultural, and judicial leaders there. More frequently, I was present here in Ottawa when he received foreign dignitaries. Speaker Molgat and Mrs. Allison Molgat always did Canada proud, and one was always proud of them on those occasions.

[Translation]

Honourable senators, everyone knows how perfectly bilingual Senator Molgat was, but he also had an even rarer and more desirable quality, true Canadian biculturalism. Earlier, the Leader of the Government, Senator Carstairs, alluded to it, quite correctly. Senator Molgat was perfectly at ease in the two great cultural traditions of our country.

Having been both a provincial and a federal parliamentarian, he had a very good understanding of the history and value of constitutional traditions and institutions. A committed citizen, his collaboration and leadership in charities was much sought after and always given generously, in both linguistic communities of Canada, especially those of his native province. A proud Franco-Manitoban, Senator Molgat was a staunch advocate of the rights of linguistic minorities throughout Canada.

I know little of his childhood, his youth or his family. However, I think it is worth mentioning that this one family from the town of Ste. Rose du Lac, Manitoba, gave us both Senator Molgat and his brother Ambassador Daniel Molgat, one of the most respected leaders of Canada's diplomatic service. This is a source of pride for his descendants and of inspiration for us all.

[English]

His life has been a good Canadian story and he has earned the gratitude of Parliament and of the country.

[Translation]

Hon. Rose-Marie Losier-Cool: Honourable senators, I will limit my remarks to a small personal note.

On rare occasions in our lives we have the privilege of meeting and knowing special people. Senator Molgat was one such person; he was exceptional.

When you appointed me to be the Speaker *pro tempore* of the Senate in November 1999, Senator Molgat was a source of inspiration to me. I learned so much from him, not from anything that he had previously prepared or written down as a directive, but from his example. I quickly learned of his quest for excellence at all times. He inspired great respect in this house. His was an unwavering commitment to our institution, the Senate, and to the Government of Canada; he admired his country as a whole.

Like him, I represent minority francophones in Canada. I quickly understood a senator's role in representing people as I saw his constant interest in and affection for Franco-Manitobans.

I was inspired by his ability to share his knowledge with warmth, dignity and good humour at meetings such as Encounters with Canada, Young Encounters, the teachers' forum, and the Forum for Young Canadians, and at official receptions and dinners in the company of foreign diplomats and parliamentarians.

Last week, I had the honour of representing the Senate of Canada at a forum in Mauritania, West Africa. Senator Molgat had recently visited that country and made quite an impression. I was given many messages expressing admiration. I was to pass on these messages Tuesday morning.

Honourable senators, we mourn the passing of Senator Molgat. Today, we are sad to have lost him, but richer for having known him.

Allison, thank you. My heart goes out to you.

Hon. Gérald-A. Beaudoin: Honourable senators, Senator Gildas Molgat's long and brilliant career in the Senate of Canada spanned 30 years. He held numerous important positions. Others have mentioned his contributions as the chair of Senate committees, parliamentary associations and parliamentary delegations to other countries, as Deputy Speaker and Speaker of the Senate from 1994 to 2001.

[English]

He was involved in the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and of the House of Commons on the Constitution of Canada in 1971-72, as co-chair, and in the Special Joint Committee of the

[Senator Murray]

Senate and of the House of Commons on Senate Reform in 1983-84, the Molgat-Cosgrove report, again as co-chair. Those very interesting reports are still quoted by politicians, historians and academics.

In 1971, I appeared before the Special Joint Committee on the Constitution of Canada as dean of law.

[Translation]

This was the first time I encountered Senator Molgat. He represented our country internationally on many occasions. In my view, he extended the sphere of activities of the Speaker to the diplomatic level, which is a relatively new and excellent idea.

Senator Molgat was a friendly man, very at ease in our cultures. He did much to strengthen the legislative arm of the Government of Canada. His legacy will be a lasting one. Parliament owes him much.

I extend to his wife, Allison, and all his family my deepest sympathy.

[English]

Hon. Dan Hays: Honourable senators, I should like to read a message from the Prime Minister to share words of condolence that he extends to the Molgat family. The Prime Minister states:

Dear Allison:

Aline and I would like to extend our heartfelt sympathies to you and your family on the passing of your husband, Gil.

There can be no loss greater than that of the person with whom you have chosen to share your life. At this difficult time, it is our hope that the memory of the remarkable person that he was and the support of loved ones and friends will help to ease your grief.

Gil was a Parliamentarian of tremendous integrity and resolve, who served the people of Manitoba and, indeed, all Canadians with great skill. It was both an honour and a privilege to have served alongside him in Ottawa — in opposition and in government. He will always be remembered for his engaging personality, his good humour and incredible intellect, as well as his abiding commitment to public service. Indeed, his contributions to the development of this nation are many and you may take some solace in the fact that he leaves behind a rich legacy that will live on for many, many years to come.

Our thoughts and prayers are with you and your children, Anne and Mathurin.

Sincerely,
Jean Chrétien

Honourable senators, not as a senator speaking here now but in another capacity, I have received many letters of condolence from Speakers of the international community.

I would like to extend my deepest condolences to Allison, Mathurin and Anne Marie, and to Ginette Lafrenière and those who provided so much assistance and support to Senator Molgat during his years in the Senate.

We are all very aware of what the loss of our colleague and friend means in terms of the many unfinished projects that he looked forward to completing such as the review and restatement of the Senate rules, in part alluded to by Senator Murray.

• (1500)

Although Gil served in virtually every leadership role during his more than 30 years as a respected member of this place, he will be remembered most fondly as our former Speaker, particularly by me. With all due respect to Senator Lynch-Staunton, those rulings when I was deputy leader were absolutely superb.

I remember the debates we had when Speaker Molgat was in the Chair. We all benefited from his interest in procedure, his fairness and his sense of humour. Senator Molgat was always a great defender of this place. He enjoyed our traditions and worked hard to preserve them. The example of his success in achieving his goals is now a part of our history.

[Translation]

Senator Molgat was a proud francophone, a true Manitoban and a great Canadian. In the course of his long and distinguished career, he was an ardent defender of constitutionalism and minority rights. Gil was an exceptional human being with a strong sense of justice. He was a source of inspiration to us all.

[English]

His wisdom and easy manner made him a valued friend and advisor to all whose lives he touched. I will endeavour to follow his good example, as I know all here will. He brought great honour to this institution and we will all cherish his memory.

[Translation]

Farewell, my friend.

Hon. Lise Bacon: Honourable senators, it is with great sadness that I pay tribute to our colleague, the Honourable Gildas Molgat, who was so suddenly taken away from his family and friends.

I will not talk about his career, which was so full of accomplishments. Let me simply say that he spent his whole life in the service of his country. Because of his deep common sense and sound views, his advice was always well received.

Senator Molgat was an honest and good man who had earned the trust and respect of all. It is with a deep sense of regret that we lose a colleague with whom we were so proud to work.

Allison and her children in their great sorrow can find solace in the sympathy expressed by all those who knew him and appreciated him, here and all over the world.

Allow me to read a message that I received today from François Loncle, the chairman of the foreign affairs committee of the French National Assembly and the president of the Canada-France Inter-Parliamentary Association. The message reads as follows:

It is with great sadness that I heard of the sudden death, at age 74, of the Honourable Gildas Molgat, a senator from Manitoba and former Speaker of the Senate of Canada, whom I have known for over 20 years.

We had the honour and pleasure of welcoming him to France last summer, for the 30th session of the Canada-France Inter-Parliamentary Association. We could all see how much he loved our country. His availability, talent, refinement and great attention to Franco-Canadian issues made him a major figure in our association and a great Canadian.

Gildas Molgat, who was a member of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba from 1953 to 1970, a senator appointed by Prime Minister Elliott Trudeau in 1970, the Deputy Speaker of the Senate from 1983 to 1991, and the Speaker from 1994 to 2000, was an experienced parliamentarian who was appreciated by all in the Parliament of Canada.

As a Franco-Manitoban, as he liked to call himself, he cared as much about his country's unity as about the Francophonie, which he considered his family.

On my own behalf and on behalf of the many French deputies who love Canada, I offer to his wife, Mrs. Allison Molgat, to his two children, Anne and Mathurin, and to his colleagues in the Parliament of Canada, the most sincere condolences of the French delegation to the Canada-France Inter-Parliamentary Association.

[English]

Hon. Jeremiah S. Grafstein: Honourable senators, politics, like the human condition, like character, has a dark and a sunny side. For me, the late most Honourable Gildas Molgat represented the very best in politics — the sunny side of politics, the politics of joy.

I first met Gil four decades ago in the early 1960s when I travelled to Winnipeg for a Liberal Party meeting. Gil was then Leader of the Liberal Party and Leader of the Opposition in Manitoba. Three things immediately struck me when I first met him: first and foremost, his sunny, smiling disposition; second, his sensitive interpersonal skills; and, third, his fluent, articulate and easy bilingualism.

Leading the opposition in Manitoba can be a lonely, difficult task. Gil was able to enter the cut and thrust of politics in that province, never losing his gentle and graceful manner.

The next event I recall was the dark and difficult period of the debates in this chamber on the GST, as alluded to today by the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate. Gil was the deputy leader at the time. He was most unhappy with the unruliness of the debate and the unseemly conduct on both sides. It was so out of keeping with his personal predilection to resolve issues by careful, quiet and fair diplomacy. Throughout that raucous period, he remained a man of deliberation and honour, convinced in his convictions, certain in his principles about the role of the Senate as a chamber of sober second thought.

Gil's career as a senator was exemplary. His innate skills shone through when it came his time to act as Joint Chair of the Special Committee on the Constitution. The other co-chair, you will recall, was another late great friend of ours, Mark MacGuigan. Their report was called the MacGuigan-Molgat report. Many ideas from that report were later incorporated in the Constitution of 1982. Then in the Special Joint Committee on the Reform of the Senate, Gil joined with Paul Cosgrove, Member of Parliament for Scarborough, as co-chairs. That report, as others have mentioned, still bears reading today.

Who can forget the great dignity Gil lent to the chamber as Chair of the Committee of the Whole on the Meech Lake Constitutional Accord when Mr. Trudeau made his last memorable appearance in Parliament here on the floor of the Senate?

Incredibly, after being President of the Liberal Party, whip of the Senate, Deputy Leader of the Senate, Deputy Speaker of the Senate and, finally in 1994, as Speaker of the Senate, Gil continued to grow in stature on every task he undertook, large or small. As Speaker of the Senate, he was unparalleled in dignity, integrity and objectivity. The careful scholarship he brought to the opinions of the Speaker was not a facile pose.

Honourable senators, the role of the Speaker is never an easy one. Appointed under the Parliament Act by the Prime Minister, it is always difficult to separate one's loyalty and allegiance and still maintain the independence, integrity and objectivity required by the duties of that office. Yet, this is precisely what Gil did. Recently, when importuned to vote on a thoroughly contentious matter, he refused. Principle and integrity overruled the natural pull of loyalty and allegiance.

The full story of Gil Molgat as Speaker is yet to be told, but those of us who know only parts of his story will forever admire his invincible integrity. Gil Molgat, soldier, businessman, scholar, politician, diplomat, was a leader in all facets of his

career, rising from the bottom to the top by the dint of his own energy and his own honour.

Honourable senators, "honour" is a word much used and much abused. Gil lived and died a man of honour. What better tribute can his colleagues here in the Senate pay to him?

In 1770, the great English parliamentarian Thomas Burke noted:

It is the business of the speculative philosopher to mark the proper ends of government. It is the business of the politician who is the philosopher in action to find out proper means towards those ends, and employ them with effect.

Gil was relentless in his search for the proper means to make politics a profession of honour.

Honor virtutis praemium: Honour is the reward of virtue. So said Cicero. So say we about Gil Molgat.

[Translation]

Hon. Jean-Robert Gauthier: Honourable senators, I will make a small personal comment. We were good friends, Gildas and I. We had known each other a long time, perhaps 30 or 35 years. We often travelled together. Allison will recall that we had an exceptional experience in Japan. Gildas was chairing a meeting of the Inter-Parliamentary Union in Tokyo. In this sea of humanity, we were very conspicuous. We had a guide known as Sunshine. Gildas had told everyone to bring along the address of the hotel in Japanese in order to be able to return there after the event.

• (1510)

That was clever of him. He was an excellent head of delegation. He believed that if you do not know where you come from, you cannot return there when you want to. It takes a compass, as we all know, to find our bearings and travel in the unknown. Senator Molgat knew how to find his bearings. He was a credible Canadian ambassador, appreciated by all internationally. He was a great Canadian. A Franco-Manitoban by birth, he understood his cultural and linguistic roots well. He had everyone's respect. He was a great French Canadian.

For me, he was a great friend and colleague for over 35 years. He knew how to weather a storm — something I have yet to learn. His death leaves me very sad. I wrote him a week ago about his report on the study of the Senate rules, which he had given to the Standing Committee on Privileges, Standing Rules and Orders. It had been agreed that, yesterday morning, we would meet. I wrote him on February 21 on this and addressed my letter thus: "My dear Speaker. You will remain my Speaker until you leave this world." It is an old custom or practice in the Francophonie. Once you are Speaker, you remain so for life. To my mind, Senator Molgat was Speaker for life. Gildas is gone. He will not be forgotten.

I thank you, Gildas, for all you contributed.

[Senator Grafstein]

[English]

Hon. Janis G. Johnson: Honourable senators, I met the late Senator Molgat when I was a kid and he and my dad sat in the Manitoba legislature. My dad was a minister in the government of Duff Roblin, and Gil Molgat was the leader of the Liberal Party. I grew up listening to stories of the legendary legislative debates amongst Molgat, Roblin, Lyon, Pauley, Johnson and many others. Thirty years later I arrived in the Senate of Canada, and there was Senator Molgat greeting me with a kazoo.

Gil Molgat was a passionate man when it came to politics, and I had learned this as a youngster, so I was very understanding of his welcoming of me and my colleagues at that time. Coming to the Senate was rather intimidating, and I was somewhat shaky until he came over to me and whispered in my ear, "Your dad must be very proud of you today. He and I go back a long way, and, if you are anything like him, you old Iclander, you'll serve your country well."

Honourable senators, it was an honour and a distinction to work with Gil Molgat, especially on Manitoba issues. However, it was in his role as Speaker of this chamber that Senator Molgat truly shone. He was such an excellent Speaker; he was fair, articulate, intelligent and capable. Senator Molgat also held incredible parties, dinners, receptions, breakfasts, along with his marvellous wife, Allison, who was his partner for so many years. She was also a dear friend of my late parents.

Honourable senators, the Molgats endeared themselves to many people across this country and around the world with their gracious hospitality. Let me share with you what happened last year when we Icelanders held our famous — "Thank God it's over," I am sure everyone is saying — millennium celebrations in Ottawa and Manitoba. Senator Gil Molgat was there. With all the other things he had to do, he was there to support our events. He came to our dinners, he hosted Icelandic dignitaries, including the Prime Minister of Iceland, as well as our friends, colleagues and acquaintances from Gimli and the little towns in the Interlake of Manitoba, where the Icelandic people settled. We even made him an honorary Iclander, and I can tell you very few ever receive that honour. It takes a whole lifetime, or maybe two. His actions spoke to me once again about Senator Molgat's life-long commitment to and special regard for Manitobans, particularly the ethnic minorities, and I knew this when I was growing up.

Honourable senators, we have lost a very dear friend, colleague and senator. My two Manitoban colleagues, the Honourable Terry Stratton and the Honourable Mira Spivak, join me today in telling you that we really will miss this man who loved his province, his country and served them both proudly all his life.

Our deepest sympathy to you, Allison, and your family, at this very sad time.

Hon. Nicholas W. Taylor: Honourable senators, I will be brief. So many things have been said about Senator Molgat that are right on. He truly was a soldier, politician, philosopher — a renaissance man. There is little I can add to that so I should like to reminisce a bit instead.

Like Senator Carstairs, I am a part of that endangered species known as "the provincial prairie Liberal leader," which creates a special bond with others who have also held that position. It is similar to going through a Dieppe prisoner of war camp together. We shared that bond with Senator Molgat. I had another bond with Senator Molgat in that we both needed two hearing aids, which might not really be a drawback for a politician at times, but he liked to discuss the relative merits of hearing aids. I am sure that Allison, like my wife, spent a great deal of time looking for misplaced ones around the house.

I also recall going into business with Gil Molgat. Many years ago we formed a little company called Petro Mines, got it listed on the Winnipeg Stock Exchange and drilled a hole in Saskatchewan. That was sort of a compromise between Manitoba and Alberta. It did not do too well. Mind you, natural gas was then 10 cents per Mcf or per thousand cubic foot, versus \$9 now, and I believe oil was 80 cents, versus \$38 now. Nevertheless, if the certificates have not already been used to paper a wall, give me a call, because the company has been brought to life by some other people recently. Maybe we can do something.

Honourable senators, travelling with Gil and Allison was an experience in itself, which I have been lucky enough to share at different times. They were great hosts and shared a great partnership in life and politics. There is little we can say or do now to help the family ease the sense of loss that must be theirs, but I do hope they take some consolation from the fact that there are literally thousands of Canadians who feel that Canada has been a better place for having Gil Molgat.

Hon. Lorna Milne: Honourable senators, I feel a little shy about standing up here today, down in the rump end of the Senate, because I did not know Senator Gil Molgat as long as others who have spoken today. However, I was one of those people who was privileged to travel with Gil on his last diplomatic mission: the one he led to Saudi Arabia and Qatar at the end of January, which was also his last trip as Speaker of this place.

• (1520)

I have always known that Senator Molgat was both a skilled politician and an able and most patient Speaker here, but I must tell you that his diplomatic skills were even more evident abroad than they were in this chamber. He treated every member of our group in exactly the same way. He gave us all an equal opportunity to contribute to the discussions no matter what our diplomatic pecking order was. He treated everyone we met with equal courtesy, whether they were king, emir or vendor in the street. He was a man of the people and he demonstrated that fact daily.

He put forward Canada's position, whether it was on democracy and elections, human rights or the sharing of medical and educational expertise without offending our hosts or trespassing on our host nation's sovereignty. He never missed a beat. I can still hear his voice saying, as we heard him say so often in this place, "But I must tell you that..." and he would go on to make either his own point or the point of the people of Canada.

After our return from the Mideast, I shared some pictures with Senator and Mrs. Molgat. Just this Monday I got a lovely note from Allison thanking me for those pictures. She ended it with a postscript: "The 'singing swans' last flight was a good one." Indeed it was, as was any flight with Gil Molgat at its head.

Gil was a fine advocate for his region, his people, and his country. He was a lot of fun. More than all of these things, he was a good person. Canada needs more people like Senator Gildas Molgat, not fewer. We are impoverished by his death.

Hon. Anne C. Cools: Honourable senators, I rise to join senators on both sides of the aisle in paying tribute to our colleague, Senator Gildas Molgat, who left us so suddenly and unexpectedly yesterday, Ash Wednesday, the first day of Lent. Lent is that season of the liturgical calendar for penance, reflection and reconciliation. Senator Molgat had been here for a long time. His loss is heavy on the minds of senators and, I would add, the Senate staff. All our thoughts are with his wife and family. All the senators know his wife, Allison Molgat, and what a good woman she is. How devoted she was to her husband. Yesterday, I observed her in our Senate gallery, where she was present during our very short sitting, which only lasted long enough for senators to pause for a moment of silence in honour of Senator Molgat. In the foyer afterwards, I offered Allison my support and consolation. We embraced. She started to speak. I assured her that in this time there was no need for her to utter a single word. She looked into my eyes and she said, "There are no words."

Honourable senators, there are no words. Allison Molgat loved him very deeply and we all know that.

Honourable senators, when facing the insufficiency of words to express human grief and sorrow, I have always found that the Scriptures speak best. The Bible speaks so well. I place before senators, and especially before Senator Molgat's family, the words of the New Testament book of Revelations. Revelations, chapter 21, verse 4, tells us:

And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away.

I repeat, God shall wipe away all tears.

[Senator Milne]

Honourable senators, last night at the Ash Wednesday service at my own parish church, I upheld the Molgat family in my prayers.

Honourable senators, I offer Mrs. Molgat, who is in the gallery again today, and the entire Molgat family my sincere support at this difficult time in their lives.

[Translation]

Hon. Marcel Prud'homme: Honourable senators, I have known Senator Molgat since 1954.

[English]

When I was a young officer cadet at CFB Shilo, Manitoba, in the early 1950s, he was already a young parliamentarian and I was a young Liberal. I could, therefore, speak for hours. I was a member of that famous committee you all referred to that went across Canada in 1971. Many people said that we were not to sit in Quebec. I decided to organize a public hearing in my own parish, in the basement of a church, and 1,000 people attended. I think almost everyone crashed at our house across the street, Beaubien, St. Denis, and I can still see Senator Josie Quart holding court, and my father was very close by holding court, if anyone remembers my father.

Senator Molgat was a super chairman and we had never stopped being close, whether we agreed or not. I share so many souvenirs with Madame Allison. All the souvenirs I have with her are nice, but some are full of grief. I happened to be in Algeria with Mr. Speaker and Madame when she lost her brother in Winnipeg. I did not know what to do. I feel that in these circumstances the best you can do is to hold someone as long as you can without saying a word, as I did yesterday.

I was with Senator Milne and the others on the trip to Saudi Arabia and Qatar. I would have loved you to see what a man Gil Molgat was, not only a great parliamentarian, a great statesman, but also an extraordinarily good ambassador.

Allison and family, I share your grief. I offer to all your family the assurance of my lifetime of friendship. I want all the devoted staff to know that I give them my same lifetime friendship. In singling out one of the staff but without forgetting all the others, I know how they feel today. My grief also goes to the Chief of Staff, Ginette, who has been so impeccable to the Molgat family.

I do not know if I can make it, but I will try to be at the funeral. I would hope the press will be at the funeral, they who always deny us the right to be what we are at the service of Canada. I know that on Monday there will be real public testimony to a very great man. I would hope that many of us will make an effort to be present.

[Translation]

Madame Allison Molgat, my heart truly goes out to you.

• (1530)

Hon. Leonard J. Gustafson: Honourable senators, I should like to add a word to all the kind words that have been said about Senator Molgat. When I came to the Senate, he was so kind and so understanding. Very often, he would say, "Len, I think you should do this." I had the privilege of travelling with Gil and Allison to Georgia. I do not think I know of a kinder man who exemplified the beatitudes of the Gospel. If ever anyone exemplified the notion that blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven, it was Gil Molgat.

Allison, God bless you and your family and the memory of a great man.

Hon. Frank Mahovlich: Honourable senators, I should like to read the following quotation:

To laugh often and much; to win the respect of intelligent people and the affection of children; to earn the appreciation of honest critics and endure the betrayal of false friends; to appreciate beauty; to find the best in others; to leave the world a better place, whether by a healthy child, a garden patch, or a redeemed social condition; to know that even one life has breathed easier because you lived. This is to have succeeded.

That was the answer Ralph Waldo Emerson gave when someone asked him, "What is the answer to life? What is the recipe?" I think Gil Molgat read that statement.

So often, Gil made me feel at ease when I arrived in the Senate two and one-half years ago; when I travelled to Hong Kong and he gave me a wreath to place on a monument for the veterans; and when I came back and thought I would be called upon to give a speech and he pushed me aside and relieved me again, saying, "Frank, I will do the talking."

I wish to express my sympathy to the family and to congratulate them on having such a successful father and statesman.

SENATORS' STATEMENTS

SCOTT TOURNAMENT OF HEARTS

NOVA SCOTIA—CONGRATULATIONS TO WINNING RINK

Hon. Wilfred P. Moore: Honourable senators, last Wednesday, my colleague Senator Callbeck spoke in this place about the Shelly Bradley rink from Prince Edward Island, which was then leading the Scott Tournament of Hearts Canadian Women's Curling Championship in Sudbury, Ontario. I am tickled to report that despite P.E.I.'s strong start, this championship was won by the Colleen Jones rink of the Mayflower Curling Club in Halifax, Nova Scotia, in a gritty eleventh-end comeback victory over Team Canada, the Kelley Law rink of British Columbia. With this third championship,

Colleen Jones joins the elite of Canada's woman curlers, Manitoba's Connie Laliberte, Saskatchewan's Vera Pezer and the late Sandra Schmirler, all three-time winners of the event.

We congratulate skip Colleen and her teammates, lead Nancy Delahunt, second Mary-Anne Waye, third Kim Kelly, spare Lanie Peters and coach Ken Bagnell. We wish them well as they represent Canada at the women's World Curling Championships scheduled for Lausanne, Switzerland, this coming March 31 to April 8.

[Translation]

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

THE ESTIMATES, 2001-2002

TABLED

Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, pursuant to rule 28(3) of the *Rules of the Senate*, I have the honour to table the Estimates for 2001-2002.

THE ESTIMATES, 2000-2001

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (A) TABLED

Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, pursuant to rule 28(3) of the *Rules of the Senate*, I have the honour to table Supplementary Estimates (A) for 2000-2001.

BLUE WATER BRIDGE AUTHORITY ACT

BILL TO AMEND—REPORT OF COMMITTEE

Hon. Lise Bacon, Chair of the Standing Senate Committee on Transport and Communications, presented the following report:

Thursday, March 1, 2001

The Standing Senate Committee on Transport and Communications has the honour to present its

SECOND REPORT

Your Committee, to which was referred Bill S-5, An Act to amend the Blue Water Bridge Authority Act, has, in obedience to the Order of Reference of Wednesday, February 7, 2001, examined the said Bill and now reports the same without amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

LISE BACON
Chair

The Hon. the Speaker: When shall this bill be read the third time?

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

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

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

BANKING, TRADE AND COMMERCE

REPORT PURSUANT TO RULE 104 TABLED

PRIVILEGES, STANDING RULES AND ORDERS

SECOND REPORT OF COMMITTEE TABLED

Hon. Terry Stratton: Honourable senators, I have the honour to table the second report of the Standing Committee on Privileges, Standing Rules and Orders. The committee has revised the October 2000 edition of the *Rules of the Senate*. This edition incorporates the amendments made by the Senate on October 19, 2000, to rule 94, which deals with the disclosure of private financial interests.

Hon. David Tkachuk: Honourable senators, pursuant to rule 104 of the *Rules of the Senate*, I have the honour to table the first report of Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce, which deals with the expenses incurred by the committee during the Second Session of the Thirty-sixth Parliament.

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

INTERNAL ECONOMY, BUDGETS AND ADMINISTRATION

SECOND REPORT OF COMMITTEE PRESENTED

Hon. Mabel M. DeWare, Deputy Chair of the Standing Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration, presented the following report:

March 1, 2001

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

SECOND REPORT

Your Committee has approved the Senate Estimates for the fiscal year 2001-2002 and recommends their adoption.

Respectfully submitted,

MABEL DEWARE
Deputy Chair

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

BILL TO GIVE EFFECT TO THE REQUIREMENT FOR CLARITY AS SET OUT IN THE OPINION OF THE SUPREME COURT OF CANADA IN THE QUEBEC SECESSION REFERENCE

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO RULE 104 TABLED

Hon. Joan Fraser: Honourable senators, pursuant to rule 104 of the *Rules of the Senate*, I have the honour to table the report of the Special Senate Committee on Bill C-20, to give Effect to the Requirement for Clarity as Set Out in the Opinion of the Supreme Court of Canada in the Quebec Secession Reference, dealing with the expenses incurred by the committee during the Second Session of the Thirty-sixth Parliament.

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

FISHERIES

REPORT PURSUANT TO RULE 104 TABLED

Hon. Gerald J. Comeau: Honourable senators, pursuant to rule 104 of the *Rules of the Senate*, I have the honour to table the first report of the Standing Senate Committee on Fisheries, which deals with the expenses incurred by the committee during the Second Session of the Thirty-sixth Parliament.

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

[Translation]

THE ESTIMATES, 2001-2002

NATIONAL FINANCE COMMITTEE
AUTHORIZED TO STUDY MAIN ESTIMATES

Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, with leave of the Senate and notwithstanding rule 58 (1)(f), I move:

That the Standing Senate Committee on National Finance be authorized to examine and report upon the expenditures set out in the Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2002, with the exception of Parliament Vote 10 and Privy Council Vote 25.

Motion agreed to.

• (1540)

VOTE 10 REFERRED TO THE STANDING JOINT COMMITTEE
ON THE LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, with leave of the Senate and notwithstanding rule 58(1)(f), I move:

That the Standing Joint Committee on the Library of Parliament be authorized to examine the expenditures set out in Parliament Vote 10 of the Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2002; and

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

Motion agreed to.

VOTE 25 REFERRED TO THE
STANDING JOINT COMMITTEE ON OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, with leave of the Senate and notwithstanding rule 58(1)(f), I move:

That the Standing Joint Committee on Official Languages be authorized to examine the expenditures set out in Privy Council Vote 25 of the Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2002; and

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

Motion agreed to.

THE ESTIMATES, 2000-2001

NATIONAL FINANCE COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED
TO EXAMINE SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (A)

Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, with leave of the Senate and notwithstanding rule 58(1)(f), I move:

That the Standing Senate Committee on National Finance be authorized to examine and report upon the expenditures set out in the Supplementary Estimates (A) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2001, with the exception of Privy Council Vote 25a.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVY COUNCIL VOTE 25A
OF SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (A)
REFERRED TO STANDING JOINT COMMITTEE
ON OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, with leave of the Senate and notwithstanding rule 58(1)(f), I move:

That the Standing Joint Committee on Official Languages be authorized to examine the expenditures set out in Privy Council Vote 25a of the Supplementary Estimates (A) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2001; and

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

Motion agreed to.

CANADA-FRANCE INTER-PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

THIRTIETH ANNUAL MEETING—
REPORT OF CANADIAN DELEGATION TABLED

Hon. Gérard-A. Beaudoin: Honourable senators, I have the honour to table the report on the thirtieth annual meeting of the Canadian delegation to the Canada-France Inter-Parliamentary Association that was held in Paris, Marseille and Nice, France, from September 9 to 16, 2000.

FISHERIES

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE
TO PERMIT ELECTRONIC COVERAGE

Hon. Gerald J. Comeau: Honourable senators, I give notice that on Tuesday next, March 13, 2001, I shall move:

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

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE TO STUDY
MATTERS RELATING TO FISHING INDUSTRY

Hon. Gerald J. Comeau: Honourable senators, I give notice that on Tuesday, March 13, 2001, I shall move:

That the Standing Senate Committee on Fisheries be authorized to examine and report upon matters relating to the fishing industry;

That the papers and evidence received and taken on the subject during the Second Session of the Thirty-sixth Parliament be referred to the Committee;

That the Committee submit its final report no later than March 31, 2002; and

That the Committee be permitted, notwithstanding usual practices, to deposit any report with the Clerk of the Senate, if the Senate is not then sitting; and that the report be deemed to have been tabled in the Chamber.

[English]

**CANADA BUSINESS CORPORATIONS ACT
CANADA COOPERATIVES ACT**

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AUTHORIZE BANKING, TRADE AND
COMMERCE COMMITTEE TO APPLY PAPERS AND EVIDENCE ON
STUDY OF BILL DURING PREVIOUS SESSION TO CURRENT BILL

Hon. David Tkachuk: Honourable senators, on Tuesday, March 13, 2001, Senator Kolber will move:

That the papers and evidence received and taken by the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce during its study of Bill S-19, to amend the Canada Business Corporations Act and the Canada Cooperatives Act and to amend other Acts in consequence, in the Second Session of the Thirty-sixth Parliament be referred to the Committee for its present study of Bill S-11, to amend the Canada Business Corporations Act and the Canada Cooperatives Act and to amend other Acts in consequence.

BANKING, TRADE AND COMMERCE

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE
TO PERMIT ELECTRONIC COVERAGE

Hon. David Tkachuk: Honourable senators, I give notice that on Tuesday, March 13, 2001, Senator Kolber will move:

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

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE
TO ENGAGE SERVICES

Hon. David Tkachuk: Honourable senators, I give notice that on Tuesday, March 13, 2001, Senator Kolber will move:

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

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE TO STUDY STATE
OF DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL SYSTEM

Hon. David Tkachuk: Honourable senators, I give notice that on Tuesday, March 13, 2001, Senator Kolber will move:

That the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce be authorized to examine and report upon the present state of the domestic and international financial system;

That the papers and evidence received and taken on the subject during the First and Second Session of the Thirty-sixth Parliament and any other relevant Parliamentary papers and evidence on the said subject be referred to the Committee;

That the Committee be empowered to permit coverage by electronic media of its public proceedings with the least possible disruption of its hearings;

That, notwithstanding usual practices, the Committee be permitted to deposit an interim report on the said subject with the Clerk of the Senate, if the Senate is not sitting, and that the said report shall thereupon be deemed to have been tabled in the Chamber; and

That the Committee submit its final report no later than March 31, 2002.

• (1550)

Hon. Anne C. Cools: Honourable senators, I rise on a point of order. I am very curious. I thought I heard Senator Tkachuk say that he was giving notice that another senator will do something. How is that possible?

The Hon. the Speaker: I must advise Senator Cools that under our rules points of order must be raised at the end of Orders of the Day just before Government Business. I will hear her then.

I now call on Senator Milne.

Senator Cools: It is more of a question than a point of order.

[Translation]

The Hon. the Speaker: If we could deal with it as —

Hon. Lowell Murray: The honourable senator has given notice that he will raise this matter of allegations in the press later today. Is that why he is asking the leave of the Senate?

[English]

Hon. Anne C. Cools: Perhaps the Honourable Senator De Bané can tell us why leave is required. It seems to me that whenever leave is requested, which should happen exceptionally, senators should be given an indication of why it has been requested. Perhaps the senator could tell us why leave is required.

Senator De Bané: Honourable senators, this is my first opportunity to bring this issue forward. Due to the tragic passing of our former Speaker, the Senate has not conducted its usual business in the past few days. This issue has already been brought before the House of Commons. *Le Journal* and *La Presse* have both apologized and retracted. Time is of the essence because it will become irrelevant if we wait another week or two. That is why I have requested the indulgence of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to make a statement about the honour of the minister at the end of our sitting today.

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

Hon. John Lynch-Staunton (Leader of the Opposition): No.

The Hon. the Speaker: Leave not being granted, the matter will be placed on the Orders of the Day for two days hence.

[Translation]

LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE TO PERMIT ELECTRONIC COVERAGE

Hon. Lorna Milne: Honourable Senators, I give notice that at the next sitting of the Senate, I will move:

That, the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs be authorized to permit coverage by electronic media of its public proceedings with the least possible disruption of its hearings.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE TO ENGAGE SERVICES

Hon. Lorna Milne: Honourable senators, I give notice that at the next sitting of the Senate, I will move:

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

[Translation]

PUBLIC WORKS AND GOVERNMENT SERVICES

ALLEGATIONS IN PRESS WITH REGARD TO MINISTER— NOTICE OF INQUIRY

Hon. Pierre De Bané: Honourable senators, with leave of the Senate and notwithstanding rule 57(2), I give notice that later today I will call the attention of the Senate to certain allegations made in the press against the Minister of Public Works and Government Services, the Honourable Alfonso L. Gagliano.

[English]

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

CABLE PUBLIC AFFAIRS CHANNEL

CLOSED CAPTIONING SERVICE—NOTICE OF INQUIRY

Hon. Jean-Robert Gauthier: Honourable senators, I give notice that, on Tuesday, March 13, 2001, I shall call the attention of the Senate to the current negotiations on the renewal of the broadcasting agreement between the Senate and CPAC, the Cable Public Affairs Channel, to ensure that they include the closed captioning of parliamentary debates authorized for television and that the renewal of this agreement reflect the commitments made by CPAC on services for the hearing-impaired.

NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION NETWORK

NOTICE OF INQUIRY

Hon. Jean-Robert Gauthier: Honourable senators, I give notice that, on Tuesday, March 13, 2001, I shall call the attention of the Senate to the need to establish a national educational television network.

[English]

QUESTION PERIOD

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

EAST COAST—PROPOSAL TO SPLIT FISHING ZONES INTO NATIVE AND NON-NATIVE AREAS

Hon. Gerald J. Comeau: Honourable senators, my question is addressed to the Leader of the Government in the Senate. It concerns a report in the Halifax *Chronicle-Herald* on Sunday that a federal fisheries proposal was made to split fishing zones into native and non-native areas, dividing Saint Mary's Bay in Nova Scotia, Malpeque Bay in Prince Edward Island, and Miramichi Bay in New Brunswick, with the natives getting the best half because they were there first.

Given the consequences of such a proposal, which I need not spell out for the Leader of the Government in the Senate, would the minister seek the full details of the federal proposal and table those in this house as soon as possible?

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I thank the honourable senator for his question. In particular, I thank him for the memorandum he sent to my office in which he gave me notice that this question was forthcoming.

I have made inquiries. The negotiations are in the beginning stages. In essence, everything is on the table and nothing is on the table at this point in the negotiations. I will, to the best of my ability, keep the honourable senator abreast of the negotiations as they proceed.

The article to which the honourable senator made reference is extraordinarily premature.

Senator Comeau: Honourable senators, I have made my point clearly. Given the ramifications of even suggesting the splitting of Saint Mary's Bay, Malpeque Bay and Miramichi Bay, I do not think it has dawned on the minister how powerful the effect of this proposal would be on the future of our communities — socially, economically and investment-wise. Any suggestion that this proposal is even being discussed could cause extreme damage that may never be rectified.

To repeat the first part of my question, will the Leader of the Government table as soon as possible such proposals in order that the people in those communities affected by the discussion of this can start to make plans for the future?

INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

NOVA SCOTIA—PROPOSAL TO SPLIT PROVINCE BETWEEN NATIVE AND NON-NATIVE GROUPS

Hon. Gerald J. Comeau: Honourable senators, on another aspect of that newspaper article, it reports that a native who is involved in those negotiations made a proposal to split Nova Scotia right down the middle.

• (1600)

Honourable senators, this is a direct quote from the newspaper, and Senator Graham should have read it.

Hon. B. Alisdair Graham: What makes you think that I did not read it?

Senator Comeau: This is a direct quote, "We will take everything from just above Halifax to Yarmouth and the non-natives can take everything from Truro to Cape Breton."

Given the Acadian heritage of many of these communities in western Nova Scotia, would the minister not agree that the government should walk away from any discussion whatsoever that raises the spectre of moving people away from these Acadian communities of Nova Scotia?

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I thank the honourable senator for his question. There are two aspects to what the honourable senator has laid before the Senate this afternoon. In respect of the first aspect, I shall do my best to keep him informed as soon as, frankly, I am allowed to provide him with that information.

At the same time, I shall also express the very grave concerns that he has raised in this chamber this afternoon. I shall raise those concerns with the Minister of Fisheries. However, I am informed that Chief Paul's remarks regarding zones and province-splitting are not a negotiating point.

[Translation]

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

EAST COAST—SALE OF FISHING LICENCES TO BE TRANSFERRED TO NATIVE GROUPS

Hon. Gerald J. Comeau: Honourable senators, I read this morning in the newspaper *L'Acadie Nouvelle* that, in the Acadian Peninsula, several fishing licences are being bought up by the government to be transferred to native groups.

All shipmasters and licence holders are being compensated. However, crews and their families, plant workers and people in the community are losing their jobs. These communities are already in trouble. These people are not wealthy; they are day labourers.

Right now, the government is not doing anything to compensate those who lose their jobs, nor to take care of them. The only option for these people is to move, to leave the community they grew up in. Could the minister inform cabinet of these concerns?

Will the government pledge to take measures to compensate the people in these communities who lose their jobs? The government could do even more by inviting these people to sit at the negotiating table to look at the future. At present, these people have not been invited to do so, because negotiations are being conducted *in camera*.

[English]

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I thank the honourable senator for his question. As he knows, the licences are not owned by the crew but, in fact, by the captain of the boat. The honourable senator has raised a serious concern, specifically the impact of the sale of those licences if they are then part of the licence that goes to the aboriginal community. Obviously, one would assume that they would then hire crew from their own communities and not hire the previous crews that the captain had employed. I will bring those concerns to the Minister of Fisheries.

Senator Comeau: Honourable senators, I think it must be taken further than that. The minister is right in that the licence holders themselves are to be well compensated during the purchase of those licences in order to transfer them to native groups. However, it is the crews that had, in the past, hopes of eventually owning licences so that they could carry on traditions that have been in their families for generations. Now, they see no hope at all of ever becoming captains of vessels. Thus, their hopes are lost, and the hopes of these communities are going down the drain.

It is very difficult because many of these communities, I remind the minister, are of Acadian extraction. They have gone through some difficult times in their history just to survive in this country, but never have they complained. Now, they see their very past and future negotiated without any say whatsoever. They have to hear about it as they did yesterday, or this morning, through letters from lawyers that stated, "Sorry, your job is gone and there is nothing you can do about it." It has to be more. These people have to be invited to the table to look at their past as well as their future.

Senator Carstairs: Honourable senators, I thank the honourable senator for his question. He has raised, clearly, a concern of the fishing community from which he comes. I shall ensure that the minister is aware of those concerns, frankly, before I leave to go to Manitoba this weekend.

CHURCH COMMUNITY

FINANCIAL SUPPORT TO SETTLE LAWSUITS BY FORMER STUDENTS OF RESIDENTIAL SCHOOLS

Hon. Douglas Roche: Honourable senators, my question is addressed to the Leader of the Government in the Senate. It concerns the residential schools issue. There is deep concern that the government's proposed solution to the more than 6,000 lawsuits will assign a multi-million-dollar share of responsibility to the four churches involved, Catholic, Anglican, United and Presbyterian.

Can the minister assure the Senate that the government, instead of blaming the churches for the problem of residential schools, will accept that it was primarily the policies of the Canadian government that caused cultural deprivation, and thus the government should effect a solution without bankrupting the churches?

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I thank the honourable senator for his question. There is no policy at the present moment. As the honourable senator knows, there have been negotiations between the Deputy Prime Minister and members of the churches who were operating the residential schools in this country. No decisions have been made. Therefore, it is premature to discuss what final proposal may be put forward when such a final proposal is still in the discussion stage.

Senator Roche: Honourable senators, I thank the minister for her answer.

Could she make an inquiry into why the government, in particular Mr. Gray's office, has not convened any meetings between the churches and the First Nations leaders together with representatives of the government so that all concerned can pursue a just and meaningful solution to this problem and find some remedial action to foster a reconciliation approach that would provide the healing needed and be less quarrelsome and less expensive than litigation?

Senator Carstairs: Honourable senators, I think that has been the whole purpose of the negotiation, which is to find both some remedial action and a means by which the churches can continue to be active in this nation and to continue to do good work. Some of that good work is done for Aboriginal people in this country without bankrupting the churches, and the negotiations, as I indicated earlier, are ongoing. As to the honourable senator's specific question about why the Deputy Prime Minister has not met with these groups, I can only ask the Deputy Prime Minister for that explanation.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

UNITED STATES—MISSILE DEFENCE SYSTEM— COMMENTS BY MINISTER

Hon. Pierre Claude Nolin: Honourable senators, earlier in the week the Minister of Foreign Affairs was in Brussels. If the newscasts were right, he said that Canada was supportive of being part of the NMD. Can the minister comment on that statement, please?

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, no, I am afraid that I cannot comment on that statement. I have no knowledge whatsoever of it; however, I will obtain it for him and bring it back to the house.

HUMAN RIGHTS

RATIFICATION OF INTER-AMERICAN CONVENTION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, would the minister, knowing the views of honourable senators on both sides of this house concerning the promotion of protection of human rights, be supportive of Canada ratifying the Inter-American Convention on Human Rights?

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I thank the honourable senator for his question. I cannot tell him exactly what the position of the government is on this matter at this time. I shall try to obtain that information for him.

• (1610)

Senator Kinsella: Honourable senators, a couple of days ago, the Special Ambassador for Human Rights and Democracy, Ambassador Acosta, who was appointed by President Vincente Fox of Mexico, was in Ottawa. She expressed the view that it would be great if Canada ratified the Inter-American Convention of Human Rights prior to the Summit of the Americas in April.

If all of the provinces are in agreement, would the minister feel that the Government of Canada would be able to follow the advice of the human rights ambassador for Mexico?

Senator Carstairs: I can tell the honourable senator that the Prime Minister has gone on the record as saying that human rights will become an issue at the Summit of the Americas. As to specific plans to ratify treaties prior to that summit, I do not have that information, but I will attempt to obtain it.

[Translation]

DELAYED ANSWERS TO ORAL QUESTIONS

Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I have four delayed

answers. The first one deals with the questions asked by Honourable Senators Corbin, Nolin, Gauthier and Comeau, on January 31, 2001, and February 6, 2001, regarding official languages and the Speech from the Throne delivered on January 30, 2001. I also have delayed answers to questions raised by Senator Murray on February 6, 7 and 8, 2001, concerning the funding of abortion services and to a question asked by Senator Oliver on February 8, 2001, on the report of the auditor general and the future role of the department in the establishment of standards at the Department of Health, and the recruitment program for the Bureau of Biologics.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE—SUSTAINING OFFICIAL LANGUAGE MINORITY COMMUNITIES

(Response to questions raised by Hon. Eymard G. Corbin, Hon. Pierre Claude Nolin, Hon. Jean-Robert Gauthier and Hon. Gerald J. Comeau on January 31 and February 6, 2001)

In the last Speech from the Throne, the Government of Canada strongly reaffirmed its commitment to Canada's linguistic duality. It confirmed that this duality is at the heart of Canadian identity and that it constitutes a key element of our vibrant society.

Therefore, the Government continues its efforts so that official-language minority communities throughout the country are:

strong and dynamic, including demographically;

supported by numerous partners which help them to actively participate in Canadian society;

fully capable of ensuring their long-term development.

In addition, the Government is committed to reinforcing French culture and language throughout the country and it will mobilize its efforts to ensure that all Canadians may interact with the Government of Canada in either official language.

HEALTH

NEW BRUNSWICK—FUNDING OF ABORTION SERVICES

(Response to questions raised by Hon. Lowell Murray on February 6, 7 and 8, 2001)

New Brunswick's and Manitoba's policy on abortion services is to pay only for those that are carried out in a hospital. The Government of Canada has concerns about this approach. The Canada Health Act applies to insured hospital and physician services. The Act requires that all medically necessary hospital and physician services be provided on uniform terms and conditions.

That is, all medically necessary hospital services are to be provided without any financial or other barriers. Hospital services include those offered in any facility or a portion thereof that provides hospital care.

Abortion is an insured service in all provinces and territories. Federal and provincial officials are engaging in bilateral discussions to reach a resolution of this issue.

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT—
FUTURE ROLE OF DEPARTMENT IN SETTING STANDARDS

(Response to question raised by Hon. Donald H. Oliver on February 8, 2001)

As part of the federal government's regulatory policy development, authorities must ensure that Canadians are consulted, and are given an opportunity to participate in developing or modifying regulations and regulatory programs; they must be able to demonstrate that a problem or risk exists, that federal government intervention is justified and that regulation is the best alternative. Government must also ensure that the benefits of regulation outweigh the costs to Canadians, their governments and businesses.

One consideration in the current trend in regulatory reform is to find and use the most appropriate means for achieving these regulatory goals. It is in this context that the use of a standards-based regulatory framework is being explored for some biologics. Technical standards as a means of controlling product quality may be particularly appropriate for complex products such as biologics where the industry needs detailed information on the requirements prescribed by regulations.

The Standards Council of Canada, which is a Crown Corporation mandated by Parliament to approve National Standards in Canada, has been contracted to develop the standards. The standards are developed by a committee of interested parties with expertise, including government representatives, who seek to reach consensus on the standards. Health Canada realizes that the issues of coordination, leadership and accountability become more critical with the increased roles and responsibilities of key players in the standards development system.

Whatever the approach adopted, the department will retain the full authority to put independent regulatory action in place.

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT—RECRUITMENT PROGRAM
FOR BUREAU OF BIOLOGICS

(Response to question raised by Hon. Donald H. Oliver on February 8, 2001)

Health Canada and the U.S. Food and Drug Administration are formalizing partnership to develop a combined database for adverse effects reports, to share information and assist in identifying rare, but critical, adverse reactions.

The department recognizes the challenges it faces in obtaining qualified staff. Funding was sought and obtained through special Treasury Board Submissions to fill drug submission reviewer vacancies and increase base capacity. The department is competing aggressively with universities and private industry for highly qualified staff, particularly in the biologics area where the competition is most acute. The department is marketing vacancies to specific groups, offering innovative work arrangements and coordinating the staffing effort in order to reduce any possible inefficiencies in the staffing process.

A continuing education initiative to provide formal specialized training for new and existing staff is in place and will be incorporated into a broader human resource development framework.

[English]

ORDERS OF THE DAY

PROCEEDS OF CRIME (MONEY LAUNDERING) ACT

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Furey, seconded by the Honourable Senator Joyal, P.C., for the second reading of Bill S-16, to amend the Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) Act.

Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, I will speak at second reading, although this item was adjourned by Senator Kelleher. I am advising the house that he has yielded to me and that I shall speak as critic for the opposition on this bill.

The act to amend the Proceeds of Crime Act was known in the last Parliament and is currently known as the money laundering bill. Our colleague Senator Furey explained to the house that the amendments are based upon an undertaking by the government last June to our Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce. At that time, the government was particularly anxious to have the money laundering bill passed into law. Rather than agreeing to make the necessary amendments to the bill before it passed, the Secretary of State for financial institutions instead undertook to make the changes at a later date.

Our Banking Committee also made three unanimous recommendations for the minister to consider and, it was hoped, to implement. We note with considerable dismay that the government has chosen to ignore these recommendations. We were particularly disappointed that the government chose not to require FinTRAC, the new agency charged with enforcing the money laundering act, to obtain a warrant before inspecting records and files held in lawyers' offices. Not only does the act force lawyers to breach their oath of confidentiality, but it also fails to afford the information sought the same protection it would have if it were held in a private dwelling.

Honourable senators, confidentiality is one of the basic tenets of our legal system. Lawyers have sworn to uphold this tenet, and clients depend upon it. A visit to a lawyer's office often involves the client divulging sensitive, perhaps valuable and often personal information. Canadians need to be assured that this information is provided all reasonable protection.

The release of this information should only happen after careful consideration and under highly prescribed circumstances. At the very least, the onus should rest clearly on the shoulders of the government to satisfy a judge and obtain a warrant before its release. If the government is required to obtain a warrant to enter and obtain documentation from a private citizen in a dwelling house, then, by logical extension, the government should also be required to obtain a warrant to enter and obtain information and documentation a private citizen has relayed to a lawyer.

Surely, citizens deserve the same legal protection regardless of where their personal or private information is stored. The money laundering act provides that a lawyer may claim solicitor-client privilege for information sought by FinTRAC. This is all well and good, but the burden is on the lawyer and the client to make application to the court to have this privilege upheld.

Honourable senators, I think it is unreasonable that lawyers and their clients are forced to pay the costs of a court application to enforce a basic right that has a long tradition in this country — the basic right of solicitor-client privilege. Surely, innocent taxpayers should not have to pay to protect against an invasion of their privacy.

Honourable senators, as I indicated, the minister has lived up to his undertaking to the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce to introduce amendments to the money laundering act. However, he must now be open to those

other reasonable amendments that were unanimously recommended by our Banking Committee. Thus, I ask that the Banking Committee, to which this bill will be referred, revisit these issues once the bill is before it.

• (1620)

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to bill read second time.

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

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

On motion of Senator Robichaud, bill referred to Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce.

PATENT ACT

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. Jack Wiebe moved second reading of Bill S-17, to amend the Patent Act.

He said: Honourable senators, I am pleased to have the opportunity to rise today to begin second reading on Bill S-17, to amend the Patent Act.

Honourable senators will recall the Speech from the Throne. It set out the government's commitment to ensure that Canadian laws and regulations, including those governing intellectual property such as patents, remain among the most modern and the most progressive in the world.

A patent regime is an important framework instrument for a knowledge-based economy. It promotes innovation by rewarding creativity. It helps to diffuse knowledge and technology. It helps to create jobs and it helps to promote economic growth.

Good patent laws make Canada a very attractive place for companies to invest, especially in research and development. We are a trading nation, with 40 per cent of our gross domestic product coming from exports, and we seek direct foreign investment for our knowledge-intensive industries. Canada's current and future prosperity depends on open world markets, a stable trading environment and, above all — and I emphasize this — a means to settle trade disputes based on the rule of law rather than political or economic might. In this system, small and medium-sized open economies like Canada can hold their own against the economic giants of the world.

[Senator Kinsella]

Canada has international obligations respecting intellectual property. These obligations flow from the agreement on the trade-related aspects of intellectual property rights, or TRIPS, of the World Trade Organization. Meeting international obligations is a necessary and important first step in ensuring that our intellectual property framework remains modern and remains progressive. In October of last year, the WTO ruled that Canada's term of protection for "old act" patents or pre-1989 patents does not conform with the TRIPS agreement. The TRIPS agreement requires WTO members to provide a patent term of 20 years from the date a patent application is filed. "New act" patents, or those patents that have been introduced since 1989, already conform with the patent term of 20 years from the date of filing and are not affected by the WTO ruling.

We must now make the necessary amendments to the Patent Act. Through this bill, section 45 of the act would be amended to provide a term of patent protection in line with the TRIPS agreement.

This bill also repeals obsolete provisions in section 55 of the Patent Act. This bill, honourable senators, demonstrates that Canada takes its intellectual property regime seriously and that we take our international obligations seriously. It brings Canada's Patent Act into compliance with our international obligations through some simple and straightforward amendments.

By passing this bill we will send a signal to the international community that we do take our obligations seriously, and we send a message to Canadians that we take our investment climate seriously. On the other hand, if we did not comply with the ruling, we send the opposite signals. Moreover, we will be in default of our international obligations. The government's priority is to comply with last year's WTO ruling.

Honourable senators, Canada's patents regime serves Canadians well. It strikes a balance between effective patent protection and early and effective competition. It has provided a regime where Canadians have enjoyed access to goods and services at reasonable prices. The patent regime includes institutions such as the Patented Medicine Prices Review Board, which has been effective in helping to ensure Canadian patent drug prices are not excessive. In fact, patented drug prices in Canada are 40 per cent below U.S. prices and 10 per cent below international median prices.

Honourable senators, by implementing the World Trade Organization ruling in a timely fashion, this bill sends an important message that Canada is serious about its intellectual property regime. It sends a message that the government is serious about making Canada a smart country and that we are serious about maintaining a framework that promotes innovation. It also sends a very clear signal that Canada supports and upholds an international trading system built upon rules and dispute resolutions.

These, honourable senators, are all important messages for both the domestic and the international audiences. I would urge all honourable senators to support this particular bill.

Hon. Jeremiah S. Grafstein: Honourable senators, I have a short question of the honourable senator, and I apologize in advance to Senator Wiebe if I am out of the park.

What impact will extending the patent law have on generic drugs? Will it have the impact that some are complaining about, namely, that the prices for generic drugs will increase as a result of the extension of the patents that we are now proposing?

Senator Wiebe: The quick and short answer to that is, no, this will definitely not result in an increase in prescription drugs.

Let me give you some history, if I may, honourable senators. There are 138,000 old act patents that are affected by this particular amendment. Of those, 53,000 old act patents have terms of less than 20 years. Of those 53,000, there are possibly what could be called 30 valuable patents. Of those 30 valuable patents, the effect of this ruling will mean that there will be a delay in savings on prescription drugs from anywhere from one month to six months, the longest being six months. It will not have any impact or any severe impact in the savings. There will definitely be no price increase as a result of this legislation.

Hon. John Lynch-Staunton (Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, is the Honourable Senator Wiebe aware that the argumentation he is bringing forward is, for all intents and purposes, word for word, except for updating on the purpose for it, the argumentation given by this side when it was in government for a similar amendment to the Patent Act to abide by a GATT ruling? At that time, it was adamantly opposed by our friends across the way, one of whom has just spoken. I read his argumentation against it, and I think I might use it, if I were so inclined, just to be obstructionist in opposing the bill.

One of the arguments they used was directly related to what Senator Grafstein suggested, namely, that extending the patent protection would delay the ability of generic companies to copy those drugs and, therefore, increase costs to Canadians. A number of cost estimates were put forward by Senators Grafstein, Kirby, Fairbairn, and others, which were scary at the time.

• (1630)

After 10 years of the extended protection provided by Bill C-91, does the honourable senator have any figures to show whether the estimates made by his colleagues have been borne out?

Senator Wiebe: Honourable senators, I did not anticipate that particular question. I must admit that I did not take a pencil or calculator in hand to prepare a response, nor was I aware that such an intervention took place.

As the honourable senator knows, in 1989 when this legislation was introduced, a very exciting and serious debate took place. That is as it should be. That is the democratic system.

Parliament made a decision back in 1989, and the Patent Act became the law of this country. Canada has gained a tremendous reputation throughout the world as a country that honours the rule of law. When we are debating this particular bill, we are not debating policy; rather, we are debating a Canadian commitment that we would honour all of our obligations. We all know Canada is not a giant military world power, nor are we a giant economic world power. However, this one thing we do know; abiding by the rule of law makes our country an equal with every country in the world. That is the reason for this particular amendment.

Hon. Lowell Murray: Honourable senators, might we assume that the honourable senator is invoking the Brian Tobin doctrine to the effect that Mulroney was right and he was wrong?

Senator Robichaud: The honourable senator does not have to answer all the questions asked of him.

Senator Meighen: We know the answer.

Senator Wiebe: Honourable senators, I imagine that this bill will be referred to the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce, of which I am a member. Perhaps the honourable senator would like to pose that question to the minister when he appears before the committee. I would be more than interested in the answer as well.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: I am happy to move the adjournment of the debate. When my turn comes to speak, I will be even happier to refresh the memories of my colleagues across the way about some of the statements they made at the time. I promise that I will not adopt those statements for myself; there will be consistency on this side.

On motion of Senator Lynch-Staunton, debate adjourned.

[Translation]

COMMITTEE OF SELECTION

THIRD REPORT OF COMMITTEE ADOPTED

The Senate proceeded to consideration of the third report of the Committee of Selection (*composition of joint committees*) submitted to the Senate on February 22, 2001.

Hon. Léonce Mercier moved adoption of the report.

Motion agreed to and report adopted.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

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

Hon. Fernand Robichaud, pursuant to notice of February 21, 2001, moved:

[Senator Wiebe]

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

Motion agreed to.

[English]

MOTION FOR ADDRESS IN REPLY—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Cordy, seconded by the Honourable Senator Setlakwe, for an Address to Her Excellency the Governor General in reply to her Speech from the Throne at the Opening of the First Session of the Thirty-seventh Parliament.—(3rd day of resuming debate)

Hon. Lowell Murray: Honourable senators, I intend to make a short and non-controversial intervention in this debate. My purpose is simply to draw to the attention of honourable senators several matters that we have inherited from previous Parliaments and which we have in my opinion an obligation to revisit. My list of three items is by no means exhaustive. Other senators may well add to it.

The first item is the existence of child support guidelines as regulations under the Divorce Act. Second is the status of personal health information under the Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act. The third is a perennial favourite of Senator Graham's, Senator Buchanan's and mine — the status of that federal Crown corporation called the Cape Breton Development Corporation. Let me say just a word of background on those three items.

The child support guidelines, as I pointed out, are regulations under our federal Divorce Act. That being said, I should add that they have been adopted or adapted by most provinces and are used in their family court processes. Those child support guidelines were the subject of some controversy here when we debated Bill C-41, amendments to the Divorce Act, during the winter of 1997. That would have been during the Thirty-fifth Parliament.

The Senate and the committee were so concerned about those proposed guidelines and their possible impact that, as part of the price of getting the legislation through Parliament, the minister of the day and the then Leader of the Government in the Senate agreed that the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology would monitor the impact of those guidelines. That is where I came in.

At the beginning of the Thirty-sixth Parliament, just after the 1997 election, I became Chairman of the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology. We undertook this study in December of 1997 and continued during the winter and spring of 1998. We issued a report in June of 1998, which we described as an interim report. We had held nine meetings and had heard from 16 individuals and organizations. We made 12 recommendations, at least half of which recommended certain changes in the guidelines. However, we had to acknowledge that, at the time of our study, the guidelines had been in effect for just over one year.

It was early days to reach definitive conclusions on the operation of those guidelines, and so we undertook as a committee to return to the subject in 18 months' time. We are about one year overdue to return to that subject. I moved on from being Chairman of the Social Affairs Committee and Senator Kirby has succeeded me. Nevertheless, it is timely that the committee revisit the child support guidelines.

I remind the house that an amendment to the Divorce Act in Bill C-41 imposed upon the Minister of Justice an obligation to undertake a review of the provisions and the operations of the guidelines and the determination of child support under the act and to cause a report on the review to be laid before each House of Parliament within five years after the coming into force of this section.

• (1640)

I believe that would put the date of the tabling of a report at April 2002. My point is that, if we want to have any influence on this process, we should get on with it now. We should revisit the guidelines. I would hope that by the end of this calendar year, at the very latest, the committee would have studied and made a report that the minister can take into consideration when he is preparing his report and recommendations to Parliament.

The second matter I want to raise concerns the status of personal health information under the Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act. Honourable senators will perhaps recall the debate on Bill C-6 in this place, during November and December of 1999. This was a debate on a most important bill, which I have said and continue to believe will be one of the main accomplishments of the past Parliament.

Nevertheless, the application of Part I of the legislation to the health care sector caused a great deal of difficulty. Different perspectives were brought to bear even within the health care sector. The doctors and the dentists, or the organizations that represent them, were of the view that the privacy provisions were inadequate and they wanted to, in effect, strengthen them by incorporating their own codes into the legislation. Others in the

health care sector — I believe the hospitals and the pharmacists, et cetera — felt that the privacy provisions were too onerous and would militate against the kind of exchange of information that is necessary for the proper administration of the health care sector. In any case, we discussed it here.

The committee went into great detail on this matter and issued a report, the result of which was that the Senate amended the bill and sent it back to the House of Commons. Our amendment had the effect of delaying the application of the bill to personal health information for one year following the coming into force of Part I. This was to give the government and the health care sector an opportunity to agree on provisions that are appropriate to that sector. If they have not agreed, then the provisions of Part I will kick in, to no one's satisfaction and to everyone's discomfort. Part I became effective on January 1, 2001. Here again, we do not have much time to come up with a new regime to cover the health care sector.

Simply put, I trust that the Social Affairs Committee will take this on at an early date. I am aware that there is considerable work being done at the federal-provincial level, at the professional level, and in the government, to try to come up with an appropriate regime; however, I feel the committee ought to at least call a senior official or two from the Department of Industry, and/or the Department of Health, more particularly, to find out what is happening.

In that connection, today I noticed for the first time on our Order Paper a motion standing in the name of Senator LeBreton, which I presume was placed there at the instance of the chairman, Senator Kirby. The motion asks for authorization for the committee to examine and report on developments with regard to Bill C-6. That will give them the authority they need to get a status report on the personal health care sector.

In relation to the Cape Breton Development Corporation, honourable senators will recall that we passed Bill C-11 last June. At the time, it was clear to everyone that a buyer was at hand, although we did not know the buyer's name. Minister Goodale was quite definitive in his views as to the kind of deal he wanted to make for Devco in terms of employment levels and the long-term commitment to Cape Breton. In July, a letter of intent was signed by Oxbow Carbon and Minerals, a United States company. The deal was to have been consummated in September. Three conditions were posed: one, the consummation of a coal sales contract to Nova Scotia Power; two, the negotiation of a collective agreement with the Devco unions; and, three, agreement on a purchase price. Since then, no one knows what is happening. A curtain of silence has descended over the whole operation. Naturally, there is a good deal of uncertainty and insecurity in the communities and among the people affected by this Crown corporation. What will happen? I believe I am correct in saying that the policy of the government is that, if they cannot sell this Crown corporation, they will close the one remaining mine, the Prince Mine on the north side.

Honourable senators, I took a look at the Estimates for the next fiscal year, which begins April 1. The financial requirements listed under the Department of Natural Resources for the Cape Breton Development Corporation are considerably less than what they were in the fiscal year now ending. It is not clear to me whether those financial requirements assume a year-long operation by the federal Crown corporation of that company, or whether they assume that it will be successfully sold off.

At any rate, honourable senators, I think that the Standing Senate Committee on Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources, which considered Bill C-11, should take it upon themselves to call the minister as a witness. That is all they need do — call one witness — to get an update so we can find out exactly what the status is of this Crown corporation.

Those are the three matters, honourable senators, that I wanted to bring to your attention. Before I sit down, however, I want, in a time-honoured but in no perfunctory way, to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

I was pleased to hear Senator Cordy mention the one-hundredth anniversary of the incorporation of the Town of Glace Bay in Cape Breton, even if in so doing she stole some of the thunder from Senator Graham, who grew up in the area. I remember, as a very young boy, the fiftieth anniversary of the Town of Glace Bay, when Senator Graham played such a leading part in the celebrations.

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham: On Senators' Corner.

Senator Murray: I bid hail and farewell to those who have left centre stage, as it were, in terms of Senate responsibilities, and those who have arrived at centre stage. Sadly, my farewell to Senator Molgat, our former Speaker, had to be delivered under the circumstances that we know of earlier today, and the farewell is, alas, a permanent and final one to him.

Honourable senators, I am glad to see that Senator Hays has acceded to the Chair. I am sure he will represent us very well. I have had the pleasure of travelling under his leadership on several occasions in Japan, and I know that he makes an effective leader indeed. One has not seen Senate diplomacy in full flower until one has seen Senator Hays performing in a karaoke setting in Tokyo.

Finally, I welcome Senator Carstairs to her new position. I trust that she will have a longer run at it than her three Liberal predecessors. She is off to a good start by recruiting, or causing to be recruited, Senator Robichaud, a New Brunswicker of eminent good sense. We depend on his sense of equity, fairness

[Senator Murray]

and good humour in dealing with many of the matters that keep the place operating from hour to hour and from day to day.

Naturally, we on this side are pleased that our own leader has been acclaimed once again as the Leader of the Opposition. I thought the two leaders got the debate off to a very good start.

• (1650)

Senator Lynch-Staunton did his constitutional duty by pointing to the various gaps, all the matters not mentioned, in the Speech from the Throne. I think Senator Carstairs tried, with some success, to raise our sights above these obvious deficiencies. As a matter of fact, I thought that Senator Carstairs — I mean no disrespect — made a better speech than the Governor General.

In any event, honourable senators, I look forward to hearing other speeches in the course of this debate.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

Hon. Wilfred P. Moore: Honourable senators, I rise today to take part in the debate on the motion for an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

I should like to take this opportunity to mention the late Senator Molgat and his exemplary service to the Senate as our Speaker of almost seven years and to thank him most profusely for that service to Canada.

I congratulate Senators Hays, Carstairs and Robichaud on their respective appointments and wish them every success in their new responsibilities.

I congratulate the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Opposition for being confirmed in their posts.

Also, I commend Senators Cordy and Setlakwe for their insightful speeches in moving and seconding this motion.

Honourable senators, the Speech from the Throne promises more of the solid leadership, sound policy and steady hand that have produced three consecutive majorities for Prime Minister Chrétien.

I should like to focus my remarks today on a particular aspect of the Speech from the Throne. A considerable portion of the speech was devoted to “creating opportunity,” and the importance of skills and learning in the pursuit of that objective. Permit me to cite the key passage:

Canada will only realize its full potential by investing aggressively in the skills and talents of its people.

Honourable senators, the government has identified a critical objective for the continued development of our economy, that objective being ready access to higher education as a means of cultivating a highly skilled workforce. How is this objective to be realized? The Speech from the Throne reveals the government's view:

Building a skilled workforce must be a national effort. The Government of Canada will work with provinces and territories and with non-governmental organizations to ensure that all Canadians, young and old, can achieve their learning goals. Canada must see at least one million more adults pursue learning opportunities during the next five years.

Honourable senators, I agree wholeheartedly that the Government of Canada and the Parliament of Canada have an important role to play in guaranteeing that all Canadians have access to higher education.

The federal government has been involved in education since Confederation. Indeed, in preparation for these remarks, I came across a publication that outlines the history of the objectives of the Government of Canada in the field of education. It was published in 1983 by the then-Secretary of State of Canada, who is now our colleague in the Senate, the Honourable Senator Joyal. In that publication, the Secretary of State noted:

Federal involvement dates back to the latter part of the 19th century and came about through a series of pragmatic responses to challenges which, by their sheer magnitude or by virtue of their national character, appeared to many Canadians to require action on the part of the Government of Canada.

I believe that the emerging concern about accumulated deferred maintenance costs in Canada's post-secondary institutions meets the "test" set out by Senator Joyal. In other words, the problem is one that, by its sheer magnitude and its national character, requires action on the part of the federal government.

From my own experience as a member of the Board of Governors of Saint Mary's University in Halifax since 1994, I know that the cost of maintaining buildings is becoming almost unbearable. The problem is not new. In December of 1997, the Special Senate Committee on Post-Secondary Education tabled its report in the Senate. That committee, as part of its general assessment of the state of post-secondary facilities at the time, observed that the general climate of budgetary restraint over the previous 15 years had forced institutions of higher learning to make difficult expenditure choices. To quote the report, it states, in part:

Physical facilities have deteriorated as priority has of necessity been given to academic functions and serious maintenance needs have been deferred.

The special committee flagged a very important problem. Unfortunately, it made no recommendation on the subject, as it was only beginning to emerge as a serious problem at that time.

Honourable senators, in the four years since that report, the problem has become glaring in its enormity. I refer to a more recent study, published in January of last year by the Association of Atlantic Universities and the Atlantic Provinces Economic

Council. The study, "Our University Students: The Key to Atlantic Canada's Future," found, among other things, the following:

With limited access to public funds for new building construction, most universities across the region have increasingly relied on repairs or renovations to existing facilities. However, since the start of the 1990s, even these expenditures have become increasingly difficult to manage, leading to a significant level of deferred maintenance. The Atlantic universities now estimate that there is over \$400 million in deferred maintenance required across the four provinces.

Honourable senators, the report deals with the Atlantic provinces, but I am sure many of you can confirm that similar problems exist in other regions.

The 1960s and 1970s brought an infrastructure boom to universities across Canada. Every campus saw new structures, including residences, to help meet the rising demand for post-secondary education. Unfortunately, no measures were taken at the time to secure long-term financing of predictable maintenance costs. When public budgets were trimmed in the 1980s and 1990s, universities and colleges did the best they could, prioritizing expenditures that related to immediate academic requirements and deferring maintenance costs. Two decades of such deferrals have left most of our post-secondary institutions struggling to keep existing facilities open, let alone undertaking construction of badly needed new facilities.

Honourable senators, most recent data available tell of a situation that is spiralling out of control. The recent report prepared for the Canadian Association of University Business Officers provides some grim figures. First, the Canada-wide cost estimate to eliminate accumulated deferred maintenance is \$3.6 billion. This is a conservative estimate and may even understate the situation. Second, of that \$3.6 billion, more than \$1 billion is considered urgent. Third, the cost to eliminate the ADM is over \$5,500 per student. Fourth, data on residences is incomplete and would undoubtedly increase the scope of the problem.

Fifth, the Facility Condition Index (FCI) is a well-known measure of the condition of physical plants. It is defined as the ratio of accumulated deferred maintenance over current replacement value. In most of Canada, the FCI ranges from 9 per cent to 12 per cent. The average is 11.3 per cent, which compares unfavourably to the average of 7 per cent in the United States of America.

Finally, in my own region, the average FCI has reached an alarming level of 17.3 per cent.

These numbers demonstrate the magnitude and the national character of this issue, which trigger the interest — even the duty — of the federal government that I spoke of when I quoted the former Secretary of State a moment ago.

Most recently, the Government of Canada continued its involvement in post-secondary education when it took steps to address the national problem of increased student debt. Increased student debt was seen to be significant in its magnitude and national in its scope, so the Government of Canada took action. The principal means was the millennium scholarship fund that was established in the last Parliament. The last Parliament also implemented better tax relief to students.

Having addressed the problem of student debt, I believe the government should now turn its attention to helping solve the emerging problem of infrastructure maintenance. There can be no doubt that this issue meets the test for federal involvement.

Failing to address the problem in the short term will result in even more sharply increasing tuition rates. Failure in the long term could result in a crisis, forcing federal and provincial governments to spend very heavily to compensate for a total collapse of infrastructure. By investing in the short term, governments will protect themselves from a major fiscal burden at some point in the future.

• (1700)

More important, however, we need to change the culture of university funding in Canada. As it used to be with health care, the construction of new infrastructure was often the only way politicians and administrators could think of to spend available money. Even today, the various public and private foundations that help to finance post-secondary institutions focus mainly on either scholarships or the construction of new buildings. The problem of deferred maintenance is simply not addressed. We must change this culture of deficiency. If we want to ensure that Canadians, no matter where they live, have access to higher education, we must help universities put their houses in order by providing the funding necessary to carry out required maintenance without relying exclusively on the public purse. The burden placed on the public treasury by such a program pales in comparison to the cost of waiting to intervene when the situation has reached a crisis level and infrastructure has begun to disintegrate totally.

Those of us who are involved in the administration of post-secondary institutions were pleased with the commitment expressed in the Speech from the Throne. I will quote the relevant passage:

Canada will only realize its full potential by investing aggressively in the skills and talents of its people.

The speech goes on to state:

Building a skilled work force must be a national effort. The Government of Canada will work with provinces and

[Senator Moore]

territories and with non-governmental organizations to ensure that all Canadians, young and old, can achieve their learning goals. Canada must see at least one million more adults pursue learning opportunities during the next five years.

The Prime Minister highlighted the government's commitment in his speech on the address in reply in the other place when he said:

I want Canada to be seen throughout the world as having the most skilled and the most talented labour market force anywhere. That has to be a national goal. And a national effort.

The Prime Minister cited a number of government achievements in this area, including the millennium scholarship fund. He went on to say:

There is more to do, and this government is prepared to play its full part in this national effort.

Those words gave me great hope, honourable senators, that the government will address the fundamental issue of accumulated deferred maintenance costs, because only by addressing those very basic concerns will it be feasible to make significant progress in creating the most skilled workforce in the world.

Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): The Honourable Senator Moore made some important observations with respect to the funding of higher education in Canada. I thank him for putting those on the record.

The honourable senator's focus was on the tremendous latent burden on the operating costs of our universities across the country. He underscored that very clearly with reference to the capital costs associated with renovating the old infrastructure.

If governments do not come up with an appropriate program to facilitate the necessary response to that problem, universities will be only able to turn to that other source of revenue, namely, tuition.

Would the honourable senator share his views on the current high level of indebtedness that Canadian students are incurring? Would he express a view as to whether there is no significant additional revenue for the universities from that source?

Senator Moore: Honourable senators, I thank the honourable senator for his question. Obviously, I am concerned about that. I can speak mostly about my own situation at Saint Mary's University in Halifax. I know what a burden tuition fees are there. They are probably the highest in the province. I do not know that the students can take on much more. However, as I mentioned in my remarks, we must also address the matter of the culture of addressing university facilities and the maintenance thereof. Many foundations in the country have resources, but they tend to want to build anew. We must put in place a program that will encourage them to improve existing resources.

Governments must encourage foundations, both public and private, to invest in our universities. What better way to invest your money than in the youth of the country? It must happen. I do not think we can look to the students to bear increased tuition fees. When that report was written two years ago, fees were \$5,500. I do not know what they are today, but the burden is overbearing. We must find another way to address the problem.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I regret to inform you that the time for the speech, questions and comments has expired.

Senator Kinsella: We will agree to an extension.

The Hon. the Speaker: It is up to Senator Moore to ask for leave for additional time if he so desires.

Senator Moore: I do not mind, honourable senators.

The Hon. the Speaker: Is leave granted?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Senator Kinsella: My second question to the Honourable Senator Moore relates to the cost of post-secondary education as it is borne by students. I should like to draw the attention of all honourable senators to an international treaty obligation that Canada has undertaken by virtue of its ratification by Canada, with the written consent of every premier across Canada. I am speaking of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights which states that states parties — of which Canada is one — must undertake to set in place progressive steps to make possible free post-secondary education.

This covenant was ratified by Canada in 1976. It came into force on August 16, 1976. Would you not agree that since that time there has been an increase in the cost to students of post-secondary education rather than a decrease?

Senator Moore: I was not aware of that international agreement, but I expect that the figure has increased since 1976. The purpose of my speech today is to deal with one element of attempting to hold the line. Free post-secondary education is a wonderful goal, but I do not know that we have yet reached that point. I would like to see us get our houses in order first, and then aim for Utopia.

Senator Kinsella: Honourable senators, we have a legal international obligation which we are clearly not meeting. The situation has worsened rather than improved.

Did the honourable senator have a chance, in preparing his remarks, to research the amount of money that Canada invests in post-secondary education in comparison to other countries? If so,

was he not impressed with the significantly large amount of money that Canada has been investing and continues to invest in post-secondary education? Did he not find that we rank very favourably with the other countries in the G7 or G8?

• (1710)

Do you know how much money Canada is putting in globally and what that means in terms of the percentage of gross national product? To the same point, if we are putting in that much money, why is it that the cost to the students has continued to increase in Canada but not in these other countries? Is the problem not that we have insufficient money in the system, but that we are not managing it properly?

Senator Moore: I am not aware of the numbers mentioned by the honourable senator. I did not look at that as I was preparing my remarks.

Hon. Michael A. Meighen: Honourable senators, this is more encouragement for Senator Moore than it is a question. In terms of infrastructure renewal for universities, it seems that there might be two approaches to take. One might be an analogous approach. I do not know the details, but in the United States it is called a tax-exempt municipal bond. Perhaps the honourable senator looked into that approach, or something similar whereby the universities could issue such bonds. The people who put up the money — buy the bonds — would receive favourable tax treatment on the grounds that, obviously, the money would be going directly to the particular need.

Indeed, even without any tax exemption or tax benefit status, the Toronto General and Western Hospital financed its massive, new construction primarily through a bond issue. That was an innovative financing method for new construction at a hospital. Perhaps that is one approach Senator Moore could look into, and I would be happy to participate in any investigation along those lines.

In this country — and this applies to various governments — we seem to be able to come up with road-building infrastructure programs. Perhaps now is the time for a university renewal program shared by the federal and provincial governments, alumni and the business community. If an incentive could be built into such a program — a matching government grant, for example — we might get the private sector, in the form of alumni and the business community, to participate.

There are avenues to be explored, and I encourage the honourable senator to do that. Will he explore those avenues?

Senator Moore: Honourable senators, I have heard about the municipal bond model. I am not fully familiar with it, but hopefully the discussion that will flow from this debate and the inquiry that I have initiated will provide us with ideas to deal with this problem. My honourable friend mentioned programs for roads and infrastructure. He is right; monies are transferred from the federal government to the provinces. We cannot control, as he well knows, exactly where the money goes. Hopefully this debate will point to the issue and will force a priority in respect of where the money should be applied.

Hon. Douglas Roche: Honourable senators, I begin by expressing my sorrow at the death of Senator Molgat, and I express my condolences to the Molgat family.

As a fellow Albertan, I am pleased to see Senator Hays in the Chair. I wish him great fortune in his role. Again, I express my congratulations to the Leader of the Government, the Deputy Leader of the Government, the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and I offer them my cooperation.

Honourable senators, is there alienation today in Canada? Yes. Is it growing? Yes. Is disaffection with government real? Yes. I want to talk about something much larger than the Western alienation issue that we have been hearing so much about lately.

The alienation that concerns me is the exclusion, marginalization and isolation of the growing numbers of poor people in a richer Canada. The working poor, the homeless, and hungry children are looking for human dignity, community and a feeling of truly belonging to this great country. I am very much afraid that governments have forgotten that they have a responsibility first and foremost to protect the common good.

Let me first dismiss the idea that alienation is something particular to Western Canada and that Albertans are suffering some sort of bad deal in Confederation and want to build a “firewall” around the province. Is there a bad deal? These complainers who are making a career of feeling “alienated” should follow me on my journeys through developing countries where 1 billion people live without ready access to water, health and education facilities, and where many are caught up in the ravages of war. Then they would, as I do, kiss the ground of Canada on their return.

Canada is consistently hailed by the United Nations as the best country in terms of human development in the world. The grumbling of the few should stop. The voices of the great majority of Albertans, who speak moderately for a stronger Confederation, must be reinforced.

Honourable senators, a clear majority of recently polled Albertans rejected the provincialism of the “Alberta First” agenda. This majority of 67 per cent of Albertans continues to support national programs such as the Canada Pension Plan and the Canada Health Act.

Far from being downtrodden, Alberta approaches from a position of considerable strength the complexities of equalization that pay for our national programs.

Real GDP growth reached 5.5 per cent in Alberta last year and is expected to grow another 5.7 per cent in 2001-02. That is by far the fastest growth in the country.

Alberta’s total tax burden is the lowest in the country. Moreover, Alberta has no sales tax.

The per capita disposable income is \$22,489 — the highest in the country.

Alberta’s oil and gas industry is projected to earn \$10.3 billion this year.

The Alberta Treasury is booming with a \$7.3 billion surplus last year.

The Alberta debt will be eliminated in two years — the first province in Canada to become debt-free.

The unemployment rate is 4.8 per cent, the lowest in Canada, and Alberta leads Canada in job creation.

The University of Alberta has been rated the fourth best overall university in Canada.

We have nature trails galore, mountains of world renown, and a population density of only 4.6 people per square kilometre, which gives us all the space we need and more.

We have a quality of life that is unmatched anywhere in the world — and I have been in every region of the world.

It is a portion of the taxes of the richest provinces such as Alberta that helps to provide minimum national standards for social programs in the poorer provinces. Is that not the way that Canadians want to ensure the strengths of the whole of Canada? I can assure honourable senators that this is the way the great majority of Albertans want it.

The measurement of our society must be more than an accounting exercise. We do not make a great province or a great country by building a “firewall” around ourselves. What a regressive approach to government.

Honourable senators, we must have a vision for the Canada that we want. I will tell you my vision. I want a country that is human-centred and genuinely democratic; a country that builds and protects peace, equality, justice and development. I want a country where human security, as envisioned in the principles of the United Nations Charter, is the foremost government aim. I want a country where everyone lives in a clean environment with a fair distribution of our resources and where human rights are protected by a body of law.

Do we see such a vision in the recently delivered Throne Speech? I regret that we do not. That brings me back to the real sources of alienation in Canada.

• (1720)

The Speech from the Throne called for a national project “to ensure that no Canadian child suffers the debilitating effects of poverty.” That is very edifying. But what is the record? In 1989, all political parties in the House of Commons vowed to eliminate child poverty by the year 2000. Since then, the number of poor children in Canada has increased by 43 per cent. One in five children in Canada still lives in poverty, an increase of 402,000 since 1989.

UNICEF reported that Canada has one of the worst records on child poverty among the world's richest countries. In a ranking of the 23 states of the OECD, Canada positioned seventeenth.

The Edmonton-based Quality of Life Commission's new report, "Listen to the Children," dramatically illustrates, in the words of children themselves, the effects of debilitating poverty. Politicians everywhere should read it.

The Vanier Institute for the Family, named after one of Canada's great Governors General, says the gap between the rich and the poor continues to grow in Canada despite the buoyant Canadian economy of the last half the 1990s. In 1998, 5 million Canadian families saw their incomes shrink, while 3.3 million families showed increases. It is for this reason that the Social Affairs Commission of the Catholic Bishops of Canada recently issued a strong statement on economic and social justice in a letter to parliamentarians entitled, "The Common Good or Exclusion: A Choice for Canadians."

The bishops highlighted the challenges facing this new Parliament, reminding us that solidarity comes from the just distribution of resources and opportunities and efforts to create a more just social and political order. This is what governing for the common good should be all about.

Governing for the common good means we must never accept exclusion. True respect for the dignity of all people means that each individual's potential and contribution is needed in order to make our society the best that it can be.

Concern for the well-being of Canadians must not only focus on issues such as fiscal imbalance, federal-provincial transfers, visibility, intergovernmental cooperation and parliamentary reform. We must also develop a community of shared values, shared challenges and equality opportunities, based on a sense of trust, home and reciprocity. Canadian democracy demands that each individual shall have the same capacity for engaging in the decision-making processes that affect his or her life.

It seems to me that these values are indeed eroding, undermined not so much by whether Ottawa or the provinces get the bigger tax grab but by the apathy and loss of dignity that economic exclusion has fostered within the Canadian people.

One of the key findings of the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology in its 1990 Report on Social Cohesion is that the faith of Canadians in their political institutions is declining. No wonder the voter turnout in the recent federal election, at 61 per cent, was the lowest since 1896.

We need desperately to rebuild the confidence of people that governments will play their proper role in building the conditions

for economic and social justice. It is a myth to think that governments are immobilized by the market forces of globalization.

Here, I recall the British government's white paper of December 2000, "Eliminating World Poverty: Making Globalization Work for the Poor." An overarching theme of this document is that, if well managed, the benefits of globalization for the poor can substantially outweigh the costs with the right policies on the part of government.

The British government's white paper makes the case that good social policy goes together with good economic policy — investment in social services and social protection is an essential investment in economic development.

What is primarily needed is political will. It is not inevitable that globalization will work well for the poor — nor that it will work against them. This depends on the policies that governments pursue.

I do not want policies in Canada that promote tax cuts that benefit mostly the rich. I want government surpluses used for social reinvestment to rebuild health, education and social programs, as well as debt relief.

Prime Minister Chrétien recently said the following: "I deeply believe that government has the responsibility to promote social justice." I applaud the Prime Minister's words, but they need to be accompanied by adequate money for social programs. That is where the real investment in our country should be made. The poor have suffered enough in the cutback of social programs in the name of deficit-cutting. Now they have a rightful claim on the new government surpluses.

On motion of Senator DeWare, for Senator Kinsella, debate adjourned.

TOBACCO YOUTH PROTECTION BILL

SECOND READING

Hon. Colin Kenny moved the second reading of Bill S-15, to enable and assist the Canadian tobacco industry in attaining its objective of preventing the use of tobacco products by young persons in Canada.—(*Honourable Senator Kenny*).

He said: Honourable senators, I should like to take this occasion to make a few remarks on Bill S-15. I spoke to the chamber on the subject before, some might feel *ad nauseum*, so I will endeavour to be brief.

I have heard it said that we have the best tobacco control program in the world: no adds, no promotions, big colourful warning labels on cigarette packages and a \$20-million program for enforcement and education. In California, they have both advertising and promotion. The tobacco industry is forced to put tiny warning labels on the sides of cigarettes. Our youth smoking rate is 29 per cent; theirs is 6.9 per cent.

Honourable senators, who do you think has the best smoking program in the world? Which program is most effective? Ours, at 30 per cent for youth smoking? Or theirs, at 6.9 per cent for youth smoking?

Honourable senators, I think we are very lucky today. From time to time, we get a chance to change things. We have been given this opportunity to help young Canadians with the problem that faces all of our society. If this chamber can be persuaded, we will have a chance to profoundly affect the lives of our children for years to come. Let me briefly describe the problem.

Back in 1997, when I first began to look at tobacco statistics, 40,000 deaths a year were contributed to tobacco-related diseases. That was the widely accepted estimate. Now Health Canada estimates 45,000 deaths per year is a more accurate figure. In fact that figure may be conservative because Health Canada does not maintain records on the number of deaths related to environmental tobacco smoke.

• (1730)

The trend also appears to be going in the wrong direction regarding the age at which smokers start. In 1997, it was widely accepted that 80 per cent of smokers started before the age of 18 but, on January 18, 1999, the Minister of Health announced that 85 per cent started before the age of 16, and many started as young as 10, 11 and 12.

Each year, 250,000 children become trapped. Since the Senate first addressed this problem, three-quarters of a million young people have become addicted. If we do not address the problem this year, the number will rise to 1 million new smokers since we first started talking about it.

Health Canada currently estimates that tobacco-related diseases have a direct health cost in excess of \$3 billion per year and indirect costs to the economy in excess of \$7 billion. New research is coming out almost every day linking more health problems to the effects of tobacco smoke.

Young people are the most important target group for smoking-prevention activities because that is when people begin to smoke. No one starts smoking at the age of 40. That is when they are looking for the patch or the pill or some other solution. The earlier people start, the longer they smoke and the harder it is for them to quit.

I would like to address briefly an argument that I hear often. It is the argument called freedom of choice. We have a tobacco industry that uses bogus arguments like "freedom of choice" or "lifestyle." Where is the place of young people in this argument? Freedom of choice might apply if you are 35 or 45, but does it apply if you are 10, 11 or 12? Are we going to say to our kids,

you have the freedom of choice to smoke if you want to or not; or do we have an obligation to these kids to do something, to try to educate them, to try to persuade them, to try to ensure that they do not get addicted to this terrible habit which will spoil their quality of life by making them more susceptible to numerous diseases and will inevitably shorten their lives?

The most recent phrase coming from the Tobacco Manufacturers Council is "a risky adult pleasure." Think about it — "a risky adult pleasure." What better way to get young people involved than to describe something as "a risky adult pleasure"? Can you imagine a teenager not finding that pretty alluring?

We have an obligation to our children to educate them and to protect them from the tobacco companies who rely on kids for their very future. Smoking remains the leading cause of preventable death in Canada, more than 10 times higher than the number who die as a result of automobile accidents, including drunk driving which is in second place.

What is missing? Honourable senators, the gap is in funding. Currently, the federal government has allocated \$20 million to fight the tobacco problem. That is 66 cents per capita. Every year, the federal government collects \$2.25 billion, including GST, in tobacco taxes. That means the government is spending \$1 on tobacco control for every \$100 it collects in taxes.

How do we find our way to a solution? In August of 1999, the highly respected Atlanta Center for Disease Control published a model called "Best Practices for Comprehensive Tobacco Control." This paper was based on successful, well-established programs in California, Massachusetts and other states in America. For example, between 1998 and 1999, California's overall cigarette consumption was down 50 per cent.

Recently I had a very interesting conversation with Dr. Dileep Bal who is head of the California program. I called him up, looking for some moral support. He said, "Oh, Colin, things are terrible here." When I asked what he meant, he answered, "Well, I have to tell you; our budget has been cut in half." I said that was a terrible thing to happen to the best program in North America. He said, "Yes, that is true, Colin, but you have to understand that, in the last two years, smoking in California has gone from a consumption rate of 120 packages per capita to 60 packages per capita." The budget was cut.

California's current youth smoking rate is 6.9 per cent. Canada's youth smoking rate is 29 per cent. In November of 1992, Massachusetts levied an extra 25 cents on each pack of cigarettes. Since 1993, per capita cigarette consumption has dropped by over 17 per cent. This reduction was the largest single decline in Massachusetts history, and it occurred nearly three times faster than predicted.

For jurisdictions the size of Canada, the Atlanta Center for Disease Control model proposes spending between U.S. \$5 and \$16 per capita. That works out to spending roughly between Can. \$9 and \$24 — versus the 66 cents we are spending now.

[Senator Kenny]

The “Best Practices for a Comprehensive Tobacco Control Program” report gives us a template for the spending which includes community programs, school programs, province-wide and national programs, media campaigns, counter-marketing programs, cessation hot lines, evaluation and administration. Under each of these areas, in the template it describes ranges so you can adjust it to your own community and to the special needs of the area in which you live. For example, according to the model, the federal government should be spending \$90 million on media advertising, rather than the \$3 million they are currently spending. Massachusetts is currently spending U.S. \$10 per capita which works out to around Can. \$15. Meanwhile, Vermont decided to spend in the area of U.S. \$15 which works out to Can. \$23. Finally, Ohio is currently spending approximately Can. \$32 per capita on their tobacco control programs.

My point is that there are jurisdictions in North America that are taking this problem seriously. They are putting real money behind it, and they are getting real results. Massachusetts and California have programs that are popular. They work and they pay for themselves, not just in dollars saved. Our committee heard from a witness on Bill S-13 who told us that their payback in California started in year three — so such programs do pay for themselves. They save lives, they reduce suffering, and they are exactly what we need for kids in Canada.

Before I turn to the most important principles of the bill, I must point out that our Department of Finance does not yet understand the meaning of “comprehensive tobacco control program.” They do not yet realize that each of the parts must interact and must be of a sufficient magnitude to make it work.

Right now, I hear rumours of a program costing \$70 million per year. That may sound terrific to some. In fact, it will probably be announced as a five-year program costing \$350 million, which is a tripling of the budget. The Atlanta Center for Disease Control model is calling for \$360 million per year at the bottom quartile of the range, not the top of the range.

• (1740)

The most important objective of Bill S-15 is to set a reasonable level of spending. Second, it provides for the development of a Canadian template for funding, along the lines of what the CDC has created. Third, it sets up a foundation that is at arm’s length from the government.

The bill, honourable senators, would establish a levy of three-quarters of a cent per cigarette. That works out to 19 cents a pack or \$1.50 a carton. That would produce in the area of \$360 million annually, or about \$12 per capita.

The bill would establish “a levy for industry purposes” to provide for stable funding. This is the bane of the health community. They do not have stable funding. They have on-again, off-again programs. They cannot plan from year to year, and they cannot function in an effective way without some assurance that their funding will be kept at a stable, predictable level.

The bill also calls for a transparent decision-making process, meaning that decisions will not be made behind closed doors any more. We would have evaluation, which is fundamental to the project. Ten per cent is set aside for evaluation of every project in this bill. Too much of what we have is not evaluated to determine its effectiveness, and this dooms us to continually repeat programs of little or no value.

Finally, honourable senators, the bill has a cap of 5 per cent for administration so that administrative costs do not get out of line.

The trends indicate that the situation is not improving. In fact, it seems to be getting worse. Also, we now have the benefit of the Atlanta Centers for Disease Control model, which shows that parts of our program have to be coordinated, one with another, at the right order of magnitude to be of a sufficient critical mass. If we do not have a critical mass — by that, I am talking about having enough spending — it just will not work.

Let me turn, if I may, to why the foundation should be at arm’s length from government. The first reason is because no one has yet developed precise solutions to address adolescent behaviour. New approaches are being developed, and the exercise is, to a large extent, won by trial and error.

I can go back and talk about Dr. Dileep Bal again. I remember going into his office in Sacramento. He is a big man, and he took me by the shoulder and he said “Colin, come with me. I want to show you my bookshelf.” He had a broad set of bookshelves. The top two rows were all studies. He said, “Colin, these are my failures.” On the next row were fewer books, and he said those were his successes. “But I could not have had my successes if I had not first had the failures,” he added.

The correct setting for a comprehensive tobacco control program is not a political one. It is, rather, a scientific one, one step removed from government. It would be inappropriate for the Minister of Health to have to answer on a daily basis in Question Period to the results of each project. This would be the case if the program were with Health Canada because the legislation requires regular evaluation and full disclosure.

Failures and successes will be readily apparent. The government does not like to associate itself with failures, but the health and scientific communities know that failures are a key part of the learning process.

Second, an arm’s-length agency reduces the likelihood of the political interference that has frequently hampered programs in the United States, particularly in California and Massachusetts, and it is important that we do not make the same mistakes here.

Finally, let me turn to where we stand now. We have support from over 520 organizations across the country. The medical community is on side, as are the NGOs and the public. An Environics poll, accurate 19 times out of 20, plus or minus 3 per cent, found that 78 per cent of the public supports the bill. As well, a Pollara poll shows that two thirds of those who did not support the bill changed their minds when they learned about the success that California had with its 6.9 per cent smoking rate. In other words, two thirds of the people said they did not support the bill because they thought there was no solution to youth smoking. Well, there is a solution.

Honourable senators, in addition to the medical community, the NGOs, and the public, there has been a major development since I spoke to you last. Much to our surprise, Imperial Tobacco and JTI-MacDonald Corporation, which represent 80 per cent of the industry, have come on board. They were not consulted on the bill. They did not submit a brief. The committee members who heard them were totally shocked when they came before the committee and said that they were supporting the bill. The committee in its entirety met in my office two hours before the hearing. We were sitting there, planning our questions and how we were going to nail them. We were trading questions back and forth, making sure everyone had a part to play. The last thing any of us thought would happen was that these people would come on board. My jaw dropped when they did, but they did.

Honourable senators, these companies have committed themselves in public — you saw the ads — to \$400 million a year in perpetuity to support this foundation. Undoubtedly, they have their motives, but it is pointless for me to speculate on their strategy. They support the bill as written, and they are putting their money where their mouths are.

This directly addresses the issue raised by the Speaker in the other place when he rejected Bill S-13. More important, it provides real funding in the order of magnitude recommended by the Atlanta Center for Disease Control to fund community, school, regional and national programs to encourage and persuade young people not to smoke. That is what it is all about.

Honourable senators, three years have gone by since we started this effort. If we do not act now, over 100,000 Canadians will have died and more than 1 million young people will have been addicted by the year's end. No one else has come forward with a solution or even a proposal.

This bill has been vetted by health groups and physicians from coast to coast and promises to bring Canadian children the protection enjoyed in many American states. It is the right thing to do, and now is the right time to do it.

Hon. Eymard G. Corbin: Honourable senators, I should like to ask a question for the purpose of debate only because I believe in my honourable friend's endeavours to get some action on this front.

[Senator Kenny]

Last night, I was looking at the latest issue of *Harper's*. I find the *Harper's* index quite interesting. I came upon the two following statistics. I do not know if they refer to the state of Washington or the capital region, but I believe it is the state. The percentage of Washington children who completed an eight-year anti-smoking program in the 1990s and who now smoke regularly is 25.4; the percentage of children in the program's non-participating control group who now smoke is 25.7. How does the honourable senator react to those statistics?

Senator Kenny: Honourable senators may feel that this question was planted, but it was not. I am familiar with the Washington study. The answer is very simple. Washington went at it for eight years, much as we have done, and they did not have a comprehensive tobacco control program. They simply focused all their efforts on a single program.

• (1750)

When you are dealing with adolescents, a good example to consider is that of buying a car. There is no one in this chamber who, after simply reading an ad, would go out to buy a car. If you were thinking about buying a car, you might read the ad, talk to your friends, read consumer guides, go down to the dealer, kick the tires and take the car for a test drive. You would get lots of input, lots of information, from different sources before you made your decision. Adolescents are the same, honourable senators. The Centers for Disease Control in Atlanta, California, Massachusetts, and the other places that have figured out how to get better results, have come to the conclusion that you cannot just go at kids from one direction.

The problem to which the honourable senator referred took place in Washington state. The state put all its eggs in one basket by simply having a school program. The kids turned off; they did not buy in. Had Washington state gone about it the way that California did — and I believe Washington state is contiguous with California — then they would have had the television ads, the community programs and the quit lines. They would have had the whole nine yards. There would have been a coordinated effort and they would have spent enough money had they done it the way California did. They would not then be stuck with their 24.7 smoking rate after having wasted millions of dollars over eight years.

What I am afraid of happening here in Canada is that if we do not get our act together and if we do not have a comprehensive tobacco control program, one that is coordinated and of the right size, then we will end up looking just like Washington state.

I thank the honourable senator for asking the question.

[Translation]

Hon. Pierre Claude Nolin: Honourable senators, I do not intend to speak for long because you know that I support this bill. This is the third time we have had this sort of bill before us. I think support for it will be all but unanimous.

Some of you have expressed certain reservations outside the House. One of these, which I heard recently, is worth further attention. One colleague told me that he did not agree with the purpose of the bill and did not think that a foundation outside government should be given such a large amount of money to do what the government should be doing.

That honourable senator is absolutely right. All the governments that have tackled this problem have done so using measures that were too limited to do the job.

We wish that governments had initiated measures and advanced the significant sums of money needed to achieve the objectives. California and Massachusetts got the necessary funding. We did not.

We therefore have no other choice but to turn to an independent foundation, whose source of funding involves no intervention by any form of government, to ensure the implementation of the objectives in the bill.

Some of you have concerns about the bill. We will have another opportunity to hear several witnesses in committee who could not be heard in hearings on the last bill. Honourable senators with concerns should not hesitate to share them with us. We do not have all the answers, but, after three tries, I can tell you that we have covered a lot of ground and have heard most of the arguments. For those who remember the arguments raised by the Speaker of the other place, we are satisfied this time, especially with the unexpected support of the tobacco manufacturers, that the other House will have no choice but to examine this important measure, which you have twice approved. I strongly suggest, for a third time, you support this measure and refer it to committee.

[*English*]

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to and bill read second time.

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

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

On motion of Senator Kenny, bill referred to the Standing Senate Committee on Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources.

THE LATE HONOURABLE GILDAS L. MOLGAT

TRIBUTE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRINCE OF WALES

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, before we proceed to the next order of business, I should like to request leave to read a message to honourable senators from His Royal Highness, the Prince of Wales. Is leave granted?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, the message reads as follows:

ST. JAMES'S PALACE
LONDON

For the Speaker of the Senate

I was deeply saddened to hear of the sudden death of Gildas Molgat and wanted to extend my deepest sympathy to the Canadian Senate. He set the finest possible example of public service and amongst the wide spectrum of his interests, worked tirelessly for my Regiment, The Royal Winnipeg Rifles, as Honorary Colonel. This comes with my heartfelt condolences.

Charles
Prince of Wales

FOOD AND DRUGS ACT

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. Jerahmiel S. Grafstein moved second reading of Bill S-18, to Amend the Food and Drugs Act (clean drinking water).—(*Honourable Senator Grafstein*).

He said: Honourable senators, way back in October 1965, the Right Honourable John Turner, then a youthful backbencher of Parliament, made a rather prescient speech entitled, "Clean Water — A National Priority." In that speech, he said, "No resource is more fundamental to Canada's future than water."

Since that time, Canada's clean water supply, the largest in the world, even then in danger of pollution, has deteriorated further.

Now, honourable senators, we witness across Canada a clear and present danger to public health emerging in recent months due to the obvious deteriorating state of our community drinking water systems.

Regretfully, the sorry saga of Walkerton, in my home province of Ontario, was only a wake-up call.

In recent months, reports estimate 357 out of 645 Ontario drinking water systems failed to meet provincial standards. In Quebec, at least 90 drinking water systems have received boiled water advisories recently. In Newfoundland, 188, or 25 per cent of all of Newfoundland's water systems, have received boiled water advisories. Some 171 Aboriginal water systems — one out of five — have been found to be polluted by chemicals. Senator Watt has pointed out to some senators the dire health consequences suffered by the Aboriginal population as a result of unsafe drinking waters in the Aboriginal communities across the North. In Saskatchewan, 28 drinking water systems have received boiled water advisories. Late last year, 18 public schools in Manitoba were advised that their drinking water was unsafe.

Honourable senators, does this fearsome catalogue not *prima facie* represent a clear and present danger to public health in every region of Canada? What to do, and what to do quickly?

My bill to amend the Food and Drugs Act is a simple, surgical, cost-effective means for the federal government to assume the exercise of its constitutional powers. Under the Constitution, the regulation of food has a dual aspect, allowing both federal and provincial regulation. For some, this bill will raise the question of the modern scope and ambit of the federal government in our society. When should the federal government act? What role for the federal government was envisioned by the separation of powers and the Constitution?

The Hon. the Speaker: I regret to interrupt the Honourable Senator Grafstein.

Honourable senators, it being six o'clock, I am obliged to leave the Chair, unless there is leave given not to see the clock. Is leave granted?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

• (1800)

Senator Grafstein: Honourable senators, what was the reach of federal checks and balances? To what extent was residual power in the face of deficient provincial governance encapsulated in the overriding federal power of “peace, order and good government”? When a clear and present danger to public health across all regions of Canada appears, should the federal government vigorously occupy its space of this dual field when provincial regulations of drinking water systems appear not only to be deficient but dangerous to public health? Apparently, over 700 drinking water systems across Canada, based on recent reports, fail to meet existing health standards. There may be many more.

The bill's remediation is simple in form. The Food and Drugs Act is amended to expand the definition of “food” to include community drinking water systems and the collection and distribution of drinking water to 25 or more inhabitants. No new regulatory regime need be established. A powerful regulatory regime already exists under the Food and Drugs Act.

This bill merely amends the Food and Drugs Act to include water from community water systems for human consumption. This act was chosen as the best vehicle for the amendment, as it is this act that governs federal control over food with the power to establish standards and to inspect, investigate and enforce standards to protect public health.

The amendment permits federal control of water systems, except temporary and extremely small systems. The federal governance is based on the theory of “responsible government.” This will allow the federal government to take responsibility for the protection of public health with respect to water in the same way as it does for other foods, including carbonated drinking water and chewing gum.

[Senator Grafstein]

Clause 1(1) adds “water from a community water system” to the list of things defined as “food.” This effectively extends the scope of the act into water quality control and makes applicable to drinking water all the powers and responsibilities of that act that currently relate to food.

Further amendments to the act are proposed to make the quality control, inspection and protection aspects of the bill effective for water systems.

Clause 1(2) widens the definition of “sell” to ensure that the powers in the act cover the possession of water for the purposes of distribution, as drinking water is sometimes provided by arrangements that are not strictly “selling.”

Clause 1(3) adds a definition of “article” to certain unpackaged bulk substances such as water and defines “community water system” as one that supplies 25 or more people for more than 30 days a year, to exclude very small and temporary systems, for which federal regulation might be an unreasonable burden.

Clause 2 extends the section 7 “sanitary conditions” requirement of the act to cover collection, as water is unique in the food and drink category as it is not produced or manufactured, but “collected” from natural sources using both natural and man-made channels.

Clause 3 amends the section 23 powers of inspection to cover the power to enter places from where drinking water is collected. This would include anywhere in the watershed. In addition, the inspection zone is further widened to allow inspection of places from which contaminants might escape into and contaminate food, but, most importantly, drinking water.

This amendment would ensure that inspectors could go to places such as agricultural or industrial operations from which contaminants might reach the water either in the distribution system or in the area from which it is collected. The clause widens the regulation-making powers to cover the means of collection, which are particularly important in the case of drinking water.

Honourable senators, the federal government already issues safe drinking water standards. These federal standards are guidelines only. There is no mandatory federal inspection or testing of provincial drinking water systems. There are no federal, punitive consequences for failing to maintain clean drinking water.

It is my hope that the Senate will speedily approve this bill on second reading. The bill could then be quickly referred to a committee of the Senate to carefully investigate the defects and deficiencies; the failure of the provinces, territories and public health regimes in regulation; and the role of federal governance to renovate this appalling state of affairs that appears, on its face, to be so dangerous to public health and safety.

Think about this, honourable senators: The health of thousands of Canadians might be at risk. Think of the direct economic consequences of the increased cost to a health system already overloaded by burgeoning costs. Think about the consequences of an unhealthy population to our economic competitiveness.

By way of comparative exegesis, the responsibility for safe drinking water in the United States ultimately lies with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, the federal agency established primarily under the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974 by the U.S. Congress.

Honourable senators, my mother is always right: An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. A speedy passage of this measure could restore confidence in public health, a paramount responsibility of all governments.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

Hon. Nicholas W. Taylor: Honourable senators, would the honourable senator permit a question for clarification purposes?

As honourable senators know, I come from the West where a great deal of our water is ingested by animals, which water comes out of different wells, dugouts and so on. When Senator Grafstein refers to “drinking water,” is he referring to potable water consumed by humans, and not animals?

Senator Grafstein: Yes. Water as defined as food under the Food and Drugs Act.

On motion of Senator Kinsella, debate adjourned.

[*Translation*]

REVIEW OF ANTI-DRUG POLICY

MOTION TO ESTABLISH SPECIAL SENATE COMMITTEE—
DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Nolin, seconded by the Honourable Senator Molgat:

That a Special Committee of the Senate be appointed for a period of three years to thoroughly examine Canada's anti-drug legislation and policies, to carry out a broad consultation of the Canadian public, and finally, to make recommendations for a national strategy on illegal drugs developed by and for Canadians;

That the Committee, in pursuing this mandate, give particular importance to issues relating to cannabis and prepare an interim report on cannabis;

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

- review the federal government's policy on illegal drugs in Canada, its effectiveness, and the ways in which it is implemented and enforced;

- study public policy approaches adopted by other countries and determine if there are applications to Canada's needs;

- examine Canada's international role and obligations under United Nations conventions on narcotics and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other related treaties in order to determine whether these treaties authorize it to take action other than laying criminal charges and imposing sentences (at the international level);

- examine the social and health effects of illegal drugs and explore the potential consequences and impacts of alternative policies;

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

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

That the Honourable Senators Kenny, Molgat, Nolin, Rossiter and (a fifth Senator to be named by the Chief Government Whip) be named to the Committee;

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

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

That the papers and evidence received and taken on the subject and the work accomplished by the Special Committee on Illegal Drugs during the Second Session of the Thirty-sixth Parliament be referred to the Committee;

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

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

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

Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, the motion has been adjourned in my name. I yield the floor to Senator Kenny who would like to speak to this motion.

[English]

MOTION IN AMENDMENT

Hon. Colin Kenny: Honourable senators, I move:

That the motion be amended by deleting all of the words following the word "That," and replacing them with the following:

... a special committee of the Senate be struck to examine:

- The approach taken by Canada to cannabis, its preparations, derivatives and similar synthetic preparations, in context;
- The effectiveness of this approach, the means used to implement it and the monitoring of its application;
- The related official policies adopted by other countries;
- Canada's international role and obligations under United Nations agreements and conventions on narcotics, in connection with cannabis, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other related treaties; and
- The social and health impacts of cannabis and the possible consequences of different policies;

That the special committee consist of five senators, three of whom shall constitute a quorum;

That the Honourable Senators Banks, Kenny, Nolin, Rossiter and (a fifth Senator to be named by the Chief Government Whip) be named to the committee;

That the committee be authorized to send for persons, papers and records, to hear witnesses, to report from time to time, and to print from day to day such papers and evidence as may be ordered by it;

That the briefs and evidence heard during consideration of Bill C-8, an Act respecting the control of certain drugs, their precursors and other substances and to amend certain other Acts and repeal the Narcotic Control Act in consequence thereof, by the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs during the Second Session of the Thirty-fifth Parliament be referred to the committee;

That the documents and evidence compiled on this matter and the work accomplished by the Special Senate

Committee on Illegal Drugs during the Second Session of the Thirty-sixth Parliament be referred to the committee;

That the committee be empowered to authorize, if deemed appropriate, the broadcasting on radio and/or television and the coverage via electronic media of all or a part of its proceedings and the information it holds;

That the committee present its final report no later than August 31, 2002; and that the committee retain the powers necessary to publicize its findings for distribution of the study contained in its final report for 30 days after the tabling of that report;

That the committee be authorized, notwithstanding customary practice, to table its report to the Clerk of the Senate if the Senate is not sitting, and that a report so tabled be deemed to have been tabled in the Senate.

• (1810)

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

Hon. Nicholas W. Taylor: Honourable senators, I do not think the motion should be presented until the printed amendment has been circulated in the Senate at least one day in advance. Perhaps it has come around. It seems to have been circulated today, which does not give one time to review the amendment. I would prefer that it be tabled for a day.

The committee has until 2002 to report. I believe it would be in order to table the motion until the next sitting so that I have a chance to review the amendment. I would be the first to back off if the amendment was put on my desk a day or so ago and I missed it, but if it was only put on my desk a few minutes ago, then it is not a proper way of doing business.

On motion of Senator Taylor, debate adjourned.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO ENGAGE SERVICES

Hon. Peter A. Stollery, pursuant to notice of February 22, 2001, moved:

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

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO PERMIT ELECTRONIC COVERAGE

Hon. Peter A. Stollery, pursuant to notice of February 22, 2001, moved:

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

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO STUDY EMERGING DEVELOPMENTS IN RUSSIA AND UKRAINE AND TO APPLY PAPERS AND EVIDENCE OF PREVIOUS SESSION TO CURRENT STUDY

Hon. Peter A. Stollery, pursuant to notice of February 22, 2001, moved:

That the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs be authorized to examine and report on emerging political, social, economic and security developments in Russia and Ukraine; Canada's policy and interests in the region; and other related matters;

That the papers and evidence received and taken on the subject and the work accomplished by the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs during the Second Session of the Thirty-sixth Parliament be referred to the Committee;

That the Committee submit its final report no later than June 28, 2002, and that the Committee retain all powers necessary to publicize the findings of the Committee contained in the final report until July 31, 2002; and

That the Committee be permitted, notwithstanding usual practices, to deposit its report with the Clerk of the Senate, if the Senate is not then sitting; and that the report be deemed to have been tabled in the Chamber.

Hon. John G. Bryden: Honourable senators, it so happens that Senator Stollery's motions are the first amongst a smorgasbord of these types of motions on which notice was given the other day. Therefore, the questions that I will ask will relate to many of the others as well as to this one.

The first motion, which has already been passed, sets out that experts, counsel, technical and clerical personnel may be used for the purpose of doing certain things; that is, examining the subject

matter of bills and the Estimates that are referred to the committee.

Motion No. 6, to which we are now referring, indicates that the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs is authorized to examine and report on the emerging political, social, economic and security developments in Russia and Ukraine; Canada's policy and interest in the region; and other related matters. It is all in good form.

Honourable senators, does the authorization given in Motion No. 4, which asks that the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs be allowed to engage counsel, technical, clerical and other personnel not on the staff of the Senate, also permit that standing committee to do the same thing in relation to its special study on Russia and Ukraine?

Senator Stollery: Honourable senators, I do not think there is anything unusual. Motion No. 6 is the same motion that we passed in the last session of the last Parliament. As Senator Bryden is aware, the Foreign Affairs Committee submitted a report on NATO, peacekeeping and a whole range of things in the last Parliament. This study comes out of that. It is the same motion.

In terms of the relationship between Motion No. 4 and Motion No. 6, I had not really thought about that. I believe the connection between the two motions is actually quite straightforward. We started our study. We have already had meetings on the Russia project. I am not clear myself. These are standard motions for all committees. Motion No. 4 allows us to conduct the normal business of the committee, and Motion No. 6 allows the committee to conduct its study on Russia and Ukraine.

• (1820)

I guess I am wondering whether witnesses for our study on Russia are separate from witnesses in our normal course of business. I think it is a moot point.

Senator Bryden: Perhaps I can shorten this if I am allowed some latitude.

The rules are very clear that a standing committee of the Senate does exactly what the honourable senator says in his motion; that is, the Senate adopts a motion. It is a very restricted motion. The committee is allowed to engage such counsel, technical, clerical and other personnel as may be necessary for the purpose of its examination and consideration of such bills, subject matters of bills and the estimates that are referred to the committee.

I will summarize the procedure that is followed under the rules to finance the committee. The committee prepares a budget; the budget goes to Internal Economy; Internal Economy looks at the budget for the request for the standing committee to do these things; then the Internal Economy Committee includes that budget in its report to this house. That is how it works for the normal functioning of a standing committee.

However, the procedure is different if a standing committee is going to enter into a special study, which is how some of these three studies would be classified. I assume what is in here was prepared by clerks, or clerks' assistants, as they are all so much the same. When there is a special study, the system is such that there is no reference to the need for experts or counsel or incurring any special expenses. What has been done with respect to Motion No. 6 is correct, with a little bit of extra from before, but the motion indicates what is being studied and when the committee shall report. Then, if any expenses are to be incurred, whether it is a standing committee doing a special study or a special committee, the committee makes up a budget. The chair of the committee presents it to Internal Economy. Internal Economy reviews it and sends it back to the committee. The chair of the committee, not the chair of Internal Economy, then presents that position to this house and defends that budget.

I raise that because there has been some concern in the past that what happens is that a lot of stuff goes in to Internal Economy, it gets approved and comes in, and there is a list. Internal Economy presents its report, which gets approved, and no one sees what is in the report until it actually comes out.

What I am saying, honourable senators, does not relate to what Senator Stollery is doing, as I could have done the same thing with any of the other ones. There are two distinct procedures. It is my concern that we not confuse the right set out in the *Rules of the Senate of Canada* to engage technical experts, and pay for them outside and have it all done by Internal Economy, with a standing committee that does a special study on, as you say in another place here, "Foreign and Commonwealth relations generally."

There are three different motions here. The procedure, in order to deal with that, has to be presented to this chamber by the honourable senator as chairman at the time that there is a budget to be approved and defended. It goes through Internal Economy but it comes back for the honourable senator, or any other chair, to defend in here, if it is a special committee. That is the point.

I raise it here because I did not want honourable senators to assume that the approval of the honourable senator's Motion No. 4 also approves the hiring of experts to do what he is suggesting in Motion No. 6.

Senator Stollery: First, honourable senators, it is not a special committee. It is the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs. As I say, I presented the motion. It is the same motion approved by this chamber in the last session of the last Parliament.

I know perfectly well that we have a new Parliament. Our committee is not contemplating spending any unusual sums of money in order to conduct its business. Having been a member of the Internal Economy Committee for something like 18 years, I am quite familiar with how it operates. If anything unusual were being contemplated, we would have to go to the Internal

Economy Committee, of course. We have to go to the Internal Economy Committee to have the committee budget approved as it is.

I am presenting my motions, and the other chairmen are doing the same, in order to get the business of our Senate committees underway so that they can sit. However, it is certainly contemplated by me to go to the Internal Economy Committee and the budget subcommittee to have budgets approved. At the moment, for example, we have a project started. President Putin, when he came to Canada in December, met with some members of the committee. I am here representing the members of the committee. We would like to be able to undertake our work and have a meeting. We have witnesses. There is no exceptional or unusual amount of money involved.

Of course, I will go to the Internal Economy Committee when it meets, but I suspect the earliest it would meet would be the Thursday after we come back, the week after next. Our committee would like to meet on Tuesday and Wednesday and start to work.

That is the reason I am presenting the motion. I do not want to take up the time of honourable senators. Motion No. 8, for example, is a general motion that does not contemplate anything. It is there so that the Foreign Affairs Committee can deal with anything that comes up. I am not contemplating a single meeting on Motion No. 8, but it is there so that we can deal with any emergencies.

My motions are, I believe, fairly straightforward. Their purpose is to allow our committee to begin to hold meetings. However, I will be going in the normal course of events to the Internal Economy Committee to get the budget approved.

Hon. Eymard G. Corbin: I should like to rise on a point of order. I think it could simplify matters. I should like to refer honourable senators to the *Rules of the Senate of Canada*, Appendix II, which begins on page 114. In particular, I should like to draw honourable senators' attention to paragraph 2:02 of that appendix, page 115, which reads as follows:

A notice of motion to establish a special committee or to authorize a committee to conduct a special study shall not refer to special expenses but shall set a date by which the committee is to report to the Senate.

• (1830)

The paragraphs that follow, namely, 2:03, 2:04, 2:05, 2:06 and 2:07, outline the procedure to be followed by a committee to obtain funds to hire personnel and what have you. The rules are quite clear. I do not see the purpose of the debate that is going on at this time because the appendix makes the procedure completely clear. In fact, committees are bound to follow these directives. I do not think there is a problem.

[Senator Bryden]

Senator Bryden: Honourable senators, I agree absolutely with what Senator Corbin has just said.

The Hon. the Speaker: This is a comment on the Honourable Senator Stollery's speech.

Senator Bryden: What is contained in the motions, as far as they go, is correct. They follow the rules. However, in my experience, a standing committee functioning under the restricted position of dealing with bills —

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I must point out that time for debate — and I assume that senators are speaking to the motion — has expired. Accordingly, it is necessary to ask for leave to continue debate. Is leave granted?

Some Hon. Senators: Yes.

Some Hon. Senators: No.

The Hon. the Speaker: I am sorry, but the time for debate is over in that there is no unanimous leave to continue. Is the house ready for the question?

Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, my understanding of the pith and substance of Motion No. 6 by Senator Stollery is to receive an order of reference from the Senate to study a subject matter that, in the opinion of the honourable members of Foreign Affairs Committee, is a priority. It is important to assess whether the Senate is in agreement with the proposition that the Foreign Affairs Committee study emerging political, social, economic and security developments in Russia and Ukraine, as well as Canada's policy and interests in the region and other related matters. I interpret "other related matters" to mean matters that relate to our foreign policy development in that theatre.

I have no objection to the Foreign Affairs Committee receiving this order of reference from the Senate, but I am resting my evaluation to a large extent on the fact that we have received this recommendation in the form of a motion from our committee. This is their priority. The other committees were saying that the principle is the same.

The second paragraph of the motion describes a common practice, namely, that a committee be authorized to make papers and evidence that it had received in a previous Parliament part of the record in this Parliament. That is a tradition and is common sense. It is a practical thing to do. I have no difficulty with the second paragraph of the motion. They have determined the time line that, in the committee's view, would be reasonable for their final report. However, that does not obviate interim reports coming forward from the committee. Again, that has been our practice and custom with committees for a long period of time.

The final paragraph — namely, that the committee be permitted to deposit the report with the clerk — again is a

common practice. In the motion before us, I find nothing offensive in all four paragraphs. I find the motion very ordinary and I support it.

Concerning the issue of whether a study that will be undertaken by a committee will incur special expenses, the committee, as Senator Corbin has alluded to, will make that submission to the Internal Economy Committee at the appropriate time. The Internal Economy Committee will then make a determination by way of a recommendation to the Senate. We shall decide. I find nothing unusual at all and am prepared to support the motion.

The Hon. the Speaker: Are honourable senators ready for the question?

Hon. John Lynch-Staunton (Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, I wish to ask a question, but I do not know if it is in order. I have nothing against studies by committees because I have urged them on occasion and have supported them. However, once the order of reference is agreed to by the Senate, is the Internal Economy Committee bound to make sure that the funds necessary are there to meet the terms of that reference? In turn, because the Senate approved the terms of reference in the first place, is it bound to approve the budget automatically? If so, I think we are doing things upside down.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable Senator Lynch-Staunton, the only person to whom you could put a question right now would be to the Honourable Senator Kinsella, who has spoken to Motion No. 6.

Senator Kinsella: Honourable senators, having received the order of reference, the steps are clear. The order of reference speaks to what the Senate is saying that the committee can undertake. As far as resources are concerned, that is a separate and distinct action. In order to obtain extra resources, the committee must make a submission to the Internal Economy Committee. The Internal Economy Committee must then submit a report to the Senate, which the Senate will either approve or not approve.

The adoption by the Senate of this order of reference that the Foreign Affairs Committee can study foreign policy as it relates to the Ukraine-Russian theatre is simply an authority to study our foreign policy in that theatre. It is not an authorization to spend a certain number of dollars. That is a second and distinct step that would have to follow the course I have indicated: a recommendation by the committee to the Internal Economy Committee and a recommendation from the Internal Economy Committee to the Senate.

Senator Bryden: Honourable senators, I will try to be as specific as I can. What is occurring here is absolutely correct as far as it goes. However, there is an error, and I believe the honourable senator is reflecting that error.

If, indeed, we follow the rules and the standing committee is acting within its limited jurisdiction under the rubric of studying bills, estimates and the subject matter of bills, it is the case that a recommendation first goes to the Internal Economy Committee. The Internal Economy Committee approves the recommendation and then presents it to the Senate for approval. If, on the other hand, a standing committee wishes to conduct a special study, the procedure is different. In the *Rules of the Senate*, there is a section entitled “Committee Budgets for Work relating to Special Studies by Standing or Special Committees.” Would the honourable senator agree that the procedure is different? The committee prepares its budget for that special study and presents it to the Internal Economy Committee. The Internal Economy Committee then reports back to the committee, and the committee chair presents the committee’s position to this house and defends it — not the chair of Internal Economy but the committee chair. It is that budget that this house approves.

Would my honourable friend agree that there are two separate procedures? I think it is not by accident that they are separate.

Senator Kinsella: I agree with that interpretation.

• (1840)

The Hon. the Speaker: Are honourable senators ready for the question?

Hon. Senators: Question.

The Hon. the Speaker: It is moved by the Honourable Senator Stollery, seconded by the Honourable Senator Taylor, that the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs be authorized to examine and report on emerging political, social, economic and security developments in Russia and Ukraine; Canada’s policy and interests in the region; and other related matters —

Some Hon. Senators: Dispense.

The Hon. the Speaker: Shall I dispense?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO STUDY THE EUROPEAN UNION

Hon. Peter A. Stollery, pursuant to notice of February 22, 2001, moved:

That the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs be authorized to examine and report on the consequences for Canada of the evolving European Union and on other related political, economic and security matters; and

[Senator Bryden]

That the Committee report to the Senate no later than March 31, 2003.

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

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I want to ask Senator Stollery some questions. I see a clear distinction between Motion Nos. 6, 7 and 8. Motion No. 6 was a study, as I understand it, that was approved in the last session, so in fact Internal Economy has given its approval for this study. I realize that was done in another session, but in fact Internal Economy has dealt with that. Is that correct?

Senator Stollery: Yes, that is correct. Senator Kroft, in the last Parliament, dealt with Motion No. 6 and, in anticipation, I would say the same is true of Motion No. 7.

Senator Carstairs: That is all I needed to know.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO STUDY
ISSUES RELATED TO FOREIGN RELATIONS

Hon. Peter A. Stollery, pursuant to notice of February 22, 2001, moved:

That the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, in accordance with Rule 86(1)(h), be authorized to examine such issues as may arise from time to time relating to Foreign and Commonwealth relations generally; and

That the Committee report to the Senate no later than March 31, 2003.

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

Senator Stollery: Honourable senators, before you respond to Motion No. 8, I would ask leave to modify the motion as presented. I have spoken with Senator Kinsella and with the leadership on our side. This motion does not contemplate anything new; it is just a standard procedure of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

I would ask leave to modify the motion by removing the words “and Commonwealth.” It would then refer only to “foreign relations” for reasons well known to Senator Gauthier, who is not here. I feel we should not approve the motion in its current form. Is that change agreeable to senators? It really has no effect on the committee.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, in accordance with our rules, a senator cannot modify his or her own motion unless leave is granted.

Is leave granted, honourable senators, to make that modification?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

The Hon. the Speaker: Leave is granted. Please restate your amendment, Senator Stollery.

Senator Stollery: My amendment is that we delete the words, “and Commonwealth” and that the motion shall read:

...Foreign relations generally...

Hon. Tommy Banks: May I ask a question of Senator Stollery: Why?

Senator Stollery: Honourable senators, this amendment is proposed at the suggestion of Senator Gauthier, and I would invite you to discuss the matter with him further at another time. This wording would be Senator Gauthier’s preference. It is that simple. There is no mystery.

Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): May I ask a question of the honourable senator? The motion as modified would be redundant to the mandate of the committee as defined by the rule that defines the mandate of the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs. If there is a difference, perhaps Senator Stollery could explain.

Senator Stollery: Honourable senators, there is something in what Senator Kinsella says. I am being straight up with Senator Kinsella. This motion is a sort of covering motion in case something unusual comes forward. It is not a motion based on a great deal of contemplation. I remind everyone that we are discussing the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs and that “foreign affairs” is what we study. It was thought that the motion would cover any gaps and save us sitting around on some other late night having this discussion.

Senator Kinsella: Honourable senators, just for clarity, rule 86(h) on page 81 of the *Rules of the Senate* states:

(h) The Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, composed of...members...to which shall be referred, if there is a motion to that effect, bills, messages, petitions, inquiries, papers and other matters relating to foreign and commonwealth relations generally, including...

Then the list of topics follows. I take it that there might have been a relationship between the wording of the motion as originally presented and this section of the rules. Why is this motion not redundant? I do not quite understand.

Senator Stollery: Honourable senators, to some extent these motions are inherited from the traditions of the committee. This

is one such motion. The discussion with Senator Gauthier was that he would like to add after “Commonwealth” the words “and la francophonie” and I have no difficulty with that. This motion, as I understand it, is a motion which goes back in time. It is a standard motion of the committee. I agree that there is an element of redundancy, but my many years in Parliament have taught me that, when people do things, they usually have a reason.

That is about all I can say about the motion. If the Senate does not want to agree to this motion, it does not appear to me to make a great deal of difference. This is a traditional motion of the committee and, at some point, someone must have thought that through.

The Hon. the Speaker: I point out, honourable senators, that, pursuant to rule 30, leave was granted to Senator Stollery to modify his motion to delete the words “and Commonwealth.”

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion, as modified, agreed to.

• (1850)

SOCIAL AFFAIRS, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO ENGAGE SERVICES

Hon. Marjory LeBreton, pursuant to notice of February 22, 2001, moved:

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

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO PERMIT ELECTRONIC COVERAGE

Hon. Marjory LeBreton, pursuant to notice of February 22, 2001, moved:

That the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology be empowered to permit coverage by electronic media of its public proceedings with the least possible disruption of its hearings.

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO STUDY STATE OF HEALTH CARE
SYSTEM AND TO APPLY PAPERS AND EVIDENCE
OF PREVIOUS SESSION TO CURRENT STUDY

Hon. Marjory LeBreton, pursuant to notice of February 22, 2001, moved:

That the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology be authorized to examine and report upon the state of the health care system in Canada. In particular, the Committee shall be authorized to examine:

(a) The fundamental principles on which Canada's publicly funded health care system is based;

(b) The historical development of Canada's health care system;

(c) Health care systems in foreign jurisdictions;

(d) The pressures on and constraints of Canada's health care system; and

(e) The role of the federal government in Canada's health care system;

That the papers and evidence received and taken on the subject and the work accomplished during the Second Session of the Thirty-sixth Parliament be referred to the Committee;

That the Committee submit its final report no later than June 30, 2002; and

That the Committee be permitted, notwithstanding usual practices, to deposit any report with the Clerk of the Senate, if the Senate is not then sitting; and that the report be deemed to have been tabled in the Chamber.

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

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I have a question of clarification for the Honourable Senator LeBreton.

Motion No. 13 pertains to a study which was approved in the last session of Parliament. In fact, the subject of it has been before Internal Economy in the past. Can we assume that it will come back to Internal Economy this year?

Senator LeBreton: That is absolutely correct. As the honourable senator knows, we had only completed one phase of the study. This is for the completion of that study.

Hon. John G. Bryden: Honourable senators, I have a question for Senator LeBreton. Does this motion refer to a special study done by a standing committee?

Senator LeBreton: Yes, it is the health care study that we started in the last session of Parliament. Originally, it was to be a five-part study. It is now a four-part study, since we will be combining two sections. We completed the first phase and reported to the Senate.

Senator Bryden: In incurring any expenditures, your committee would follow the rules pertaining to special studies that are outlined in our rules, as I understand it; is that correct?

Senator LeBreton: That is correct, Senator Bryden.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO STUDY DEVELOPMENTS
IN THE FIELD OF PERSONAL INFORMATION PROTECTION
AND ELECTRONIC DOCUMENTS

Hon. Marjory LeBreton, pursuant to notice of February 22, 2001, moved:

That the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology be authorized to examine and report upon the developments since Royal Assent was given during the Second Session of the Thirty-sixth Parliament to Bill C-6, an Act to support and promote electronic commerce by protecting personal information that is collected, used or disclosed in certain circumstances, by providing for the use of electronic means to communicate or record information or transactions and by amending the Canada Evidence Act, the Statutory Instruments Act and the Statute Revision Act; and

That the Committee table its final report no later than June 30, 2001.

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

[Translation]

Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I think we all wonder whether this motion refers to a new study that has not already gone through the Internal Economy Committee, whether the idea is to create a subcommittee or to travel across the country or abroad. We would like to get some information.

[English]

Senator LeBreton: Honourable senators will recall that when Bill C-6 was studied in the last session of Parliament, one part of it had to do specifically with health care. As a committee, we undertook to assess the impact of this bill. Honourable senators will recall that, originally, it was an e-commerce bill. The whole impact on health care and privacy then came into it. Thus, it was a part that we set aside with Minister Manley's approval. We made a commitment to update it, which is what this motion is in aid of.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE SENATE

Hon. Wilfred P. Moore: Honourable senators, I ask leave to revert to Motion Nos. 9 and 10 standing in the name of Senator Bacon.

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

Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, normally, the chair or deputy chair of a committee moves these motions because, as has been the case this evening, we might have questions. I will not withhold leave on this request because I have looked at the content of these two motions and they are straightforward administrative issues. As a result, we would have no questions on them. However, there are some subsequent motions on the Order Paper which might be more problematic. Yes, we grant leave.

TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO PERMIT ELECTRONIC COVERAGE

Hon. Wilfred P. Moore, for Senator Bacon, pursuant to notice of February 22, 2001, moved:

That the Standing Senate Committee on Transport and Communications be empowered to permit coverage by electronic media of its public proceedings with the least possible disruption of its hearings.

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO ENGAGE SERVICES

Hon. Wilfred P. Moore, for Senator Bacon, pursuant to notice of February 22, 2001, moved:

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

Motion agreed to.

AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

MOTION TO AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE TO ENGAGE SERVICES—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. Jack Wiebe, for Senator Gustafson, pursuant to notice of February 22, 2001, moved:

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

That the Committee have power to adjourn from place to place within and outside Canada for the purpose of such studies.

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

[Translation]

Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, that motion is exactly along the same lines as the questions asked earlier as to whether the Senate was going to issue an order of reference so that the committee can go to the Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration Committee to get money.

In the second paragraph, it clearly says:

That the committee have power to adjourn from place to place within and outside Canada for the purpose of such studies.

This requires a budget that should be examined by the Internal Economy Committee, and then go back to the Senate and specify which resources this committee should ask and get to do its work properly.

The motion could be adjourned in my name. We could strike or amend the final paragraph. When the committee is ready to seek an order of reference, it will have the information required to do the study it is requesting in the second paragraph.

[English]

The Hon. the Speaker: I am not sure if it is a matter of order or not. This has come from a committee as opposed to from an individual senator. I shall allow Senator Wiebe to speak to whether he is comfortable speaking for the committee in terms of accepting amendments.

Senator Wiebe: Honourable senators, I hesitate to speak or act in favour of accepting an amendment on behalf of the committee because I was not the original mover of this particular motion. It was moved by Senator Gustafson, and Senator Gustafson is not here. I feel that it would be more appropriate to make that request when the individual who moved the motion is present.

On motion of Senator Robichaud, debate adjourned.

COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO PERMIT ELECTRONIC COVERAGE

Hon. Jack Wiebe, for Senator Gustafson, pursuant to notice of February 22, 2001, moved:

That the Standing Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be empowered to permit coverage by electronic media of its public proceedings with the least possible disruption of its hearings.

Motion agreed to.

ENERGY, THE ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO PERMIT ELECTRONIC COVERAGE

Hon. Nicholas W. Taylor, pursuant to notice of February 22, 2001, moved:

That the Standing Senate Committee on Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources be empowered to permit coverage by electronic media of its public proceedings with the least possible disruption of its hearings.

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO ENGAGE SERVICES

Hon. Nicholas W. Taylor, pursuant to notice of February 22, 2001, moved:

That the Standing Senate Committee on Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources have power to engage the services of such counsel and technical, clerical, and

other personnel as may be necessary for the purpose of its examination and consideration of such bills, subject matters of bills and estimates as are referred to it.

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO STUDY MATTERS RELATED
TO MANDATE AND TO RESUME STUDY ON NUCLEAR REACTOR
SAFETY AND APPLY PAPERS AND EVIDENCE
OF PREVIOUS SESSION TO CURRENT STUDY

Hon. Nicholas W. Taylor, pursuant to notice of February 22, 2001, moved:

That the Standing Senate Committee on Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources be authorized to examine such issues as may arise from time to time relating to energy, the environment and natural resources, including the continuation and completion of the study on Nuclear Reactor Safety;

That the papers and evidence received and taken on the subject of Nuclear Reactor Safety during the Second Session of the Thirty-sixth Parliament be referred to the Committee; and

That the Committee report to the Senate no later than December 15, 2002.

[Translation]

Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, could Senator Taylor give us a bit of information about the study in question. Has it already begun, will it simply continue, will it entail extraordinary expenditures and will it involve travel?

[English]

Senator Taylor: Honourable senators, there are three questions. The nuclear reactor safety matter has been going on for some time, so there will be a little left there. The energy one will involve travelling. The study has started, but there will be expenses involved with travelling. Of course we felt that we had to get the approval of the Internal Economy Committee for the travel before that could take place or we would have to tailor our ambitions in travelling to the amount of budget that Internal Economy had available.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION*[Translation]*

MOTION TO HEAR CHIEF COMMISSIONER
IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ADOPTED

Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Deputy Leader of the Opposition),
pursuant to notice of February 22, 2001, moved:

That the Senate do resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole, at a time convenient to the Government and the Chief Commissioner of the Canadian Human Rights Commission in order to receive the Chief Commissioner, Ms Michelle Falardeau-Ramsay, for the purpose of discussing the work of that Office; and

That television cameras be authorized in the Chamber to broadcast the proceedings of the Committee of the Whole, with the least possible disruption of the proceedings.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

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

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

That when the Senate adjourns today, it do stand adjourned until Monday, March 12, 2001, at 8 p.m.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

The Senate adjourned until Monday, March 12, 2001, at 8 p.m.

APPENDIX

Officers of the Senate

The Ministry

Senators

(Listed according to seniority, alphabetically and by provinces)

Committees of the Senate

THE SPEAKER

THE HONOURABLE DANIEL P. HAYS

THE LEADER OF THE GOVERNMENT

THE HONOURABLE SHARON CARSTAIRS, P.C.

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

THE HONOURABLE JOHN LYNCH-STANTON

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE**CLERK OF THE SENATE AND CLERK OF THE PARLIAMENTS**

PAUL BÉLISLE

DEPUTY CLERK, PRINCIPAL CLERK, LEGISLATIVE SERVICES

GARY O'BRIEN

LAW CLERK AND PARLIAMENTARY COUNSEL

MARK AUDCENT

USHER OF THE BLACK ROD

MARY McLAREN

THE MINISTRY

According to Precedence

(March 1, 2001)

The Right Hon. Jean Chrétien	Prime Minister
The Hon. Herbert Eser Gray	Deputy Prime Minister
The Hon. Lloyd Axworthy	Minister of Foreign Affairs
The Hon. David M. Collenette	Minister of Transport
The Hon. David Anderson	Minister of the Environment
The Hon. Ralph E. Goodale	Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board
The Hon. Brian Tobin	Minister of Industry
The Hon. Sheila Copps	Minister of Canadian Heritage
The Hon. John Manley	Minister of Foreign Affairs
The Hon. Paul Martin	Minister of Finance
The Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton	Minister of National Defence
The Hon. Anne McLellan	Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
The Hon. Allan Rock	Minister of Health
The Hon. Lawrence MacAulay	Solicitor General of Canada
The Hon. Alfonso Gagliano	Minister of Public Works and Government Services
The Hon. Lucienne Robillard	President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure
The Hon. Martin Cauchon	Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)
The Hon. Jane Stewart	Minister of Human Resources Development
The Hon. Stéphane Dion	President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
The Hon. Pierre Pettigrew	Minister of International Trade
The Hon. Don Boudria	Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
The Hon. Lyle Vanclief	Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
The Hon. Herb Dhaliwal	Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
The Hon. Ronald J. Duhamel	Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification) (Francophonie)
The Hon. Claudette Bradshaw	Minister of Labour
The Hon. Robert Daniel Nault	Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
The Hon. Maria Minna	Minister for International Cooperation
The Hon. Elinor Caplan	Minister for Citizenship and Immigration
The Hon. Sharon Carstairs	Leader of the Government in the Senate
The Hon. Robert G. Thibault	Minister of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)
The Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew	Secretary of State (Children and Youth)
The Hon. Hedy Fry	Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)
The Hon. David Kilgour	Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)
The Hon. James Scott Peterson	Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)
The Hon. Andrew Mitchell	Secretary of State (Rural Development) (Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario)
The Hon. Gilbert Normand	Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)
The Hon. Denis Coderre	Secretary of State (Amateur Sport)
The Hon. Rey Pagtakhan	Secretary of State (Asia-Pacifique)

SENATORS OF CANADA

ACCORDING TO SENIORITY

(March 1 2001)

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
Herbert O. Sparrow	Saskatchewan	North Battleford, Sask.
Edward M. Lawson	Vancouver	Vancouver, B.C.
Bernard Alasdair Graham, P.C.	The Highlands	Sydney, N.S.
Jack Austin, P.C.	Vancouver South	Vancouver, B.C.
Willie Adams	Nunavut	Rankin Inlet, Nunavut
Lowell Murray, P.C.	Pakenham	Ottawa, Ont.
C. William Doody	Harbour Main-Bell Island	St. John's, Nfld.
Peter Alan Stollery	Bloor and Yonge	Toronto, Ont.
Peter Michael Pitfield, P.C.	Ottawa-Vanier	Ottawa, Ont.
E. Leo Kolber	Victoria	Westmount, Que.
Michael Kirby	South Shore	Halifax, N.S.
Jerahmiel S. Grafstein	Metro Toronto	Toronto, Ont.
Anne C. Cools	Toronto-Centre-York	Toronto, Ont.
Charlie Watt	Inkerman	Kuujuuaq, Que.
Daniel Phillip Hays, <i>Speaker</i>	Calgary	Calgary, Alta.
Joyce Fairbairn, P.C.	Lethbridge	Lethbridge, Alta.
Colin Kenny	Rideau	Ottawa, Ont.
Pierre De Bané, P.C.	De la Vallière	Montreal, Que.
Eymard Georges Corbin	Grand-Sault	Grand-Sault, N.B.
Brenda Mary Robertson	Riverview	Shediac, N.B.
Jean-Maurice Simard	Edmundston	Edmundston, N.B.
Norman K. Atkins	Markham	Toronto, Ont.
Ethel Cochrane	Newfoundland	Port-au-Port, Nfld.
Eileen Rossiter	Prince Edward Island	Charlottetown, P.E.I.
Mira Spivak	Manitoba	Winnipeg, Man.
Roch Bolduc	Gulf	Sainte-Foy, Que.
Gérald-A. Beaudoin	Rigaud	Hull, Que.
Pat Carney, P.C.	British Columbia	Vancouver, B.C.
Gerald J. Comeau	Nova Scotia	Church Point, N.S.
Consiglio Di Nino	Ontario	Downsview, Ont.
Donald H. Oliver	Nova Scotia	Halifax, N.S.
Noël A. Kinsella	Fredericton-York-Sunbury	Fredericton, N.B.
John Buchanan, P.C.	Nova Scotia	Halifax, N.S.
Mabel Margaret DeWare	Moncton	Moncton, N.B.
John Lynch-Staunton	Grandville	Georgeville, Que.
James Francis Kelleher, P.C.	Ontario	Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.
J. Trevor Eyton	Ontario	Caledon, Ont.
Wilbert Joseph Keon	Ottawa	Ottawa, Ont.
Michael Arthur Meighen	St. Marys	Toronto, Ont.
Thérèse Lavoie-Roux	Quebec	Montreal, Que.
J. Michael Forrestall	Dartmouth and Eastern Shore	Dartmouth, N.S.
Janis G. Johnson	Winnipeg-Interlake	Winnipeg, Man.
A. Raynell Andreychuk	Regina	Regina, Sask.
Jean-Claude Rivest	Stadacona	Quebec, Que.
Terrance R. Stratton	Red River	St. Norbert, Man.
Marcel Prud'homme, P.C.	La Salle	Montreal, Que.
Leonard J. Gustafson	Saskatchewan	Macoun, Sask.
Erminie Joy Cohen	New Brunswick	Saint John, N.B.
David Tkachuk	Saskatchewan	Saskatoon, Sask.
W. David Angus	Alma	Montreal, Que.

ACCORDING TO SENIORITY

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
Pierre Claude Nolin	De Salaberry	Quebec, Que.
Marjory LeBreton	Ontario	Manotick, Ont.
Gerry St. Germain, P.C.	Langley-Pemberton-Whistler	Maple Ridge, B.C.
Lise Bacon	De la Durantaye	Laval, Que.
Sharon Carstairs	Manitoba	Victoria Beach, Man.
Landon Pearson	Ontario	Ottawa, Ont.
Jean-Robert Gauthier	Ottawa-Vanier	Ottawa, Ontario
John G. Bryden	New Brunswick	Bayfield, N.B.
Rose-Marie Losier-Cool	Tracadie	Bathurst, N.B.
Céline Hervieux-Payette, P.C.	Bedford	Montreal, Que.
William H. Rompkey, P.C.	Labrador	North West River, Labrador, Nfld.
Lorna Milne	Peel County	Brampton, Ont.
Marie-P. Poulin	Nord de l'Ontario/Northern Ontario	Ottawa, Ont.
Shirley Maheu	Rougemont	Saint-Laurent, Que.
Nicholas William Taylor	Sturgeon	Bon Accord, Alta.
Léonce Mercier	Mille Isles	Saint-Élie d'Orford, Que.
Wilfred P. Moore	Stanhope St./Bluenose	Chester, N.S.
Lucie Pépin	Shawinigan	Montreal, Que.
Fernand Robichaud, P.C.	New Brunswick	Saint-Louis-de-Kent, N.B.
Catherine S. Callbeck	Prince Edward Island	Central Bedeque, P.E.I.
Marisa Ferretti Barth	Repentigny	Pierrefonds, Que.
Serge Joyal, P.C.	Kennebec	Montreal, Que.
Thelma J. Chalifoux	Alberta	Morinville, Alta.
Joan Cook	Newfoundland	St. John's, Nfld.
Ross Fitzpatrick	Okanagan-Similkameen	Kelowna, B.C.
The Very Reverend Dr. Lois M. Wilson	Toronto	Toronto, Ont.
Francis William Mahovlich	Toronto	Toronto, Ont.
Richard H. Kroft	Manitoba	Winnipeg, Man.
Douglas James Roche	Edmonton	Edmonton, Alta.
Joan Thorne Fraser	De Lorimier	Montreal, Que.
Aurélien Gill	Wellington	Mashteuiatsh, Pointe-Bleue, Que.
Vivienne Poy	Toronto	Toronto, Ont.
Sheila Finestone, P.C.	Montarville	Montreal, Que.
Ione Christensen	Yukon Territory	Whitehorse, Y.T.
George Furey	Newfoundland and Labrador	St. John's, Nfld.
Nick G. Sibbeston	Northwest Territories	Fort Simpson, N.W.T.
Isobel Finnerty	Ontario	Burlington, Ont.
John Wiebe	Saskatchewan	Swift Current, Sask.
Tommy Banks	Alberta	Edmonton, Alta.
Jane Marie Cordy	Nova Scotia	Dartmouth, N.S.
Raymond C. Setlakwe	The Laurentides	Thetford Mines, Que.

SENATORS OF CANADA

ALPHABETICAL LIST

(March 1, 2001)

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

SENATORS OF CANADA

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

SENATORS OF CANADA

BY PROVINCE AND TERRITORY

(March 1, 2001)

ONTARIO—24

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
1 Lowell Murray, P.C.	Pakenham	Ottawa
2 Peter Alan Stollery	Bloor and Yonge	Toronto
3 Peter Michael Pitfield, P.C.	Ottawa-Vanier	Ottawa
4 Jeremiah S. Grafstein	Metro Toronto	Toronto
5 Anne C. Cools	Toronto-Centre-York	Toronto
6 Colin Kenny	Rideau	Ottawa
7 Norman K. Atkins	Markham	Toronto
8 Consiglio Di Nino	Ontario	Downsview
9 James Francis Kelleher, P.C.	Ontario	Sault Ste. Marie
10 John Trevor Eyton	Ontario	Caledon
11 Wilbert Joseph Keon	Ottawa	Ottawa
12 Michael Arthur Meighen	St. Marys	Toronto
13 Marjory LeBreton	Ontario	Manotick
14 Landon Pearson	Ontario	Ottawa
15 Jean-Robert Gauthier	Ottawa-Vanier	Ottawa
16 Lorna Milne	Peel County	Brampton
17 Marie-P. Poulin	Northern Ontario	Ottawa
18 The Very Reverend Dr. Lois M. Wilson	Toronto	Toronto
19 Francis William Mahovlich	Toronto	Toronto
20 Vivienne Poy	Toronto	Toronto
21 Isobel Finnerty	Ontario	Burlington
22		
23		
24		

SENATORS BY PROVINCE AND TERRITORY

QUEBEC—24

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

SENATORS BY PROVINCE—MARITIME DIVISION

NOVA SCOTIA—10

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

NEW BRUNSWICK—10

THE HONOURABLE		
1 Eymard Georges Corbin	Grand-Sault	Grand-Sault
2 Brenda Mary Robertson	Riverview	Shediac
3 Jean-Maurice Simard	Edmundston	Edmundston
4 Noël A. Kinsella	Fredericton-York-Sunbury	Fredericton
5 Mabel Margaret DeWare	Moncton	Moncton
6 Erminie Joy Cohen	New Brunswick	Saint John
7 John G. Bryden	New Brunswick	Bayfield
8 Rose-Marie Losier-Cool	Tracadie	Bathurst
9 Fernand Robichaud, P.C.	Saint-Louis-de-Kent	Saint-Louis-de-Kent
10

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—4

THE HONOURABLE		
1 Eileen Rossiter	Prince Edward Island	Charlottetown
2 Catherine S. Callbeck	Prince Edward Island	Central Bedeque
3
4

SENATORS BY PROVINCE—WESTERN DIVISION

MANITOBA—6

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
1 Mira Spivak	Manitoba	Winnipeg
2 Janis G. Johnson	Winnipeg-Interlake	Winnipeg
3 Terrance R. Stratton	Red River	St. Norbert
4 Sharon Carstairs, P.C.	Manitoba	Victoria Beach
5 Richard H. Kroft	Manitoba	Winnipeg
6		

BRITISH COLUMBIA—6

THE HONOURABLE		
1 Edward M. Lawson	Vancouver	Vancouver
2 Jack Austin, P.C.	Vancouver South	Vancouver
3 Pat Carney, P.C.	British Columbia	Vancouver
4 Gerry St. Germain, P.C.	Langley-Pemberton-Whistler	Maple Ridge
5 Ross Fitzpatrick	Okanagan-Similkameen	Kelowna
6		

SASKATCHEWAN—6

THE HONOURABLE		
1 Herbert O. Sparrow	Saskatchewan	North Battleford
2 A. Raynell Andreychuk	Regina	Regina
3 Leonard J. Gustafson	Saskatchewan	Macoun
4 David Tkachuk	Saskatchewan	Saskatoon
5 John Wiebe	Saskatchewan	Swift Current
6		

ALBERTA—6

THE HONOURABLE		
1 Daniel Phillip Hays, <i>Speaker</i>	Calgary	Calgary
2 Joyce Fairbairn, P.C.	Lethbridge	Lethbridge
3 Nicholas William Taylor	Sturgeon	Bon Accord
4 Thelma J. Chalifoux	Alberta	Morinville
5 Douglas James Roche	Edmonton	Edmonton
6 Tommy Banks	Alberta	Edmonton

SENATORS BY PROVINCE AND TERRITORY

NEWFOUNDLAND—6

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

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES—1

THE HONOURABLE		
1 Nick G. Sibbeston	Northwest Territories	Fort Simpson

NUNAVUT—1

THE HONOURABLE		
1 Willie Adams	Nunavut	Rankin Inlet

YUKON TERRITORY—1

THE HONOURABLE		
1 Ione Christensen	Yukon Territory	Whitehorse

DIVISIONAL SENATORS

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

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF STANDING, SPECIAL AND JOINT COMMITTEES

(As of March 1, 2001)

*Ex Officio Member

ABORIGINAL PEOPLES

Chair: Honourable Senator Chalifoux

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Johnson

Honourable Senators:

Carney	Christensen,	Johnson,	Rompkey,
*Carstairs (or Robichaud)	Cochrane,	*Lynch-Staunton, (or Kinsella)	Sibbeston,
Chalifoux,	Cordy,	Pearson,	Tkachuk,
	Gill,		Wilson.

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Carney, *Carstairs (or Robichaud), Chalifoux, Christensen, Cochrane, Cordy, Gill, Johnson, *Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella), Pearson, Rompkey, Sibbeston, Tkachuk,, Wilson.*

AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

Chair: Honourable Senator Gustafson

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Wiebe

Honourable Senators:

*Carstairs (or Robichaud)	Fitzpatrick,	*Lynch-Staunton, (or Kinsella)	Stratton,
Chalifoux,	Gill,	Milne,	Taylor,
Fairbairn,	Gustafson,	Oliver,	Tkachuk,
	LeBreton,		Wiebe.

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

**Carstairs (or Robichaud), Chalifoux, Fairbairn, Fitzpatrick, Gill, Gustafson, LeBreton, *Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella), Milne, Oliver, Stratton, Taylor, Tkachuk, Wiebe.*

BANKING, TRADE AND COMMERCE

Chair: Honourable Senator Kolber

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Tkachuk

Honourable Senators:

Angus,	Hervieux-Payette,	*Lynch-Staunton, (or Kinsella)	Oliver,
Banks,	Kelleher,	Maheu,	Setlakwe,
*Carstairs (or Robichaud)	Kenny,	Meighen,	Tkachuk.
Furey,	Kolber,		

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Angus, *Carstairs (or Robichaud), Furey, Hervieux-Payette, Kelleher, Kolber, Kroft, *Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella), Meighen, Oliver, Poulin, Setklawe, Tkachuk., Wiebe.*

ENERGY, THE ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Chair: Honourable Senator Taylor
Honourable Senators:

Banks,	Christensen,
Buchanan,	Cochrane,
*Carstairs (or Robichaud)	Eyton,
	Finnerty,

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Spivak

Kelleher,	Spivak,
Kenny,	Taylor,
*Lynch-Staunton, (or Kinsella)	Watt.
Sibbeston,	

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Banks, Buchanan, *Carstairs (or Robichaud), Christensen, Cochrane, Eyton, Finnerty, Kelleher, Kenny, *Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella), Sibbeston, Spivak, Taylor, Watt.*

FISHERIES

Chair: Honourable Senator Comeau
Honourable Senators:

Adams,	Carney,
Callbeck,	Chalifoux,
*Carstairs (or Robichaud)	Comeau,
	Cook,

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Cook

Corbin,	Meighen,
*Lynch-Staunton, (or Kinsella)	Moore,
Mahovlich,	Robertson,
	Watt.

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Adams, Callbeck, *Carstairs (or Robichaud), Carney, Chalifoux, Comeau, Cook, *Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella), Mahovlich, Meighen, Molgat, Moore, Robertson, Watt.*

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Chair: Honourable Senator Stollery
Honourable Senators:

Andreychuk,	*Carstairs (or Robichaud)
Austin,	Corbin,
Bolduc,	De Bané,
Carney,	

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Andreychuk

Di Nino,	*Lynch-Staunton, (or Kinsella)
Grafstein,	
Graham,	Poulin.,
Losier-Cool,	Stollery.

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Andreychuk, Austin, Bolduc, Carney, *Carstairs (or Robichaud), Corbin, De Bané, Di Nino, Grafstein, Graham, Losier-Cool, *Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella), Poulin, Stollery.*

INTERNAL ECONOMY, BUDGETS AND ADMINISTRATION

Chair: Honourable Senator Kroft
Honourable Senators:

Austin,	DeWare,
*Carstairs (or Robichaud)	Doody,
Comeau,	Forrestall,
De Bané,	Furey,
	Gauthier,

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator DeWare

Kenny,	Milne,
Kroft,	Murray,
*Lynch-Staunton, (or Kinsella)	Poulin,
Maheu,	Stollery.

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Austin, *Carstairs (or Robichaud), Comeau, De Bané, DeWare, Doody, Forrestall, Furey, Gauthier, Kenny, Kroft, *Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella), Maheu, Milne, Murray, Poulin, Stollery.*

LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS

Chair: Honourable Senator Milne
Honourable Senators:

Andreychuk,	*Carstairs (or Robichaud)
Atkins,	Cools,
Beaudoin,	Fraser,
Buchanan,	

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Beaudoin

Grafstein,	Milne,
Joyal,	Moore,
*Lynch-Staunton, (or Kinsella)	Nolin,
	Pearson.

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Andreychuk, Atkins, Beaudoin, *Carstairs (or Robichaud), Cools, Fraser, Grafstein, Joyal, *Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella), Milne, Moore, Nolin, Pearson.*

NATIONAL FINANCE

Chair: Honourable Senator Murray
Honourable Senators:

Banks,	Comeau,
Bolduc,	Cools,
*Carstairs (or Robichaud)	Doody,
	Finnerty,

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Finnerty

Ferretti Barth,	*Lynch-Staunton, (or Kinsella)
Hervieux-Payette,	Mahovlich,
Kinsella,	Murray.
Kirby,	

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Banks, Bolduc, *Carstairs (or Robichaud), Cools, Doody, Finnerty, Ferretti Barth, Hervieux-Payette, Kinsella, Kirby, *Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella), Mahovlich, Murray, Stratton.*

PRIVILEGES, STANDING RULES AND ORDERS

Chair: Honourable Senator Austin

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Stratton

Honourable Senators:

Andreychuk,	Corbin,	Joyal,	Murray,
Austin,	DeWare,	Kroft,	Poulin,
Bryden,	Di Nino,	Losier-Cool,	Rossiter,
*Carstairs (or Robichaud)	Gauthier,	*Lynch-Staunton, (or Kinsella)	Stratton,
	Grafstein,		

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Andreychuk, Austin, Bryden, *Carstairs (or Robichaud), DeWare, Di Nino, Gauthier, Grafstein, Hervieux-Payette, Joyal, Kroft, Losier-Cool, *Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella), Murray, Poulin, Rossier, Stratton.*

SELECTION

Chair: Honourable Senator Mercier

Deputy Chair:

Honourable Senators:

*Carstairs (or Robichaud)	Cordy,	Kinsella,	Mercier,
	DeWare,	LeBreton,	Milne,
Corbin,	Fairbairn,	*Lynch-Staunton, (or Kinsella)	Robertson.

Original Members agreed to by Motion of the Senate

*Austin, *Carstairs (or Robichaud), Corbin, DeWare, Fairbairn, Graham, Kinsella, LeBreton, *Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella), Mercier, Murray.*

SOCIAL AFFAIRS, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Chair: Honourable Senator Kirby

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator LeBreton

Honourable Senators:

Callbeck,	Cook,	Johnson,	*Lynch-Staunton, (or Kinsella)
*Carstairs (or Robichaud)	Cordy,	Kirby,	Pépin,
	Fairbairn,	LeBreton,	Roberston,
Cohen,	Graham,		Roche.

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Callbeck, *Carstairs (or Robichaud), Cohen, Cook, Cordy, Fairbairn, Graham, Johnson, Kirby, LeBreton, *Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella), Pépin, Robertson, Roche.*

TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

Chair: Honourable Senator Bacon

Honourable Senators:

Adams,	*Carstairs
Bacon,	(or Robichaud)
Callbeck,	Eyton,
	Finestone,

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Forrestall

Fitzpatrick, Milne,
Forrestall, Rompkey,
*Lynch-Staunton, Setlakwe,
(or Kinsella) Spivak.

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Adams, Angus, Bacon, Callbeck, *Carstairs (or Robichaud), Christensen, Eyton, Finestone, Fitzpatrick, Forrestall, *Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella), Rompkey, Setlakwe, Spivak.*

THE SENATE OF CANADA
PROGRESS OF LEGISLATION
(1st Session, 37th Parliament)
Thursday, March 1, 2001

GOVERNMENT BILLS
(SENATE)

No.	Title	1st	2nd	Committee	Report	Amend	3rd	R.A.	Chap.
S-2	An Act respecting marine liability, and to validate certain by-laws and regulations	01/01/31	01/01/31	—	—	—	01/01/31		
S-3	An Act to amend the Motor Vehicle Transport Act, 1987 and to make consequential amendments to other Acts	01/01/31	01/02/07	Transport and Communications					
S-4	A First Act to harmonize federal law with the civil law of the Province of Quebec and to amend certain Acts in order to ensure that each language version takes into account the common law and the civil law	01/01/31	01/02/07	Legal and Constitutional Affairs					
S-5	An Act to amend the Blue Water Bridge Authority Act	01/01/31	01/02/07	Transport and Communications	01/03/01	0			
S-11	An Act to amend the Canada Business Corporations Act and the Canada Cooperatives Act and to amend other Acts in consequence	01/02/06	01/02/21	Banking, Trade and Commerce					
S-16	An Act to amend the Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) Act	01/02/20	01/03/01	Banking, Trade and Commerce					
S-17	An Act to amend the Patent Act	01/02/20							

GOVERNMENT BILLS
(HOUSE OF COMMONS)

No.	Title	1st	2nd	Committee	Report	Amend	3rd	R.A.	Chap.

COMMONS PUBLIC BILLS

No.	Title	1st	2nd	Committee	Report	Amend	3rd	R.A.	Chap.

SENATE PUBLIC BILLS

No.	Title	1st	2nd	Committee	Report	Amend	3rd	R.A.	Chap.
S-6	An Act to assist in the prevention of wrongdoing in the Public Service by establishing a framework for education on ethical practices in the workplace, for dealing with allegations of wrongdoing and for protecting whistleblowers (Sen. Kinsella)	01/01/31	01/01/31	National Finance					
S-7	An Act to amend the Broadcasting Act (Sen. Finestone, P.C.)	01/01/31	01/02/07	Transport and Communications					
S-8	An Act to maintain the principles relating to the role of the Senate as established by the Constitution of Canada (Sen. Joyal, P.C.)	01/01/31							
S-9	An Act to remove certain doubts regarding the meaning of marriage (Sen. Cools)	01/01/31							
S-10	An Act to amend the Parliament of Canada Act (Parliamentary Poet Laureate) (Sen. Grafstein)	01/01/31	01/02/08	—	—	—	01/02/08		
S-12	An Act to amend the Statistics Act and the National Archives of Canada Act (census records) (Sen. Milne)	01/02/07							
S-13	An Act respecting the declaration of royal assent by the Governor General in the Queen's name to bills passed by the Houses of Parliament (Sen. Lynch-Staunton)	01/02/07							
S-14	An Act respecting Sir John A. Macdonald Day and Sir Wilfrid Laurier Day (Sen. Lynch-Staunton)	01/02/07	01/02/20	Social Affairs, Science and Technology					
S-15	An Act to enable and assist the Canadian tobacco industry in attaining its objective of preventing the use of tobacco products by young persons in Canada (Sen. Kenny)	01/02/07	01/03/01	Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources					
S-18	An Act to Amend the Food and Drugs Act (clean drinking water) (Sen. Grafstein)	01/02/20							
S-19	An Act to amend the Canada Transportation Act (Sen. Kirby)	01/02/21							

PRIVATE BILLS

No.	Title	1st	2nd	Committee	Report	Amend	3rd	R.A.	Chap.

CONTENTS

Thursday, March 1, 2001

PAGE

PAGE

The Late Honourable Gildas L. Molgat

Tributes. Senator Carstairs	196
Senator Lynch-Staunton	197
Senator Graham	198
Senator Kinsella	199
Senator Fairbairn	199
Senator Murray	201
Senator Losier-Cool	202
Senator Beaudoin	202
Senator Hays	202
Senator Bacon	203
Senator Grafstein	203
Senator Gauthier	204
Senator Johnson	205
Senator Taylor	205
Senator Milne	205
Senator Cools	206
Senator Prud'homme	206
Senator Gustafson	207
Senator Mahovlich	207

SENATORS' STATEMENTS

Scott Tournament of Hearts

Nova Scotia—Congratulations to Winning Rink.	
Senator Moore	207

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

The Estimates, 2001-2002

Tabled. Senator Robichaud	207
---------------------------------	-----

The Estimates, 2000-2001

Supplementary Estimates (A) Tabled. Senator Robichaud	207
---	-----

Blue Water Bridge Authority Act (Bill S-5)

Bill to Amend—Report of Committee. Senator Bacon	207
--	-----

Privileges, Standing Rules and Orders

Second Report of Committee Presented. Senator Stratton	208
--	-----

Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration

Second Report of Committee Presented. Senator DeWare	208
--	-----

Banking, Trade and Commerce

Report Pursuant to Rule 104 Tabled. Senator Tkachuk	208
---	-----

Bill to Give Effect to the Requirement for Clarity as Set Out in the Opinion of the Supreme Court of Canada in the Quebec Succession Reference (Bill C-20)

Report of Special Committee Pursuant to Rule 104 Tabled.	
Senator Fraser	208

Fisheries

Report Pursuant to Rule 104 Tabled. Senator Comeau	208
--	-----

The Estimates, 2001-2002

National Finance Committee Authorized to Study Main Estimates.	
Senator Robichaud	209
Vote 10 Referred to the Standing Joint Committee on the Library of Parliament. Senator Robichaud	209
Vote 25 Referred to the Standing Joint Committee on Official Languages. Senator Robichaud	209

The Estimates, 2001-2002

National Finance Authorized to Examine Supplementary Estimates (A), 2000-2001. Senator Robichaud	209
--	-----

Privy Council Vote 25a of Supplementary Estimates (A)

Referred to Standing Joint Committee on Official Languages.	
Senator Robichaud	209

Canada-France Inter-Parliamentary Association

Thirtieth Annual Meeting—Report of Canadian Delegation Tabled.	
Senator Beaudoin	209

Fisheries

Notice of Motion to Authorize Committee to Permit Electronic Coverage. Senator Comeau	209
Notice of Motion to Authorize Committee to Study Matters Relating to Fishing Industry. Senator Comeau	210

Canada Business Corporations Act Canada Cooperatives Act (Bill S-19)

Notice of Motion to Authorize Banking, Trade and Commerce Committee to Apply Papers and Evidence of Previous Session to Current Study. Senator Tkachuk	210
--	-----

Banking, Trade and Commerce

Notice of Motion to Authorize Committee to Permit Electronic Coverage. Senator Tkachuk	210
Notice of Motion to Authorize Committee to Engage Services. Senator Tkachuk	210
Notice of Motion to Authorize Committee to Study State of Domestic and International Financial System.	
Senator Tkachuk	210
Senator Cools	210

Legal and Constitutional Affairs

Notice of Motion to Authorize Committee to Permit Electronic Coverage. Senator Milne	211
Notice of Motion to Authorize Committee to Engage Services. Senator Milne	211

Public Works and Government Services

Allegations in Press with Regard to Minister—Notice of Inquiry.	
Senator De Bané	211
Senator Murray	211
Senator Cools	211
Senator Lynch-Staunton	211

Cable Public Affairs Channel

Closed Captioning Service—Notice of Inquiry. Senator Gauthier	211
--	-----

National Educational Television Network

Notice of Inquiry. Senator Gauthier	211
---	-----

QUESTION PERIOD**Fisheries and Oceans**

East Coast—Proposal to Split Fishing Zones into Native and Non-native Areas. Senator Comeau	212
Senator Carstairs	212

Indian Affairs and Northern Development

Nova Scotia—Proposal to Split Province Between Native and Non-native Groups. Senator Comeau	212
Senator Graham	212
Senator Carstairs	212

Fisheries and Oceans

East Coast—Sale of Fishing Licences to Be Transferred to Native Groups. Senator Comeau	212
Senator Carstairs	213

Church Community

Financial Support to Settle Lawsuits by Former Students of Residential Schools. Senator Roche	213
Senator Carstairs	213

Foreign Affairs

United States—Missile Defence System—Comments by Minister. Senator Nolin	214
Senator Carstairs	214

Human Rights

Ratification of Inter-American Convention on Human Rights. Senator Kinsella	214
Senator Carstairs	214

Delayed Answers to Oral Questions

Senator Robichaud	214
-------------------------	-----

Official Languages

Speech from the Throne—Sustaining Official Language Minority Communities. Questions by Senators Corbin, Nolin, Gauthier and Comeau. Senator Robichaud (Delayed Answer)	214
---	-----

Health

New Brunswick—Funding of Abortion Services. Question by Senator Murray. Senator Robichaud (Delayed Answer)	214
Auditor General's Report—Future Role of Department in Setting Standards. Question by Senator Oliver.	

Senator Robichaud (Delayed Answer)	215
Auditor General's Report—Recruitment Program for Bureau of Biologics. Question by Senator Oliver. Senator Robichaud (Delayed Answer)	215

ORDERS OF THE DAY**Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) Act (Bill S-16)**

Bill to Amend—Second Reading. Senator Kinsella	215
Referred to Committee.	216

Patent Act (Bill S-17)

Bill to Amend—Second Reading—Debate Adjourned. Senator Wiebe	216
Senator Grafstein	217
Senator Lynch-Staunton	217
Senator Murray	218

Committee of Selection

Third Report of Committee Adopted. Senator Mercier.	218
--	-----

speech from the throne

Address in Reply—Termination of Debate on Eighth Sitting Day— Motion Adopted. Senator Robichaud	218
Motion for Address in Reply—Debate Continued. Senator Murray	218
Senator Graham	220
Senator Moore	220
Senator Kinsella	222
Senator Meighen	223
Senator Roche	224

Tobacco Youth Protection Bill (Bill S-15)

Second Reading. Senator Kenny	225
Senator Corbin	228
Senator Nolin	228
Referred to Committee.	229

The Late Honourable Gildas L. Molgat

Tribute—Message from the Prince of Wales.	229
--	-----

Food and Drugs Act (Bill S-18)

Bill to Amend—Second Reading—Debate Adjourned. Senator Grafstein	229
Senator Taylor	231

Review of the Anti-Drug Policy

Motion to Establish Special Senate Committee—Debate Continued. Senator Robichaud	232
Motion in Amendment. Senator Kenny	232

Foreign Affairs

Committee Authorized to Engage Services. Senator Stollery ...	232
Committee Authorized to Permit Electronic Coverage. Senator Stollery	233
Committee Authorized to Study Emerging Developments in Russia and Ukraine and to Apply Papers and Evidence of Previous Session to Current Study. Senator Stollery	233

Senator Bryden	233
Senator Corbin	234
Senator Kinsella	235
Senator Lynch-Staunton	235
Committee Authorized to Study the European Union.	
Senator Stollery	236
Senator Carstairs	236
Committee Authorized to Study Issues Related to Foreign Relations.	
Senator Stollery	236
Senator Banks	237
Senator Kinsella	237

Social Affairs, Science and Technology

Committee Authorized to Engage Services.	
Senator LeBreton	237
Committee Authorized to Permit Electronic Coverage.	
Senator LeBreton	237
Committee Authorized to Study State of Health Care System and to Apply Papers and Evidence of Previous Session to Current Study.	
Senator LeBreton	238
Senator Carstairs	238
Senator Bryden	238
Committee Authorized to Study Developments in the Field of Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents.	
Senator LeBreton	238
Senator Robichaud	238

Business of the Senate

Senator Moore	239
Senator Kinsella	239

Transport and Communications

Committee Authorized to Permit Electronic Coverage.	
Senator Moore	239
Committee Authorized to Engage Services. Senator Moore	239

Agriculture and Forestry

Committee Authorized to Engage Services. Senator Wiebe	239
Senator Robichaud	239
Committee Authorized to Permit Electronic Coverage.	
Senator Wiebe	240

Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources

Committee Authorized to Permit Electronic Coverage.	
Senator Taylor	240
Committee Authorized to Engage Services. Senator Taylor	240
Committee Authorized to Study Matters Related to Mandate and to Resume Study on Nuclear Reactor Safety and Apply Papers and Evidence of Previous Session to Current Study.	
Senator Taylor	240
Senator Robichaud	240

Canadian Human Rights Commission

Motion to Hear Chief Commissioner in Committee of the Whole Adopted. Senator Kinsella	241
--	-----

Adjournment

Senator Robichaud	241
-------------------------	-----

Appendix

.....	i
-------	---

Progress of Legislation

.....	i
-------	---



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