



CANADA

Debates of the Senate

2nd SESSION

•

37th PARLIAMENT

•

VOLUME 140

•

NUMBER 31

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Tuesday, February 4, 2003



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

THE SENATE

Tuesday, February 4, 2003

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

Prayers.

NEW SENATORS

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I have the honour to inform the Senate that the Clerk has received certificates from the Registrar General of Canada showing that the following persons, respectively, have been summoned to the Senate:

Maria Chaput
Pana Pappas Merchant
Pierrette Ringuette-Maltais

INTRODUCTION

The Hon. the Speaker having informed the Senate that there were senators without, waiting to be introduced:

The following honourable senators were introduced; presented Her Majesty's writs of summons; took the oath prescribed by law, which was administered by the Clerk; and were seated:

Hon. Maria Chaput, of Sainte-Anne, Manitoba, introduced between Hon. Sharon Carstairs, P.C., and Hon. Richard H. Kroft;

Hon. Pana Pappas Merchant, of Regina, Saskatchewan, introduced between Hon. Sharon Carstairs, P.C., and Hon. Jack Wiebe; and

Hon. Pierrette Ringuette-Maltais, of Edmundston, New Brunswick, introduced between Hon. Sharon Carstairs, P.C., and Hon. Fernand Robichaud, P.C.

The Hon. the Speaker informed the Senate that each of the honourable senators named above had made and subscribed the declaration of qualification required by the Constitution Act, 1867, in the presence of the Clerk of the Senate, the Commissioner appointed to receive and witness the said declaration.

• (1420)

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I am delighted this afternoon to welcome the Honourable Maria Chaput, the Honourable Pana Merchant and the Honourable Pierrette Ringuette-Maltais as members of the Senate. I am fortunate to count each of them as a friend and have admired their many personal and professional accomplishments.

[Translation]

The Honourable Maria Chaput is the first female Franco-Manitoban to sit in the Senate. Senator Chaput used her business skills to promote the economic development of her province.

The efforts she made on behalf of the Franco-Manitoban community over several decades have earned her the respect and recognition of her fellow citizens in Manitoba.

The work that Senator Chaput did, especially for the Société franco-manitobaine, the Fédération des aînés franco-manitobains, and the Division scolaire manitobaine, was extremely valuable to the Francophone community in Manitoba.

[English]

Senator Merchant has worked on behalf of many Liberal causes for many years, but the dedication that she and her entire family have shown to the people of Saskatchewan is so evident that on her appointment Senator Merchant received accolades from representatives of every political party in her home province. Of course, this is a very special time for me because her mother-in-law, Sally, who has contributed much to the country, is sitting in the gallery today. My oldest friend, Adrian Merchant Macdonald, is also there. She is my oldest friend because we were born in the same hospital in the same city, delivered by the same doctor in the same week. Those who have known us must wonder why the entire nursery was not reorganized by the time we left.

She has volunteered, and I am referring to our new senator, with many organizations in Saskatchewan, particularly in the health care field, as well as with Canadian Parents for French and the MacKenzie Art Gallery. She is the second woman to represent Saskatchewan in the Senate. We are fortunate to be able to benefit from her talent and her desire to serve her fellow Canadians.

[Translation]

The Honourable Pierrette Ringuette-Maltais represented New Brunswick residents in the legislative assembly in her province and in the House of Commons.

[English]

While at the other place, Senator Ringuette-Maltais was a founding member of the True Grit Band, and I think there are a few of her fellow players in the gallery. I am sure she would be happy to share her talent with the Singing Senators.

Senator Ringuette-Maltais has worked at the Canada Post Corporation on trade missions overseas to assist foreign postal administrations and to promote Canadian expertise. She studied at the University of Moncton and Laval University, completing a course toward a master's degree in industrial relations. Senator Ringuette-Maltais also earned a master's in business administration at the University of Ottawa.

I hope all honourable senators will join me in welcoming these three exceptional women to the Senate of Canada.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

Hon. John Lynch-Staunton (Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, I am pleased to join with the Leader of the Government in welcoming our new colleagues, Senator Chaput, Senator Merchant and Senator Ringuette-Maltais and to wish them every success as they assume their new responsibilities, which will be enhanced by the strategic seating with which they have been favoured.

While the honourable leader has well summarized the impressive accomplishments of each of them, I cannot resist pointing out that they all have one thing in common, and something which will come as a great surprise, perhaps even as a shock to them, as it involved a precedent set by former Prime Minister Brian Mulroney.

On November 17, 1986, Prime Minister Brian Mulroney filled all three vacancies in the Senate with women only, the first time this was ever done. This place has greatly benefited ever since from the significant commitment and contributions made by Senators Cochrane, Rossiter and Spivak.

Prime Minister Chrétien, who since the 1993 election has displayed remarkable support for many of the Mulroney government's policies, practices and accomplishments, is to be commended for recognizing and following yet another.

• (1430)

This is the second time he has done so, for eight years after Prime Minister Mulroney set the precedent, Prime Minister Chrétien named Senators Bacon, Carstairs and Pearson to fill three vacancies, and, eight years later, we have three women filling the vacancies available.

[Translation]

Our new colleagues, like those I have just mentioned, will live up to the challenge that awaits them. We wish them the very best.

Hon. Marcel Prud'homme: Honourable Senators, if only to reaffirm the role that individual senators can play, I would like to join in the praises that our colleagues have just made. I have the privilege and pleasure of knowing two of the three new senators personally. I hope to become very good friends with Senator Chaput.

[English]

As a reminder, I had the honour of campaigning for a fabulous woman in Saskatchewan. That shows how far back I go and how close I am to the door, but I think she is in the gallery and I should like to take this opportunity to salute her. I campaigned as a young Liberal member of the House of Commons, the only federal Liberal under Prime Minister Pearson acceptable to Mr. Ross Thatcher. I am referring to the honourable senator's

mother-in-law, Ms. Sally Merchant, who was a minister and a member of the government of Mr. Thatcher. That does not make us young, but I am very happy to see the honourable senator here.

Knowing that she is a very proud member of a community for which I have great affinity, being an honorary Greek citizen, I hope the honourable senator, who is fluent in English, Greek and French, will help me polish my Greek. I say welcome.

[Translation]

I am very pleased, because Senator Ringuette-Maltais will bring a lot of charm and vivacity to this Senate.

[English]

I hope my friend, Jean Chrétien, as I still refer to him because I am not shy, will imitate another friend, Brian Mulroney. I have no hesitation in saying that Mr. Mulroney is a good friend — I know it is a sin for some to say that, but not for me. The honourable senator may remember a famous debate in which Mr. Mulroney said to Mr. Turner, another fine gentleman, whom I have known for 40 years, "Sir, you had the option. You could say no." We know it is difficult to elect women, but with the Senate the Prime Minister of Canada has the option. What is his option? It is to ensure that we have an equal number of men and women in the Senate. That has been my dream, and I have made that representation to him. We are on our way to that goal. There are now 33 women in the Senate. There are seven vacancies now, plus two this year and ten next year. We will achieve, at long last, total absolute equality, and I think Jean Chrétien could show the way by doing so, even though Brian Mulroney appointed one senator more than Mr. Trudeau. Honourable senators will remember that it took a long time to arrive at this number today.

I welcome the new senators.

Hon. Herbert O. Sparrow: Honourable senators, I in turn wish to welcome our new senators today and tell them how pleased I am with all of the appointments. I wish to tell our new colleagues that they have joined an institution that will give them the opportunity to do great things for their province and their country. I believe they knew that when they accepted their appointments. No other institution, where the ability to do good for your country, exists, outside the Senate.

I welcome you all, and I particularly welcome Senator Merchant from Saskatchewan, for whom I am particularly pleased. I have not met the other honourable senators, but I hope to do so later this day. I look forward to the opportunity to work with Senator Merchant, and I welcome her family members to this chamber this afternoon.

SENATORS' STATEMENTS

ALBERTA

CALGARY—LOSS OF STUDENTS OF STRATHCONA-TWEEDSMUIR SCHOOL IN AVALANCHE

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn: Honourable senators, it is with profound sadness that I rise today to pay tribute to the memory of the seven young Alberta students who lost their lives doing what they loved to do in a place they loved to be — skiing in one of the most beautiful areas of the Rocky Mountains, Glacier National Park, down on the southern border of Alberta and British Columbia: Ben Albert, Danielle Arato, Scott Broshko, Alex Patillo, Michael Shaw, Marissa Staddon and Jeffrey Tricket.

Along with seven other students and three adults, these young people set out on a glorious adventure on Saturday to engage in an outdoors event that was part of their mountain leadership course at Strathcona-Tweedsmuir School, just outside of Calgary. They were skilled, they were experienced and they were aware of the risks that always exist in these regions. In spite of all the expertise available, avalanches have a life of their own. It is a part of nature that seems to defy human calculation.

Seven adults also lost their lives in a similar accident recently in an area close to the scene of the weekend tragedy.

Investigations are underway. Canadians are demanding greater diligence and expertise from governments, scientists, environmentalists and organizations whose responsibilities touch on mountain, back-country ski and sport areas. This is already taking place.

Today, I simply ask all honourable senators to offer their prayers, sympathy and support to the families of the young people who have lost their lives, those who survived the avalanche, and the students and the staff whose hearts have been broken by the events of the weekend.

With the departure of these remarkable young people, Canada also mourns the loss of part of its future.

Hon. Dan Hays: Honourable senators, as Senator Fairbairn has observed, a tragedy has befallen the Strathcona-Tweedsmuir School located between Okotoks and Calgary. I wish to add my voice to the chorus of all those who mourn the lives of the seven Grade 10 students who were swept away by that avalanche this past weekend in British Columbia's Glacier National Park. The students, each one of them exceptional, were taking part in a mountain leadership course, having trained rigorously for several months before setting out to face the challenges of the mountain. As we now know, as they undertook their final expedition through Connaught Creek Valley near Rogers Pass, they displayed the energy, courage and enthusiasm, so typical of their youth, for which they will be remembered and which makes their passing all the more tragic.

As an Albertan and former student at Strathcona School, I am particularly saddened by this event and wish to convey heartfelt condolences to the parents, friends, classmates and teachers of the students that were named by Senator Fairbairn.

• (1440)

As we mourn their passing, we also celebrate the courage and heroic efforts of the rescue workers who managed to save the lives of ten other people buried in the avalanche. More than 35 individuals, including park wardens, skiers and members of the Canadian Armed Forces, took part in the mission. Their dedication deserves our most sincere praise and our lasting admiration.

Though no sadness can be deeper than the one brought about by the death of a child, we find solace in celebrating the talent, courage and enthusiasm displayed by these students throughout their all-too brief lives. We hope that somehow their passing will prevent such tragedies in the future.

[Translation]

THE LATE MS. FRANÇOISE GIROUD

TRIBUTES

Hon. Lise Bacon: Honourable senators, I wish to pay tribute to an extraordinary woman who left us on January 19. I am speaking of Françoise Giroud, the leading light of journalism in France, who left us at the age of 86. This woman of character symbolized, especially in French-speaking countries, women's aspirations to take their rightful place in society.

I am saddened by the passing of this great intellectual. Twice, as a member of the Quebec government, I had the opportunity to meet her. She impressed me with her kindness, her great intelligence and her warm voice. Françoise Giroud personified perseverance and the determination to succeed in a man's world.

Born in 1916 to a family of Russian and Turkish origin, she left school at age fourteen and a half, following her father's death. At sixteen, she started out as a shorthand typist and then became a movie script girl. It was during the Liberation, after World War II, that she started her career as a journalist for *Elle* magazine, where she rapidly became editor-in-chief. In 1953, with Jean-Jacques Servan-Schreiber, she founded *L'Express*, where she was editor-in-chief for twenty years.

In 1974, she tried her hand at politics and was made the secretary of state responsible for the status of women. She wrote about her experience with power in her book *La comédie du pouvoir*, in which she gives a caustic account of men and their exercise of power.

She said:

As soon as a woman crosses into a man's world, the nature of professional combat changes. With regard to the virtues required of a woman as a result, how many men would be capable of showing them —

She was an activist, a feminist, but not vengeful or obsessed with doctrine. She knew that nothing in life is ever free, ever easy. From nothing, one had to succeed to survive.

When she died, Françoise Giroud was still a very active contributor to the *Nouvel Observateur*, commenting on the world of television. She recently wrote about the future of digital technology. She had not lost her passion for writing about the world and observing its evolution. She wanted to remain vigilant. She had a habit of saying that "intelligence is nothing without courage." For her, the struggle of women for equality was one that was carried out every day and everywhere.

Honourable senators, I salute Françoise Giroud, a woman of courage and conviction. Writer, minister, journalist, woman committed to important issues in society, she never lacked in energy to defend her causes. She encouraged women to have confidence in themselves, to strive for more. She was, for me and many other women, a veritable source of inspiration.

Thank you, Madame Giroud!

Hon. Lucie Pépin: Honourable senators, as Senator Bacon mentioned, on January 19, at the age of 86, feminist luminary Françoise Giroud passed away in Paris. The international French-speaking community lost one of its leading lights.

Today I pay tribute to Françoise Giroud for her life of activism that was recognized and appreciated around the world. I simply had to pay my respects to her, because she was a role model and tireless source of inspiration to many feminists.

This exceptional woman left her mark on our times and inspired many women of my generation, including several women sitting here today in this very chamber. Through her work as a journalist and writer, and through her ministerial duties, she contributed to transforming the conscience and daily lives of her peers.

She was a natural. She was one of those people who were born to make things happen.

Throughout her lifetime, this dedicated, fascinating and engaging woman worked to prove that being born a woman was not a curse.

Françoise Giroud managed to do so in a manner that was committed and generous. While her politics leaned left, she nevertheless served under right-wing governments as minister responsible for the status of women. For her, it was a way to implement her feminist ideas and do her share for the feminist movement that was sweeping the world. When criticized for this choice, she responded, unfazed: "Feminism, as far as I know, is not about the right or the left." For the President at the time, Valéry Giscard D'Estaing, Françoise Giroud "flung the doors of life in France wide open to the role of women."

Although she was very committed, the feminism promoted by Françoise Giroud was nonetheless open. It was without hate or bitterness. She always said, boy or girl, man or woman, there are only individuals who are dependable or not.

There was a time when the path for women was riddled with obstacles. Françoise Giroud was among those who greatly contributed to clearing the way. In the special issue of the magazine *L'Express*, we find the following:

Women everywhere have lost something. Ms. Giroud defended them so intelligently and strongly.

It is to this example for women, and simply for humanity, that I wanted to pay tribute. She has left us, but her ideal and her heritage will inspire us for a long time to come.

[English]

JUSTICE

RACIAL PROFILING

Hon. Donald H. Oliver: Honourable senators, I have called your attention to the problem of racial profiling in this chamber before and, sadly, racial profiling is still being employed in our country.

Senior Ontario Crown Prosecutor James Stewart recently determined that racial profiling was a factor in a case involving DeCovan Brown. In that case, the former Toronto Raptor appealed his 2001 impaired driving conviction on the grounds that the police stopped him because he was a Black man driving an expensive vehicle. During the hearing in the *Brown* case, Stewart said:

I am not disputing the existence of racial profiling by the police. This is a problem that warrants corrective action.

Immediately after the hearing, Julian Falconer, a lawyer for the Urban Alliance for Racial Relations, made the following statement:

This concession by the Ontario government is a monumental development in the effort by racial minorities across the country to have racial profiling recognized and to put an end to mindless navel-gazing. The days are now gone where abject denials drive the debate.

Racial profiling is used at our airports as well. Dr. George Elliot Clarke, an Associate Professor at the University of Toronto and recipient of the 2001 Governor General's Literary Award for Poetry, is an African-Canadian from Nova Scotia who travels regularly on business. In September 2002, Dr. Clarke flew between Toronto, Ottawa and Edmonton on three separate occasions. Each time he was subjected to random security checks that went beyond the normal procedure of scanning carry-on luggage and walking through the metal detector. When he suggested to security officials that they might be engaging in racial profiling, they responded vehemently and strongly.

When the Anti-terrorism Act, Bill C-36, was passed on December 18, 2001, many Canadians felt that racial profiling, which had occurred frequently in the past, would increase. In light of the experiences of Mr. Brown and Dr. Clarke, it appears that their fears are not unfounded.

Honourable senators, this is Black History Month, which affords us a perfect opportunity to begin the process of ending racial profiling in Canada. By studying the achievements made by visible minorities in our country, we will foster better understanding and appreciation for the diversity we enjoy in our great nation. I encourage every senator to promote the study and teaching of Black history to help eliminate racial profiling and racism in our country.

[Translation]

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRIVACY COMMISSIONER

2002 ANNUAL REPORT TABLED

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I have the honour to table the report of the Privacy Commissioner for the year ending March 31, 2002, pursuant to the Privacy Act.

[English]

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

2002 PERFORMANCE REPORT TABLED

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I have the honour to table the performance report of the Library of Parliament for the fiscal year ended March 31, 2002.

INTERNAL ECONOMY, BUDGETS AND ADMINISTRATION

EIGHTH REPORT OF COMMITTEE PRESENTED

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

Tuesday, February 4, 2003

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

EIGHTH REPORT

Your Committee recommends the adoption of Supplementary Estimates (B) of \$639,000 for the fiscal year 2002-2003.

These Supplementary Estimates are needed to meet the following requirements:

- 1) to meet the Senate's 30 per cent share of additional funding requested by the Joint Inter-Parliamentary Council;

- 2) to provide the necessary funds required for the increased expenditures of the Office and Research Expenses Budget.

Respectfully submitted,

LISE BACON
Chair

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

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

• (1450)

RULES, PROCEDURES AND THE RIGHTS OF PARLIAMENT

SEVENTH REPORT OF COMMITTEE PRESENTED

Hon. Lorna Milne, Chair of the Standing Committee on Rules, Procedures and the Rights of Parliament, presented the following report:

Tuesday, February 4, 2003

The Standing Committee on Rules, Procedures and the Rights of Parliament has the honour to present its

SEVENTH REPORT

1. On October 31, 2002, the Senate referred to your Committee the recommendations and proposed rules contained in the Fourteenth Report of the Standing Committee on Rules, Procedures and the Rights of Parliament presented to the Senate in the First Session of the 37th Parliament on June 11, 2002. Included in this order of reference was a proposal for a procedure to enable the Senate, following its approval of a report submitted by a select committee, to refer that report to the Government with a request for a comprehensive government response within 150 calendar days.
2. Subsequently, on November 5, 2002, the Senate agreed to refer the following motion of Senator Jane Cordy to your Committee:

That within 150 days, the Leader of the Government shall provide the Senate with a comprehensive government response to the report of the Standing Committee on National Security and Defence entitled *Defence of North America: A Canadian Responsibility* tabled on August 30, 2002.

3. As noted above, your Committee dealt with this issue in its Fourteenth Report in the previous Session, entitled *Modernizing The Senate From Within: Updating The Senate Committee Structure: Issues Raised by Individual Senators*. On May 17, 2001, the Senate had referred to your Committee a motion by Senator Gauthier, as amended by Senator Lynch-Staunton, that would have amended the *Rules of the Senate* to enable the

[Senator Oliver]

Senate, after approving a report submitted by a standing committee, to refer that report to the Government with a request for a comprehensive response by the Minister within 90 days. The purpose of the motion was to equip the Senate with a procedure, comparable to that employed by the House of Commons, which would enhance its capacity to obtain a clear and public reaction from Governments to policy studies and recommendations developed by committees. Your Committee's Fourteenth Report, which was presented to the Senate on June 11, 2002, was not adopted by the Senate prior to the prorogation of the Session on September 16, 2002.

4. In the course of their deliberations, members of your Committee agreed that the work of the Senate was potentially undermined by the lack of any formal means of seeking a response from the Government to policy studies, and also agreed that this problem feeds a widespread perception in the media that such studies simply gather dust after they are tabled in the Senate Chamber.
5. Senate studies frequently contribute to the broad processes of debate and public policy formation by virtue of the strength of their findings and recommendations. However, the absence of tangible evidence of Government attention implies indifference to Parliament, and to the citizens it represents, that is unacceptable in a democratic system of government. As well, it impedes the capacity of committees to follow up on their work by assessing its impacts; threatens to undermine committee effectiveness by discouraging expert witnesses and Senators from making the necessary investments of time and effort; and fosters the impression that the public funds required for committee studies are not producing results.
6. Your Committee has considered practices established in the House of Commons and other jurisdictions, involving a procedural entitlement of committees to a formal Government response to their reports within a specified period of time. Although the quality of the responses provided by Governments varies considerably (and also varies among Ministers within governments), a formal response at least provides committees and the witnesses that have appeared before them with a tangible indication that reports have been given serious attention. Responses can also provide an initial focus for follow-up study.
7. While the Senate may request a Minister to appear before itself or its Committees, the Senate has no easy means to compel a minister of the Crown to respond to its reports. However, your Committee believes that the political pressures that would be associated with a public request for a response would normally be sufficient to ensure action from ministers, especially if the request is made on a committee's behalf by the Senate as a whole, and the time period is consistent with that employed by the House of Commons — 150 calendar days.

8. The proposed procedure would allow the Senate, following its approval of a report submitted by a committee, to refer that report to the Government with a request for a complete and detailed government response within 150 calendar days. The Leader of the Government in the Senate would be required to either table the Government's response within the 150-day period or provide the Senate with an explanation for the absence of such a response. Upon tabling of the response of the Government, it and the report would be referred back to the committee for review; where no response was received within the 150-day period, the report would be deemed to have been referred back to the committee. It will, of course, be up to the committee to decide whether to pursue the matter. In the absence of a response, the committee could decide to call the relevant Minister or Ministers to review the matter. As in all cases where the Senate decides to invoke a procedure, it should be prepared to follow through, should its resolution be ignored.
9. Committees are created by and subordinate to the Senate, and they report to the chamber. In the case of committee reports that are tabled, rather than presented, no further action is required, although it is always open to the Senate to adopt such a report. The Senate may adopt all or any part of the report, and may make amendments to it. Several members of your Committee pointed out that reports are often the result of lengthy negotiation and compromise, and should not be divided or amended without the input of the committee tabling it. It is always open to the Senate to send a report back to a committee for reconsideration (although this is more difficult in the case of a special committee which has ceased to exist). Your Committee assumes that this proposal would be made in appropriate cases.
10. Your Committee wishes to note that the proposed procedure allows the Senate, not an individual committee, to request a government response. The 150-day time period runs only from when the request is passed by the Senate, not from when the report was tabled in the Senate. Moreover, it will be available only where the Senate had adopted a report from a select committee.

Your Committee recommends that the *Rules of the Senate* be amended as follows:

(a) by renumbering rule 131 as 131(1); and

(b) by adding after subsection 131(1) the following:

“Request for Government response

(2) The Senate may request that the Government provide a complete and detailed response to a report of a select Committee, which has been adopted by the Senate if either the report or the motion adopting the report contains such a request, or if a motion to that effect is adopted subsequent to the adoption of a report.

(3) Upon adoption of a report or motion pursuant to subsection (2), the Clerk shall communicate the request to the Government Leader who shall, within one hundred and fifty calendar days after the adoption of the report or motion, either table the Government's response or give an explanation for not doing so in the Senate.

(4) Where the Senate adopts a report or a motion pursuant to subsection (2), the report of the select committee and the response of the Government or the explanation of the Government Leader for the absence of a response, or the absence of such response or explanation, are deemed to be referred to the select committee one hundred and fifty calendar days after the adoption of the report."

Respectfully submitted,

LORNA MILNE
Chair

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

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

STUDY ON NEED FOR NATIONAL SECURITY POLICY

INTERIM REPORT OF NATIONAL SECURITY AND DEFENCE COMMITTEE TABLED

Hon. Colin Kenny: Honourable senators, pursuant to the order of the Senate adopted on Wednesday, October 30, 2002, I have the pleasure to inform the Senate that on Tuesday, January 21, 2003, the fifth report of the Standing Senate Committee on National Security and Defence was deposited with the Clerk of the Senate. That report, entitled "The Myth of Security at Canada's Airports," is an interim report on the study on the need for national security policy for Canada.

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

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

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

FORTY-EIGHTH ANNUAL SESSION OF NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY, NOVEMBER 15-19, 2002—REPORT TABLED

Hon. Pierre Claude Nolin: Honourable senators, I have the honour to table the report of the Canadian NATO Parliamentary Association. This is the report of the official delegation that represented Canada at the Forty-Eighth Annual Session of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, held in Istanbul, Turkey, from November 15-19, 2002.

[*English*]

QUESTION PERIOD

NATIONAL DEFENCE

REPLACEMENT OF SEA KING HELICOPTERS— WITHDRAWAL OF EUROCOPTER FROM COMPETITION

Hon. J. Michael Forrestall: Honourable senators, my question is directed to the Leader of the Government in the Senate. It will come as no surprise to her, having let her off the hook for some months now, that my inquiries will be directed toward the purchase of a replacement helicopter for the Sea King.

Perhaps the honourable senator will remember that Eurocopter withdrew the Cougar MK2 from the maritime helicopter project last winter. At the time, Eurocopter complained that the specifications set by the Department of National Defence were too high and that, as such, they could not compete. At the time, Eurocopter also threatened the withdrawal of the NH-90.

Can the minister tell us if she recalls these events and whether the Canadian government has approached Eurocopter for the readmittance of the Cougar Mach 2 into the maritime helicopter project competition?

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, it is still the intention of the government to get the right aircraft, and as soon as possible. I can also assure the honourable senator that the government is continuing with its policy of the lowest-cost compliant. Perhaps the most important point to relay to Senator Forrestall is that the government has not and will not modify the statement of operational requirements. Those requirements are based on military analysis, extensive statistical research and realistic force planning scenarios based on actual Canadian Forces operations.

Senator Forrestall: Honourable senators, the principal reason for the withdrawal of the Cougar was, of course, Eurocopter's inability to meet those standards. I can now rest assured that the Cougars will not be back in the competition.

In light of that, can the Leader of the Government in the Senate tell us why a Department of National Defence team showed up in France in January to review competing aircraft for the Sea King replacement and was asked to review the Cougar Mach 2 that had allegedly been withdrawn from the competition? Why did they go back to it?

Senator Carstairs: Honourable senators, I cannot answer exactly why we went back to France at that particular time. If that information can be made available, I shall make it available to the honourable senator. However, I want to reinforce that the government has not and will not modify the statement of operational requirements.

Senator Forrestall: I join with all the men and women who have to serve in that piece of equipment, whichever one it is, in thanking you for that undertaking.

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

BACKLOG OF REFUGEE CLAIMS

Hon. Donald H. Oliver: Honourable senators, my question is directed to the Leader of the Government in the Senate and deals with the Department of Citizenship and Immigration.

Canada's Refugee Board is currently dealing with the biggest caseload in its history. At the end of last year, 53,000 claims were still in the pipeline, up from 46,000 the previous year. This rise comes despite the fact that the actual number of refugee claims made last year was fewer than the year before. It has instead been attributed to the fact that the average hearing now takes 13 months to complete, meaning that cases carry over from year to year. Also, in November of last year, the huge backlog in the processing of immigration claims of spouses of Canadian citizens was brought to the attention of the Leader of the Government in the Senate.

Honourable senators, it would appear that the heavy caseload of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration might be alleviated with the help of additional staff. In November of last year, the Leader of the Government in the Senate said that additional resources have been given to Immigration to meet those backlogs.

• (1500)

If the Department of Immigration was allocated additional resources last fall, then why has the number of cases currently being heard not decreased? What additional resources were allocated and at what cost, and was a cost-benefit study done of them?

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government): The honourable senator has indicated that they were given additional resources and, indeed, they were. However, the reality is that people need to be trained appropriately to deal with such cases. That training is ongoing at the present time.

The honourable senator is quite correct that there is a huge backlog, but it is being whittled away. The reality is that there are a great many people who want to get into this country. There are a great many refugees. Most important, we have had to do a stop plan for some of them because of the tremendous pressures on our borders, not entirely because of what is going on in the world today.

[Translation]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES ACT

Hon. Jean-Robert Gauthier: Honourable senators, the Fédération franco-ténoise, an association of francophones living in the Northwest Territories, has appealed to the Supreme Court of the Northwest Territories for a determination that the language regime put in place by the Government of the Northwest Territories is not equivalent to or in compliance with the federal regime as required by the Northwest Territories Act, that the Government of Canada has linguistic responsibilities and

has not met its obligations under sections 16, 18 and 20 of the Charter and the unwritten principle of protection for minorities; and finally that the federal government has been remiss in its section 41 obligations under the Official Languages Act in that, even now, 15 years after the act was passed in 1988, no enabling regulations have been adopted by Parliament concerning section 41 of the Official Languages Act of Canada.

A parliamentary committee of the NWT Legislative Assembly has proposed legislative, regulatory and administrative improvements to the act. These are to be tabled in early March 2003.

Can the minister inquire of her cabinet colleagues and indicate to us whether the federal government intends to evaluate the bill of the Government of the Northwest Territories in order to ensure that its objectives are similar to those of the Official Languages Act?

Will the Parliament of Canada have the possibility of reviewing the bill and making recommendations, as needed, to the Government of the Northwest Territories?

[English]

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government): As the honourable senator knows, as he is probably more knowledgeable than anyone with regard to official languages in this country, the Northwest Territories' Official Languages Act falls under the jurisdiction of the territory. The territorial government, therefore, has the responsibility to determine its orientations and proposed legislative amendments, as required. The Government of Canada will not interfere in that particular direction.

However, there is a special relationship, of which I am sure the honourable senator is also aware, with regard to the Northwest Territories' Official Languages Act, in that the act can only be repealed if the Parliament of Canada gives it effect. However, it is well within the authority of the Northwest Territories to add additional principles, if it wishes.

[Translation]

Senator Gauthier: Section 43.1 of the Northwest Territories Act stipulates that the Northwest Territories Official Languages Act cannot be amended or repealed, except with the concurrence of the Parliament of Canada.

Does the federal government intend to present recommendations in order to amend the Official Languages Act of the Northwest Territories before the proposed amendments are enacted by the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories, as provided for in the act?

[English]

Senator Carstairs: Honourable senators, my understanding is that the Northwest Territories can amend its law, but it cannot repeal the law without permission of Parliament. I see the honourable senator shaking his head in the negative. Therefore, I will make further inquiries as to the exact position on this matter.

[Translation]

Hon. Gérald-A. Beaudoin: Honourables senators, I believe the Constitution is very clear: the territories have powers delegated by the Parliament of Canada. The provinces have powers that are directly attributed by the Constitution. It is very clear.

In my opinion, section 16 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms clearly states that French and English are the official languages of Canada and have equal status in terms of their use in the institutions of Parliament. The three territories are institutions created by the Parliament of Canada. As a result, does it not follow that the equality of the official languages must be upheld in the territories, including the Northwest Territories? Is it the intention of the government — and I hope it is — to ensure that bilingualism becomes a reality in the Northwest Territories? The heart of the Constitution says so.

[English]

Senator Carstairs: Honourable senators, I must tell the honourable senator that the information that I have is somewhat different from the information that he has presented today.

The information that I have is that the Northwest Territories' Official Language Act falls under the jurisdiction of the territory. The territorial government, therefore, has the responsibility to determine its orientations and proposed legislative requirements and amendments, as required. The Government of Canada will not, nor does it propose to, interfere with that process. However, as I stated to the Honourable Senator Gauthier, there is a special status in that if the Commissioner and Council of the Northwest Territories try to repeal, they can only do so if Parliament gives its agreement to that effect.

[Translation]

Senator Beaudoin: I would like to add that everything the territories are given — this is extremely important — comes from delegated federal legislation. Parliament — in granting rights to the territories, which it does — is required to carry out section 16 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Section 16 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms mentions the equality of status of the official languages in the institutions of Parliament.

As far as can I see, it is quite clear that a federal territory is a federal institution, created by a statute. I shall allow the minister to answer, but legally, it seems quite clear to me.

[English]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

UNITED STATES—RENEWAL OF SOFTWOOD LUMBER AGREEMENT

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

British Columbians and all Canadians are trying to establish where the Minister of Trade is on this issue. I am checking the accuracy of this now. Apparently, on this week's trip to

Washington, he delivered a vague position on softwood lumber. Last week, he said that his trip was not about softwood lumber. Two days later, he reversed himself by saying that he was going to Washington for the softwood meetings.

Could the honourable leader elaborate on the position of these softwood discussions, which are imperative to the economic needs of all Canadians?

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I can tell the honourable senator that the softwood lumber negotiations that were stalled for a number of weeks have been revved up and are ongoing in Washington as the Senate is sitting this afternoon.

Senator St. Germain: They were stalled and have been revved up. I do not know who is revving them up, whether it is the Americans or not.

The minister clearly stated that he was relying on the WTO's findings in regard to the outcome of this matter. Now, apparently, the position has changed and the minister is even entertaining an export tax. Could the government leader clarify the government's position on this matter at this particular moment?

Senator Carstairs: Honourable senators, let me begin with the latter part of the honourable senator's question. A border tax has been suggested, but not by the Government of Canada. It has been suggested by Weyerhaeuser, which is a big player in the lumber business. The government will examine that proposal, but it is far more interested in a long-term, policy-based solution. That has been its position all along.

• (1510)

I refute what the honourable senator said with respect to the minister placing all his eggs, if you will, in the basket of the WTO. He has indicated all along that he will use WTO and NAFTA agreements in any way he can to prove the wrongness, quite frankly, of the American position. That has not prevented him, under any circumstance, from attending meetings, which is exactly why he is participating today.

Senator St. Germain: Honourable senators, basically, this can be viewed as a flip-flop. If one's position is adamant on the outcome of the WTO rulings, then one cannot try to make the Americans believe that one is prepared to accept an export tax. Basically, an export tax would take control of the management of our resources, whereas most Canadians believe we should control our own destiny. British Columbians and others in the lumber industry see this as a capitulation, a flip-flop and a show of weakness to the Americans, who certainly have been aggressive. Senator Baucus and another American senator have brought forward legislation that would double the tariff on lumber going into the United States at the present time.

Is there a clear and definitive path here, or are we only zigzagging through the trail of softwood lumber?

Senator Carstairs: Honourable senators, absolutely not. There is no flip-flop. The government has proceeded through the international agreements it has signed and which it would like the United States to respect. Therefore, it has gone through the WTO and the NAFTA process in the hope that we can come to a decision which, we believe, would clearly favour Canadian softwood lumber.

At the same time, we will not take the position that we will hide behind negotiations. If there is interest in discussions to solve this problem outside those two negotiated agreements, then, of course, we are willing to enter into such discussions.

However, the reality is that we are doing everything we can to ensure that decisions taken regarding the softwood lumber industry, which is located right across the country, although predominantly in the province which the honourable senator represents, are in the best interests of lumber producers and, more important, lumber workers.

[Translation]

SOLICITOR GENERAL

UNITED STATES DRUG ENFORCEMENT AGENCY— ILLEGAL ACTIVITIES IN CANADA

Hon. Pierre Claude Nolin: Honourable senators, my questions are directed to the Leader of the Government in the Senate and also concern Canada-United States relations.

On November 6, I asked a question about the *Licht* case heard by the Supreme Court of British Columbia. This is a case which shows how little respect the United States of America has for Canada's sovereignty. In August 1999, without the RCMP authorizing its action or operation, the Drug Enforcement Administration, commonly known as DEA, carried out an illegal sting operation in Canada, in violation of a bilateral agreement providing that each country was to give the other prior notice and obtain permission, prior permission that is, to carry out any such operation.

In response to my question, the Leader of the Government said that the Solicitor General of Canada was not prepared to comment on the reprehensible actions, as it were, of the DEA. She undertook, however, to obtain answers for me at the earliest possible opportunity concerning this, and I quote:

— issue of great import between the two nations.

It has now been three months since I asked this question, and I am still waiting for an answer. What is going on? In the post-September 11 context, are we afraid of the Americans? Are we afraid of their reaction? Does the fact that Senator Carstairs is not coming back with an answer reflect the inability of federal authorities to compel our main ally to respect Canada's sovereignty and laws or does it confirm her government's tacit support for the violation of the fundamental rights of individuals

living in Canada by DEA agents? To address the legitimate concerns of the members of this House and of Canadians, is the Leader of the Government finally prepared to state the position of her government on this very thorny issue?

[English]

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, as the honourable senator has indicated, I did take that question as notice and, eventually, there will be a response. However, because of the intervention of the honourable senator today, I will try to obtain a response sooner since this is the second time the honourable senator has asked the question.

The Deputy Leader of the Government will be tabling some delayed answers today, as well as later this week. However, I do not recall that an answer to Senator Nolin's question is among them. Therefore, I will put in an extra call on that particular question to see if we cannot get an answer for the honourable senator quickly.

[Translation]

Senator Nolin: It is possible that the minister can get some information for her reply from her colleague, the Solicitor General of Canada. I will give her a few points to ponder.

This past November 22, the Solicitor General of Canada made a statement that was both surprising and alarming. In response to a question from a member in the other place, Peter Mackay, concerning the *Licht* affair, he stated as follows:

— if there is one thing we can be proud of, it is the intelligence work that CSIS does and the good cooperation it has with its American counterpart south of the border.

— we cooperate with other intelligence services around the world in the interests of the health and safety of Canadians and in the interests of national security.

I see the questioning look on the face of the Government Leader. When I read that comment by the minister, I was greatly troubled by a matter that concerns the RCMP and by the fact that the minister, who is responsible for CSIS and the RCMP, made reference to CSIS. Obviously, the Solicitor General of Canada, who is responsible for the RCMP, let us not forget, was not informed of the *Licht* affair! Although this statement is an embarrassment for Canadians, are we to conclude that it is the government's official position on this matter?

[English]

Senator Carstairs: Honourable senators, it will be obvious that I do not agree entirely with some of the statements made by those on the other side.

The Honourable Senator Nolin says that the honourable minister made comments about the fact that CSIS was working well with its partners south of the border on issues of security and intelligence. I think that is most important. It has become increasingly important since September 11.

What the honourable senator has addressed, however, is a specific issue, and one to which we clearly need an answer. Obviously, if these individuals were acting in an illegal way in Canada, we have to identify just how they broke the law and get to the bottom of the situation.

However, the two issues are not the same. The issues of security and intelligence post-September 11 are areas in which, I can assure the honourable senator, CSIS is working closely with our friends and neighbours to the south.

[Translation]

Senator Nolin: The Supreme Court of British Columbia, in a claim for extradition made by the Government of the United States, in *U.S.A. vs. Licht*, acknowledged — which is why the application was rejected — the illegality of the actions of the Government of the United States. It seems to me that taking three months to answer this question is excessive. The facts are known and the minister is familiar with them. CSIS is not the one dealing with this; it is the RCMP. I am prepared to wait a little longer. It would appear that the leader does not have the information but, for heaven's sake, let her not tell me that her government does not have it either. It does.

[English]

Senator Carstairs: I cannot tell the honourable senators that the government does not have the information but I do not have the information. Therefore, I cannot share it with the honourable senator opposite. I will do everything I can to seek that information and to share it with the honourable senator.

UNITED NATIONS

POSSIBLE WAR WITH IRAQ

Hon. Douglas Roche: Honourable senators, my question is for the Leader of the Government in the Senate. Even at this late hour I dare to hope that the war against Iraq can be avoided, and I commend the efforts of the Government of Canada in this regard.

• (1520)

This is unquestionably the most serious foreign policy issue Canada has faced in decades, and every effort must be made to avoid war.

Has the government noted the statement last weekend by former United States President Jimmy Carter, recipient of the 2002 Nobel Peace Prize, wherein he urged the United States not to attack Iraq and stated that the U.S. has not made a case for a pre-emptive military strike against Iraq? Further, has the Government of Canada noted that President Carter called for a sustained and enlarged inspection team, even up to 1,000 inspectors, as a permanent, robust monitoring system until the United States and other members of the UN Security Council determine that its presence is no longer needed?

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, as the honourable senator knows, the position of the Government of Canada has been to support Resolution 1441 of

the United Nations. The honourable senator makes reference to statements made by the former president of the United States, Jimmy Carter; however, over the next 10 days other critical events are expected to unfold.

Tomorrow, we know that the Secretary of State for the United States, Mr. Colin Powell, will appear before the United Nations. It is expected that the Secretary of State will lay more evidence before the Security Council. That will happen, I understand, at 10:30 our time tomorrow morning. Following that, Secretary Powell will hold a news conference, around noon, with respect to information he has presented to the UN Security Council.

We have been told that Mr. Blix will be reporting, on behalf of those who are presently doing their best to uncover any weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, on February 14.

The Government of Canada will clearly continue in its support of Resolution 1441, and it will support the decisions of the United Nations Security Council.

THE SENATE

GOVERNMENT-SPONSORED DEBATE ON POSSIBLE WAR WITH IRAQ

Hon. Douglas Roche: I thank the minister for that.

Former President Carter anticipates that the Powell statement tomorrow will not provide a real or approximate threat by Iraq to the U.S. That brings us back to the imminence of the war.

Yesterday in the House of Commons, Foreign Affairs Minister Bill Graham, in answer to a question, said, in part, the following: "We are opposed to war, except as an absolutely last resort." Can the Leader of the Government in the Senate tell us what is meant by "absolutely last resort"? It is probably not easy for the minister to answer that question in a few words, which is why there should be a government-sponsored debate in the Senate on this subject.

As the honourable leader knows, I have a motion before the Senate on this subject. This is not a matter for any one senator. This is a crucial government matter. Will the minister cause there to be a special debate in the Senate on the Iraq situation?

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government): The answer to the honourable senator's question is no. However, I would encourage every senator to participate in the motion that the honourable senator has laid before the Senate, which would give us adequate opportunity, I would hope, to put our views on the record in the same way that the House of Commons now has done in its Take Note Debate last week and which, I understand, it will do again, tomorrow.

Senator Roche: The minister said clearly that she would not cause a debate in the Senate. Would the minister state why the government will not take its responsibilities and, as such, introduce a motion that would open up a government-sponsored debate, not a debate by any one senator?

[Senator Carstairs]

Senator Carstairs: As the honourable senator well knows, nothing in the Senate is a debate by any one senator. The honourable senator's motion with respect to this subject is presently on the Order Paper. Quite frankly, it would take me some time to even put down a notice on this matter. If the honourable senator thinks there is urgency to this, then I would encourage him to encourage his fellow senators who agree with him to participate in the debate on his motion.

Hon. Marcel Prud'homme: Honourable senators, I have a supplementary question.

On January 22, 1991, in respect of the Persian Gulf crisis, the government of the day decided not only to hold a debate, but also that it would be a votable motion. The Liberal caucus that morning decided to vote against Mr. Clark's motion. At the end of the day, some Liberal members switched and decided to vote in favour of the motion. I am one of 47 members who voted against the motion.

There was a very important discussion, and there was a vote.

If there is a place that should debate the issue, it is this place. I do not always agree with my colleague, but anyone can adjourn a debate after finishing speaking and then come back to it at a later time. If we were to have a full debate, then we would know exactly where we stand. I like to be counted. I am sure I am not speaking only for myself.

I would ask the Leader of the Government in the Senate to, at least, convey to the government that it would be the strong desire of some of us not only to debate the issue, but also to vote on it. If at the end of the day the Americans decide to go to war against Iraq, even though in doing so they may not have the support of the United Nations, and if the Canadian government decides to join in, as I feel they will —

Senator St. Germain: I hope so.

Senator Prud'homme: — we should debate and vote. My colleagues will vote against me, but that is why we are a democracy.

Senator Carstairs: With the greatest respect, the honourable senator raises a what-if issue. I do not think we should deal in hypothetical situations. I question whether a hypothetical debate adds in any way, shape or form to the debate that is taking place worldwide.

Senator Prud'homme: Good points.

Senator Carstairs: Senator Roche has a motion before the Senate. If Senator Prud'homme wishes to speak to that motion, there is nothing to prevent him from speaking to it when it is called on the Order Paper. That is true for every senator in the chamber. No one has been told not to debate that motion. I would hope that, if there is genuine interest, there would be an active and engaged debate on the subject.

[Translation]

DELAYED ANSWER TO ORAL QUESTIONS

Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I have the honour to table a response to a

question raised by Senator Oliver regarding the Auditor General's report, Small Business Financing Program, cost-recovery rate on small business loans.

INDUSTRY

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT—SMALL BUSINESS FINANCING PROGRAM—COST-RECOVERY RATE ON SMALL BUSINESS LOANS

(Response to question raised by Hon. Donald H. Oliver on October 8, 2002).

The January 2002 study, in question, was commissioned by Industry Canada to better understand the decline in use of Canada Small Business Financing (CSBF) loans during the past few years. In the study, lenders cited administrative burden as a factor in the declining use of the program since 1999. Industry Canada will be working with lenders to clarify the nature of their particular concerns regarding administrative burden as well as possible solutions.

The decline in use of the program between 1999 and 2001 also coincided with good economic conditions and increased financial health of businesses and as such may not be viewed as a negative development. Under these conditions, small firms may not have had to borrow as much money or were in a position to qualify for non-CSBF loans. It is interesting to note that Canadian Federation of Independent Business (CFIB) surveys have found an overall declining trend in borrowing by SMEs in this period. Lenders have also cited competition from other financial products as a further factor behind decline in use of the program. Industry Canada will continue to monitor this trend to determine what action, if any, to recommend in response.

ANSWER TO ORDER PAPER QUESTION TABLED

SOLICITOR GENERAL—ANTI-TERRORISM ACT

Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Deputy Leader of the Government) tabled the answer to Question No. 1 on the Order Paper for September 30, 2002 relating to various clauses in Bill C-36 — Honourable Senator Lynch-Staunton.

[English]

USHER OF THE BLACK ROD

WELCOME

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, before proceeding to Orders of the Day, I wish to welcome our new Usher of the Black Rod, Mr. Terrance Christopher, who is serving for the first time in chamber duty. Welcome.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

PHYSICAL ACTIVITY AND SPORT BILL

THIRD READING

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Mahovlich, seconded by the Honourable Senator Poy, for the third reading of Bill C-12, to promote physical activity and sport, as amended,

And on the motion in amendment of the Honourable Senator Murray, P.C., seconded by the Honourable Senator Oliver, that the Bill be not now read a third time but that it be amended,

(a) in clause 32, on page 13, by adding after line 27 the following:

“(4) The Minister shall cause a copy of the corporate plan to be tabled in each House of Parliament on any of the first fifteen days on which that House is sitting after the Minister receives the plan.”; and

(b) in clause 33, on page 14, by adding after line 11 the following:

“(5) The Minister shall cause a copy of the annual report to be tabled in each House of Parliament on any of the first fifteen days on which that House is sitting after the Minister receives the report.”.

And on the motion in amendment of the Honourable Senator Kinsella, seconded by the Honourable Senator Atkins, that the Bill be not now read a third time but that it be amended,

(a) on page 13, by adding after line 10, the following:

“32. The Centre is deemed to be a government institution as that term is defined in section 3 of the *Access to Information Act* and section 3 of the *Privacy Act* for the purposes of those Acts.”;

(b) on page 15,

(i) by adding before the heading “*Department of Canadian Heritage*” before line 17, the following:

“*Access to Information Act*”

37. Schedule I to the *Access to Information Act* is amended by adding the following in alphabetical order under the heading “*Other Government Institutions*”:

Sport Dispute Resolution Centre of Canada Centre de règlement des différends sportifs du Canada”,

(ii) by adding after line 21, the following:

“*Privacy Act*”

39. Schedule I to the *Privacy Act* is amended by adding the following in alphabetical order under the heading “*Other Government Institutions*”:

Sport Dispute Resolution Centre of Canada Centre de règlement des différends sportifs du Canada” ; and

(c) by renumbering clauses 32 to 40 and any cross-references thereto accordingly.

And on the motion in amendment of the Honourable Senator Roche, seconded by the Honourable Senator Murray, P.C., that the Bill be not now read a third time but that it be amended in clause 35,

(a) on page 14, by deleting the heading before line 23 and lines 23 to 46;

(b) on page 15, by deleting lines 1 to 7; and

(c) by renumbering clauses 36 to 40 as clauses 35 to 39 and any cross-references thereto accordingly.

And on the motion in amendment of the Honourable Senator Gauthier, seconded by the Honourable Senator LaPierre, that the Bill be not now read a third time but that it be amended in the Preamble, on page 1, by replacing lines 5 to 8 with the following:

“social cohesion, linguistic duality, economic activity, cultural diversity and quality of life;”.

And on the motion in amendment of the Honourable Senator Bolduc, seconded by the Honourable Senator Nolin, that the Bill be not now read a third time but that it be amended, in clause 28, on page 10, by replacing lines 34 to 38 with the following:

“*Auditor General of Canada*”

28. (1) The accounts and financial transactions of the Centre are subject to examination and audit by the Auditor General of Canada.

(2) The Auditor General of Canada shall annually

(a) audit and provide an opinion on the financial statements of the Centre; and

(b) provide a report to the Chairperson and to the Minister on the audit and opinion.

(3) The Minister shall cause a copy of the Auditor General’s report to be tabled in each House of Parliament on any of the first fifteen days on which that House is sitting after the Minister receives the report.”.

And on the motion in amendment of the Honourable Senator Gauthier, seconded by the Honourable Senator Hubley, that the Bill be not now read a third time but that it be amended in clause 7, on page 4, by adding after line 19 the following:

“(3) In developing contribution and policy implementation agreements, the Minister shall take into account the needs of the English-speaking and French-speaking minorities, in accordance with the *Official Languages Act*.”.

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

Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): What is the question?

The Hon. the Speaker: Perhaps I can help. There are presently six amendments before us with respect to the third reading of this bill. They are listed on the Order Paper. There are motions in amendment by Senators Murray, Kinsella, Roche, Gauthier, Bolduc and another by Senator Gauthier.

• (1530)

I propose that we proceed to vote on these motions in reverse order, as has been our custom.

Senator Kinsella: Honourable senators, because it has been some time since we were dealing with this bill, it may be helpful, after His Honour puts each motion, to have a comment from the government as to its position with regard to that motion.

The Hon. the Speaker: Our rules do not provide for debate after putting the question on the motion; however, with leave, we could do that, or the comment could be made before the motion is put, with the Chair describing the motion to be put.

Hon. Lowell Murray: Your Honour asked whether we were ready for the question. The deputy leader asked what is the question, and we were told that there were six amendments that would be put in reverse order.

I assume that someone from the government will stand and let us know whether any or perchance all of those amendments are acceptable to the government or, if not, simply state the government's position as we go through each amendment. I do not believe that would be out of order.

The Hon. the Speaker: Is it agreed then, honourable senators, that having put the motions in reverse order, as I described earlier, that a representative on the government side will comment briefly before I actually proceed to call for a voice vote or whatever disposal the Senate wishes? That will be followed by the question of whether the amended motion — it already has been amended once — is approved.

Senator Murray: It has been a while. Perhaps Your Honour would read the particular amendment that we are dealing with so that we will know what we are dealing with.

The Hon. the Speaker: That is an excellent suggestion, Senator Murray, and I will do that. Before I do that, however, is it agreed that I will pause after I read the amendment before saying, “Is it your pleasure, honourable senators...” to allow for comment from a representative of the government, presumably the Deputy Leader of the Government? Is that how Honourable Senators wish to proceed?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

[Translation]

Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, you have been asked whether you are prepared for the question to be put on each of the amendments now before us.

The government's position has been clearly indicated by our colleague, Senator Mahovlich. If we follow the usual procedure, the position will be made known once the question has been put. By extension, when the member, in whose name Bill C-12 stands, made his statements, we could deduce that the government would not agree with any of these amendments.

Should a vote be held at some point, we would see whether the amendments are adopted, as things progress.

[English]

Senator Kinsella: Honourable senators, I think that greater clarity should be brought to this discussion. Page 4 of today's Order Paper sets out the motion in amendment of Senator Gauthier, seconded by Senator Hubley.

I do not remember Senator Mahovlich expressing the government's view on that amendment. Senator Robichaud has indicated that Senator Mahovlich has explained the government's position. My recollection is, and Hansard will bear this out, that Senator Mahovlich has indeed not spoken on the motion in amendment of Senator Gauthier, seconded by Senator Hubley.

We would like to know what the government's position is on that amendment before the question is put on that amendment. We may agree with the government's position, but we may disagree. As His Honour has pointed out, once the question is put, the question is put. Debate should occur before the question is put.

What is the position of the government on Senator Gauthier's motion in amendment, as seconded by Senator Hubley?

[Translation]

Senator Robichaud: Honourable senators, if the question on the amendment by Senator Gauthier is put, all the senators will know the government's position immediately. It is simply a matter of having the question put on each amendment, one after the other.

[English]

Hon. Jean-Robert Gauthier: I believe, honourable senators, that I have the opportunity to speak in this debate. I may be wrong. I had started to explain why I wanted to move this amendment. I do not believe that the government had made its view known on this amendment, but I sincerely hope that we would not comment on this unless someone had a comment to make on the pertinence of the motion in amendment.

[Translation]

It would be logical for senators to understand that this motion in amendment has its merits.

[English]

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, this is the reading that I take with respect to how we should proceed if the house is ready for the question. The request — which I will attribute to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition — is that the government makes its position clear on whether it supports each amendment at some point before we vote on it. That request is not unanimously agreed to.

I will not interpret the answer. Honourable senators heard the statement from the Deputy Leader of the Government. The vote will tell you what their position is.

I am not able to depart from the rules governing the way we should proceed. The formal way for me to proceed is to read the motion as amended and then each of the six amendments. I would then go to the point where I was when I started, when I asked if the house was ready for the question. Simply by putting the last amendment, I am assuming the house is ready for the vote.

Senator Robichaud: Yes.

The Hon. the Speaker: I will ask again. Is there another point?

Hon. John Lynch-Staunton (Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, if the government has no ready views on the amendments, perhaps it is not time to vote on them. Perhaps senators on the other side should reflect and then return to us with their views. If they cannot give views on proposed amendments to a government bill, perhaps the sponsor of the bill could guide us, but we do need some guidance.

Some Hon. Senators: No.

The Hon. the Speaker: I hear some senators saying no, that they are not ready for the question. Normally at this point an honourable senator would speak. If no senator speaks, we come back to the question. Are we ready for the question?

• (1540)

Some Hon. Senators: No!

The Hon. the Speaker: I will take my seat to see if anyone speaks.

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, the official position of the government, quite frankly, is

that it does not support any of the amendments that have been proposed. However, there have been some discussions with some honourable senators, and the indication is, to me, at least, that some senators would like to support some of the amendments in this case. Beyond that, all I can do is say, "Let us vote on the amendments and see what unfolds."

The Hon. the Speaker: Is the house ready for the question?

Some Hon. Senators: Question!

The Hon. the Speaker: I will proceed by putting the questions on the amendments of Bill C-12 as amended in reverse order and proceed with the last amendment first.

It was moved by the Honourable Senator Gauthier, seconded by Honourable Senator Hubley, that the bill be not now read a third time but that it be amended in clause 7 on page 4 by adding, after line 19, the following:

(3) In developing contribution and policy implementation agreements, the Minister shall take into account the needs of the English-speaking and French-speaking minorities, in accordance with the *Official Languages Act*.

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

Some Hon. Senators: Yes.

Some Hon. Senators: No.

The Hon. the Speaker: Those in favour of the motion in amendment will please say "yea."

Some Hon. Senators: Yea.

The Hon. the Speaker: Those opposed to the motion in amendment will please say "nay."

Some Hon. Senators: Nay.

The Hon. the Speaker: In my opinion, the "nays" have it. The motion in amendment is defeated, on division.

The next amendment, honourable senators, was moved by the Honourable Senator Bolduc, seconded by the Honourable Senator Nolin, that the bill be not now read a third time but that it be amended in clause 28, on page 10, by replacing lines 34 to 38 with the following:

Auditor General of Canada

28. (1) The accounts and financial transactions of the Centre are subject to examination and audit by the Auditor General of Canada.

(2) The Auditor General of Canada shall annually

(a) audit and provide an opinion on the financial statements of the Centre; and

(b) provide a report to the Chairperson and to the Minister on the audit and opinion.

(3) The Minister shall cause a copy of the Auditor General's report to be tabled in each House of Parliament on any of the first fifteen days on which that House is sitting after the Minister receives the report.

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

Some Hon. Senators: No.

Some Hon. Senators: Yes.

The Hon. the Speaker: All those in favour of the motion in amendment will please say "yea."

Some Hon. Senators: Yea.

The Hon. the Speaker: All those opposed to the motion in amendment will please say "nay."

Some Hon. Senators: Nay.

The Hon. the Speaker: In my opinion, the "nays" have it. The motion in amendment is not passed, on division.

I will proceed to the next motion in amendment: It was moved by the Honourable Senator Gauthier, seconded by the Honourable Senator LaPierre, that the bill be not now read a third time, but that it be amended in the Preamble, on page 1, by replacing lines 5 to 8 with the following:

social cohesion, linguistic duality, economic activity,
cultural diversity and quality of life;

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

Some Hon. Senators: Yes.

Some Hon. Senators: No.

The Hon. the Speaker: All those in favour of the motion in amendment please say "yea."

Some Hon. Senators: Yea.

The Hon. the Speaker: All those opposed to the motion in amendment will please say "nay."

Some Hon. Senators: Nay.

The Hon. the Speaker: I believe the "yeas" have it. The motion in amendment is carried.

The next motion in amendment, in reverse order, was moved by the Honourable Senator Roche, seconded by the Honourable Senator Murray, that the bill be not now read a third time but that it be amended in clause 35,

(a) on page 14, by deleting the heading before line 23 and lines 23 to 46;

(b) on page 15, by deleting lines 1 to 7; and

(c) by renumbering clauses 36 to 40 as clauses 35 to 39 and any cross-references thereto accordingly.

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

Some Hon. Senators: No.

Some Hon. Senators: Yes.

The Hon. the Speaker: All those in favour of the motion in amendment will please say "yea."

Some Hon. Senators: Yea.

The Hon. the Speaker: All those opposed to the motion in amendment will please say "nay."

Some Hon. Senators: Nay.

The Hon. the Speaker: I believe the "nays" have it. The motion in amendment is lost.

The next motion in amendment was moved by the Honourable Senator Kinsella, seconded by Honourable Senator Atkins: That the bill be not now read a third time but that it be amended:

(a) on page 13, by adding after line 10, the following:

"32. The Centre is deemed to be a government institution as that term is defined in section 3 of the *Access to Information Act* and section 3 of the *Privacy Act* for the purposes of those Acts.";

(b) on page 15,

(i) by adding before the heading "*Department of Canadian Heritage*" before line 17, the following:

"Access to Information Act

37. Schedule I to the *Access to Information Act* is amended by adding the following in alphabetical order under the heading "*Other Government Institutions*":

Sport Dispute Resolution Centre of Canada
Centre de règlement des différends sportifs du Canada";

(ii) by adding after line 21, the following:

"Privacy Act

39. Schedule I to the *Privacy Act* is amended by adding the following in alphabetical order under the heading "*Other Government Institutions*":

Sport Dispute Resolution Centre of Canada
Centre de règlement des différends sportifs du Canada"; and

(c) by renumbering clauses 32 to 40 and any cross-references thereto accordingly.

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

Some Hon. Senators: Yes.

Some Hon. Senators: No.

The Hon. the Speaker: Those in favour of the motion in amendment please say "yea."

Some Hon. Senators: Yea.

The Hon. the Speaker: Those opposed to the motion in amendment please say "nay."

Some Hon. Senators: Nay.

The Hon. the Speaker: I believe the "nays" have it. The motion is lost, on division.

I will now put the last motion in amendment: It was moved by the Honourable Senator Murray, seconded by the Honourable Senator Oliver, that the bill be not now read a third time but that it be amended,

(a) in clause 32, on page 13, by adding after line 27 the following:

"(4) The Minister shall cause a copy of the corporate plan to be tabled in each House of Parliament on any of the first fifteen days on which that House is sitting after the Minister receives the plan."; and

(b) in clause 33, on page 14, by adding after line 11 the following:

"(5) The Minister shall cause a copy of the annual report to be tabled in each House of Parliament on any of the first fifteen days on which that House is sitting after the Minister receives the report.".

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

• (1550)

Some Hon. Senators: Yes.

Some Hon. Senators: No.

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

Some Hon. Senators: Yea.

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

Some Hon. Senators: Nay.

The Hon. the Speaker: In my opinion, the "yeas" have it. I declare the motion in amendment carried.

[The Hon. the Speaker]

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

Motion agreed to and bill read third time and passed, as amended.

CODE OF CONDUCT AND ETHICS GUIDELINES

MOTION TO REFER DOCUMENTS TO STANDING COMMITTEE ON RULES, PROCEDURES AND THE RIGHTS OF PARLIAMENT ADOPTED

On the Order:

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

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

And on the motion in amendment of the Honourable Senator Joyal, P.C., seconded by the Honourable Senator Losier-Cool, that the motion be amended by adding the following:

"That the Committee, in conjunction with this review, also take into consideration at the same time the code of conduct in use in the United Kingdom Parliament at Westminster, and consider rules that might embody standards appropriate for appointed members of a House of Parliament who can only be removed for cause; and

That the Committee make recommendations, if required, for the adoption and implementation of a code of conduct for Senators, and concerning such resources as may be needed to administer it, including consequential changes to statute law that may be appropriate.".

Hon. Herbert O. Sparrow: Honourable senators, I wish to speak to the code of conduct and ethics guidelines that, I believe, will be referred to the Standing Committee on Rules, Procedures and the Rights of Parliament for consideration. I spoke to the motion at a previous sitting of the Senate, but today I wish to speak to the motion in amendment of the Honourable Senator Joyal.

I expressed my concern that I believe senators should be masters of their own fate in this place. The decision affecting the ethics of the Senate should be made in this chamber. In that context, I agree that the subject matter should be referred to the Rules Committee, and I support the motion in amendment of Senator Joyal, which states:

"That the Committee, in conjunction with this review, also take into consideration at the same time the code of conduct in use in the United Kingdom Parliament at Westminster, and consider rules that might embody standards appropriate for appointed members of a House of Parliament who can only be removed for cause; and

That the Committee make recommendations, if required, for the adoption and implementation of a code of conduct for Senators, and concerning such resources as may be needed to administer it, including consequential changes to statute law that may be appropriate."

MOTION IN AMENDMENT

Hon. Herbert O. Sparrow: Honourable senators, I move, seconded by Senator Cools, that the motion in amendment be amended by adding the following:

That the committee, in conjunction with the review, also take into consideration the present Rules of the Senate, the Parliament of Canada Act, the Criminal Code of Canada, the Canadian Constitution, and the Common Law to determine after a full compilation and review of these provisions whether they do of themselves adequately serve to assure high ethical standards in the actions of Senators in performing their duties.

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

Motion in amendment agreed to.

Hon. Anne C. Cools: Honourable senators, I wanted to speak to the amendment.

Hon. John Lynch-Staunton (Leader of the Opposition): The motion in amendment has passed.

The Hon. the Speaker: Senator Cools, do you wish to speak?

Senator Cools: I want to take the adjournment.

The Hon. the Speaker: You want to move the adjournment of the debate, Senator Cools?

Senator Cools: That is what I have been trying to do, which some honourable senators find very amusing.

The Hon. the Speaker: It is moved by Senator Cools, seconded by the Honourable Senator Sparrow, that further debate be adjourned to the next sitting of the Senate.

Senator Sparrow, did you not wish to second the motion?

Senator Sparrow: Honourable senators, for confirmation, the motion was passed. I gather that Senator Cools is now speaking on either the main motion or the motion in amendment of Senator Joyal.

Senator Cools: Honourable senators, I wish to adjourn the main motion.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, there are two amendments. Senator Joyal's amendment has passed and Senator Sparrow's amendment has passed. We are now on the motion as amended twice. The honourable senator is entitled to speak to it or is entitled to move adjournment of the debate. It is my understanding that Senator Cools wishes to do the latter.

Senator Cools: Honourable senators, I thought I was quite clear when I said that I wished to move the adjournment.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: Senator Joyal's motion in amendment has not been passed.

The Hon. the Speaker: It is moved by Senator Cools, seconded by Senator Sparrow, that further debate be adjourned to the next sitting of the Senate. Is it your pleasure, honourable senators, to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Senators: Yes.

Some Hon. Senators: No.

The Hon. the Speaker: Will all those in favour of the motion to adjourn debate please say "yea"?

Some Hon. Senators: Yea.

The Hon. the Speaker: Will all those opposed to the motion to adjourn debate please say "nay"?

Some Hon. Senators: Nay.

The Hon. the Speaker: In my opinion, the "nays" have it and the motion is defeated.

Is the house ready for the question?

Some Hon. Senators: Question!

The Hon. the Speaker: Sorry. We have not put Senator Joyal's motion in amendment. We have proceeded correctly, in the reverse order, by putting the question on the motion in amendment of Senator Sparrow.

Is it your pleasure, honourable senators, to adopt the motion in amendment by Senator Joyal?

Senator Cools: Your Honour, I wish to speak to that motion in amendment too.

The Hon. the Speaker: Senator Cools, we are in the middle of putting the question.

Senator Cools: Your Honour, I have not spoken.

Senator Murray: His Honour is on his feet.

The Hon. the Speaker: Senator Cools, your motion to adjourn debate on the motion in amendment by Senator Sparrow was not agreed to. We are now in the process of taking a vote on the motion in amendment by Senator Joyal. We will then deal with the main motion. I do not believe we are at a stage where debate can take place. Accordingly, it is not in order, in the middle of the course of debate, to move adjournment or to move another motion.

Senator Cools, I will hear you on the point of order.

Senator Cools: Honourable senators, it is my understanding that one votes on amendments sequentially. When one vote is disposed of, debate automatically moves back to the main motion. I was not under the impression, and it was not made clear to me or maybe to everyone else in this chamber, that we were in point of fact disposing of all of the votes on this question today.

• (1600)

If that is the case, the mover of the motion should rise to speak to close the debate, to indicate clearly that the debate is coming to a conclusion.

My understanding is that, after the first subamendment is disposed of, the debate falls right back to the next one. The obvious course then is to discover whether the wish is to resume debate on that particular question or whether the chamber wants to hold a vote. At that point, it seems to be very reasonable that I could rise and say that I wish to take the adjournment of the debate because I wish to speak to the first motion in amendment.

Barring all of that, it seems to me that we cannot dispose of that vote and move on to a final vote on the main motion without the mover of the main motion indicating to the chamber that the debate is coming to a close. It seems to me that there is a pretty ordered way in which debate is closed, and I have not seen that happen here, Your Honour.

The Hon. the Speaker: On the point of order, Senator Sparrow.

Senator Sparrow: What happened was unusual. I am not sure that it has happened before, but that does not mean it was not right or correct. My motion in amendment was moved and passed in this chamber, but that does not mean that the motion in amendment of Senator Joyal was passed. We revert to the motion in amendment of Senator Joyal and any senator should be entitled to speak on that amendment.

The Hon. the Speaker: Any other comments on the point of order?

[Translation]

Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I would not want to complicate the procedure. Senator Sparrow moved an amendment, which was adopted by this House. We were about to vote on the amendment put forward by Senator Joyal when the Honourable Senator Cools moved the adjournment of debate. This motion was not adopted.

Nothing stops the Honourable Senator Cools or any other senator from speaking on Senator Joyal's motion in amendment. Then, the question could be put, and we could dispose of the motion in this fashion.

[English]

The Hon. the Speaker: I think I have heard enough to make a decision on this matter. Senator Robichaud's comments are well taken and concur with what Senator Cools has said, notwithstanding my suggestion that we would deal with all matters before us sequentially without further debate. On consideration, having listened to the contribution of honourable senators and following a philosophy that I think is important, which is that we should be at pains to allow senators to speak —

Senator Cools: Yes.

The Hon. the Speaker: Senator Cools, therefore, can speak or move adjournment of the debate.

Senator Robichaud: Adjournment was refused.

The Hon. the Speaker: If she moves adjournment of the debate, we can dispose of that. If it is debatable, she can either debate it or move it. It is on the floor and she can do anything that we are entitled to do, in my opinion. She may speak. I think I know the wish of the Deputy Leader of the Government in this regard.

Senator Cools: Honourable senators, it is clear to say that the wish of the government is to end the debate, which is a different issue from what I was trying to say.

The Hon. the Speaker: Senator Cools, to clarify, are you speaking to the amendment at this time?

Senator Kinsella: Yes.

Senator Cools: No, I am trying to adjourn the debate. I was trying to say that before. As far as I am concerned, the debate is still ongoing because the mover of the motion has not indicated to the chamber that the debate is over.

Senator Robichaud: Order!

Senator LaPierre: Sit down!

The Hon. the Speaker: Having disposed of the point of order in your favour, Senator Cools, I will not hear further argument on the point of order.

Senator Cools: Your Honour, I wish to ascertain whether or not I am the last speaker on this particular amendment. This particular amendment was moved by Senator Joyal. I was under the impression that the mover of an amendment or the mover of a motion indicates to the chamber that he wants the vote to proceed. I am not under the impression that the Leader of the Government or any other member of this house can simply bring a debate to a close. My understanding is that the mover of the motion is the key person who has to indicate that it is okay for his

question to move ahead. My understanding is that Senator Joyal has an opportunity to rise and to close this debate, if he so chooses. It is his right as mover of the motion. In absence of him doing that, I should like to speak on the debate and I offered to move the motion to adjourn, which I would like to do again because it seems to me the debate is still ongoing.

I understand the eagerness of some senators to terminate the debate. I question that and say that it is wrong. Your Honour, just by rising, you should not be cutting me off, either. You do it a lot.

The Hon. the Speaker: Senator Cools, you have made a motion. There seems to be some problem, but you are entitled to speak. I heard you say that you now want to move a motion to adjourn, and I thought I would put that question.

Senator Cools: What are we moving the motion on? We are still on Senator Joyal's subamendment.

The Hon. the Speaker: Let me try to dispose of the point of order.

Senator Cools is quite right. It is customary for the proposer of a bill, someone in Senator Joyal's position, to often indicate the time for the question.

Senator Cools: Precisely.

The Hon. the Speaker: However, it is also often the case that the Speaker will hear from the floor a request to put the question. The proposer of the motion may or may not be present. It is the will of this chamber as to whether or not a motion will be put. The Speaker will then often say, "Is the house ready for question?" If the answer is in the affirmative, with no one rising to continue or adjourn the debate, then the question is put.

Did you wish to comment, Senator Murray?

Hon. Lowell Murray: Honourable senators, one of the points of order raised by Senator Cools was to the effect that the mover of a motion in amendment, which is the case with Senator Joyal, has the right to close the debate.

With great respect, I believe she is incorrect in that assertion. It is true that the person who presents a bill closes the debate, but this is not done with amendments to bills or motions, as far as I am aware. Senator Joyal would not have the right to close the debate.

With regard to the motion that Senator Cools may have just made to adjourn the debate, if an identical motion has been defeated already, there must be an intervening stage before a second motion to adjourn the debate would be acceptable. I believe I am correct in that.

The Hon. the Speaker: The honourable senator is probably referring to rule 35 in terms of the right of reply, which states:

A Senator who has moved the second reading of a bill or made a substantive motion or an inquiry shall have the right of final reply.

We have a practice of giving notice. The question, then, is whether this is a substantive motion.

Senator Cools: Yes.

The Hon. the Speaker: I do not have the answer to that off the top of my head, but even if it is a substantive motion, and that is hypothetical for purposes of my comment now, Senator Joyal did not rise. Senator Joyal has not indicated any intention to speak. There is no rule or practice that I am aware of that prevents a vote from being taken on a motion only at the invitation of the proposer of that motion. This is a question for the Senate as a whole to decide. We, in practice, often take votes in the way that I described a moment ago.

What was your other question, Senator Murray?

• (1610)

Senator Murray: Before my friend can move another motion to adjourn the debate there has to be an intervening stage.

The Hon. the Speaker: That is right, but the motion to adjourn that was defeated was on the amendment of Senator Sparrow, and we are now on the amendment of Senator Joyal.

Senator Robichaud: No. No.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: No, Senator Sparrow's motion was carried. The amendment was passed.

[Translation]

Senator Robichaud: Honourable senators, the amendment put forward by the Honourable Senator Sparrow has already been adopted. We should proceed to Senator Joyal's amendment. A motion to adjourn debate on Senator Joyal's amendment has been moved and defeated. If no honourable senator wishes to speak on this amendment, the question may be put and we can dispose of this amendment in order to deal with the main motion. If no honourable senator wishes to continue debate, we could consider the proposal now before us.

[English]

Senator Rompkey: Question.

Senator Milne: Question.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I believe Senator Cools wishes to speak.

Senator Cools: Honourable senators, I want to clarify rule 35 because there seems to be some misunderstanding of the meaning of rule 35 in the minds of some senators. The rule states clearly:

A Senator who has moved the second reading of a bill or made a substantive motion or an inquiry shall have the right of final reply.

The right of final reply is a standard procedure in Parliament, as it is in the common law, however, the particular term here that senators seem to be stumbling over is the term “substantive motion.” “Substantive motion” is a parliamentary phrase referring to particular kinds of motions, for example, motions amending bills and amendments to motions as opposed to other classes of motions, for example, dilatory motions. The term “substantive motion” is not that difficult to grasp.

The second point, honourable senators, is that I never said that a vote could be put only after the mover has spoken. There are times when the mover of the motion or the one who proposes the initiative may indicate that he or she has no wish to speak again. All I was trying to say was that there was a sub-amendment before us that was disposed of, and the debate immediately reverts to the previous question, which was Senator Joyal’s motion and to which I wish to speak.

I have been waiting for some weeks now to speak. I was very interested in what Senator Sparrow had to say. Senator Sparrow is a man of considerable accomplishment, particularly in this matter. He is a long-serving senator. I have waited some weeks to hear him, and I had intended to speak after he had spoken. I had no idea we would be introducing an amendment so it was my intention to be speaking on Senator Joyal’s question.

What I am trying to say, honourable senators, is that there was no indication to any of us that there was a timeline on this debate. There has been no indication of closure, and there has been no indication from the leadership here on the floor of the Senate that they wanted this question put today. I was simply exercising my basic right to participate in the debate. I did not think that would be a problem. Obviously, it has proven to be a problem.

In any event, honourable senators, all I am saying is that I had wanted to speak in this debate and I am not ready to speak today. It is that straightforward. I am exercising my right within the rules of this Senate, under which I think we are supposed to be operating. As far as I can see, I am within my rights to ask for the adjournment.

Senator Murray: Honourable senators, I do not have a view on the matters that my friend has just raised. I do not think I will be taking part in the debate at this stage, and I am in no hurry with regard to the bill. However, I do want to point out that “substantive motion” is not what my friend says it is.

Senator Joyal’s amendment is not a substantive motion. “Substantive motion” is defined in our rules under rule 4(e)(ii), page 5 of the English version.

“Substantive motion” means an independent motion neither incidental to nor relating to a proceeding or order of the day already before the Senate;

Obviously, Senator Joyal’s amendment to this bill does not qualify as a substantive motion. Further, I think I would find, if I looked further here, that substantive motions require notice to be given. There, again, no notice is required for an amendment such as Senator Joyal has proposed.

[Senator Cools]

Again, I believe I am correct in saying that there is not a right on the part of a mover of an amendment to a bill to speak twice, as it were, by closing debate on this amendment.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: It is not a bill. It is a motion.

The Hon. the Speaker: I agree. Perhaps I have contributed to some of the confusion. The motion of Senator Sparrow was passed. Senator Cools moved adjournment of the debate, in effect on Senator Joyal’s motion in amendment, and her motion to adjourn was defeated. We have no intervening act that would allow her to move the motion to adjourn again, as was observed. Accordingly, we are now on the motion in amendment of Senator Joyal.

Senator Robichaud: Question!

The Hon. the Speaker: Is the house ready for the question?

Hon. Senators: Question!

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

Motion in amendment agreed to.

The Hon. the Speaker: We now go on to the main question of the resolution as amended.

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

Motion agreed to, as amended.

ENERGY, THE ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO MEET DURING SITTING OF THE SENATE

Leave having been given to revert to Notices of Motions:

Hon. Mira Spivak: Honourable senators, with leave of the Senate and notwithstanding rule 58(1)(a), I move:

That the Standing Senate Committee on Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources have the power to sit at 5 p.m. today, Tuesday, February 4, 2003, even though the Senate may then be sitting, and that rule 95(4) be suspended in relation thereto.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

SANCTIONING OF MILITARY ACTION AGAINST IRAQ UNDER INTERNATIONAL LAW

MOTION—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Roche, seconded by the Honourable Senator Taylor:

That the Senate notes the crisis between the United States and Iraq, and affirms the urgent need for Canada to uphold international law under which, absent an attack or imminent threat of attack, only the United Nations Security Council has the authority to determine compliance with its resolutions and sanction military action.—(*Honourable Senator Rompkey, P.C.*).

Hon. Bill Rompkey: Honourable senators, I wish to say a few words today and perhaps take the opportunity to say more on this motion later. It is important to note, first of all, in accordance with the earlier exchange we had during Question Period, that Senator Roche's motion be kept alive. It is very timely. I think it was the suggestion of Senator Carstairs that many senators might want to participate in this debate and to use Senator Roche's motion as a vehicle for debating a very serious issue that faces us at the moment.

Although I have delayed speaking up until now, I am pleased to participate in the debate at this time because the topic is becoming more timely every day. Let me make a few comments today, Your Honour, and then adjourn the debate to later.

The longer this situation goes on, the more puzzling it gets. I believe the first choice for all of us would be to have any action against Iraq taken under the auspices of the United Nations. Having said that, there are still questions that we need answered. First, what is the situation in Iraq? Exactly what weapons are there? What are the capacity and the potential of those weapons? Those questions have not been answered to the satisfaction of many people.

The second question, in my mind, relates to the role of the UN itself. While it is the only body that we have, and while we all believe it is the vehicle that should be used, its track record is not impeccable either. I refer to Kosovo and Rwanda as cases where perhaps the UN was not as effective as it might have been. We face a puzzling dilemma. If we leave the whole of the responsibility in this case to the UN, would we be right in doing that at this time?

This is a situation that must be addressed. I simply raise those questions today. If I may, honourable senators, I would take the adjournment of the debate, in order to prolong the period during which senators may participate in this debate.

Senator LaPierre: Hear, hear!

On motion of Senator Rompkey, debate adjourned.

INDEPENDENCE OF SPEAKER IN WESTMINSTER MODEL OF PARLIAMENT

INQUIRY—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the inquiry of the Honourable Senator Kinsella calling the attention of the Senate to the independence of the Speaker in the Westminster model of Parliament.—(*Honourable Senator Oliver*).

Hon. Terry Stratton: Honourable senators, I should like to speak briefly to the issue of the independence of the Speaker in the Westminster model of Parliament.

Similar to Bill S-4, which I sponsored and which talks about the review of the appointments to the Supreme Court of Canada and to the Senate and of the appointments of lieutenant governors of Canada, this inquiry addresses the kind of issue that I believe should be debated in this chamber. Whether we support it or not, the issue needs to be debated. If not here, where will it be debated?

As I look at the independence of the Speaker in the Westminster model of Parliament, the same thing holds true. The question should be opened and debated so that we put forward ideas about how this issue can be addressed in the future. The pressure is constantly building with the public out there. As with my bill in the last session, Bill S-20, the response from Western Canada was surprising. I think the same thing can hold true here.

I think we should debate this issue.

On motion of Senator Stratton, for Senator Oliver, debate adjourned.

• (1630)

NATIONAL SECURITY AND DEFENCE

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO REPORT ENTITLED "CANADIAN SECURITY AND MILITARY PREPAREDNESS"—INQUIRY

Hon. J. Michael Forrestall rose pursuant to notice of October 10, 2002:

That he will call the attention of the Senate to the Government response to the Report of the Standing Committee on National Security and Defence entitled *Canadian Security and Military Preparedness*, tabled in the Senate on Wednesday, October 9, 2002.

He said: Honourable senators, it is with deep regret that I take this opportunity to respond to the Government of Canada's hollow response to the Standing Senate Committee on National Security and Defence's report entitled "Canadian Security and Military Preparedness."

It is a response long on government "press spin" and short on government action. It is, in reality, short of the mark and a non-response to our committee. Indeed, when the House of Commons receives a government response to committee reports, it responds to each and every recommendation — not so this time with the Senate report.

To be fair, the government's response does point out that the government has committed \$7.7 billion beginning in fiscal year 2001-02 to enhance Canadian security. However, the response plays games with the numbers. For instance, it states that the government set aside \$1.6 billion for emergency preparedness and the Canadian Forces. In fact, the Department of National Defence was allotted only \$1.2 billion over five years, and of that only \$510 million over two years went to support conventional military capabilities and some \$210 million was set aside to pay for Operation Apollo.

As a point of fact, the Auditor General has pointed out that the Department of National Defence has an operations and maintenance deficit on a per annum basis of some \$1.5 billion alone. Honourable senators will be reminded that those figures are now getting to be more than a year and one half or two years old. Thus, the government's numbers are suspect and require further analysis.

Indeed, there was no answer to our recommendation for a \$4-billion infusion in this fiscal year to the Canadian Forces.

While it is true, honourable senators, that Canada has taken a number of steps to project a Smart Border with the United States, it should not go unnoticed that our southern trading partner and closest ally is becoming increasingly vocal about Canada's defence and security spending. This government's recent deal to allow American troops on Canadian soil would never have happened in this manner if we had maintained proper border controls and military forces to ensure Canadian security and hence enhance the security of the United States.

Although the government provided by its own figures and questionable accounting some \$60 million for the enhancement of maritime security and just recently another \$172.5 million — between six government departments, I might add — I would suggest to honourable senators that it has done little to ensure the security of our major ports of Montreal, Halifax and Vancouver, through no fault of the port authorities that are trying to cope with the post-September-11 world as best they can. These major ports are extremely vulnerable to attack by everything from common thieves to organized crime to terrorists with either a cyber virus or a weapon of mass destruction. These ports are critical to our economic and national security. How many of our ports have radiation detectors on cranes? What about our off-shore oil rigs and pumping stations? What steps has the government taken to protect these installations from terror attack — that top al-Qaeda terrorist hit lists in almost any country — and our environment from absolute and total destruction? The government does not address our recommendation for a public inquiry, for example, into Canadian ports. What has the government done about passenger ferry terminal security in such places as Yarmouth? Can honourable senators think of a softer target for a group that wants a high-impact target to kill innocent people, Canadians, Americans and others?

There is then the highly contentious issue of airport security, a matter about which the Standing Committee on National Security and Defence has just recently tabled a report entitled "The Myth of Security at Canada's Airports."

There is the question of the government's tax grab and the reaction of the Auditor General, who says she had to bring a review of it to a halt, honourable senators, because she could not follow the accounting procedures in place. I wonder where all that money is? We are talking about a lot of money. Is it going to enhance security? No one knows. However, what we do know is that when I travelled to the West Coast last week as a member of the National Security and Defence Committee, it cost me \$12 in Halifax, \$12 in Toronto, \$12 to get on a private flight in Regina to go to Edmonton, and from Edmonton to Vancouver it cost me another \$12. Honourable senators, that is \$48, just to get to the West Coast. The same taxes were applicable on the return journey. So in this case, the taxes amounted to \$96 — not \$12, not \$24, but \$96. The monies are in the mix somewhere, but can any honourable senator tell me that he or she is safer in the air now than prior to September 11? Can any honourable senator demonstrate that? I doubt it.

When our own committee heard testimony that few, if any, bags are searched and that organized crime has penetrated our airport cargo facilities, just as they have our major and minor ports, all we got from the government by way of a response was a rehash of government press releases. Indeed, their response was so vacuous that even Sir Humphrey Appleby of "Yes, Prime Minister" fame would be proud and pleased with the masterful inactivity of the Government of Canada.

Canada's ability to confront terrorists with weapons of mass destruction capability exists in little more than platoon form. Our intelligence services are hampered by their very size and limited resources to provide early warning. Military intelligence is tactical, at best. CSIS, if these reports are true of mail tampering, is in difficulty. The Communications Security Establishment's equipment is old, and we have been told that its equipment that is deployed for electronic intelligence gathering is unreliable for that very reason — old age. As for intelligence oversight, it appears non-existent outside CSIS. Based on a book released last year entitled *Covert Entry: Spies, Lies and Crimes Inside Canada's Secret Service*, that level of oversight must now be called into question.

Lastly, I want to say a few things about the state of Canada's military, which garnered only 67 words in the Speech from the Throne. Honourable senators, think about that. The only words on the subject that would have been acceptable to most Canadians, I think, are: "Yes, they need help. Yes, we will give them help. Yes, that help will match the demonstrated requirement of the leaders of the Canadian Armed Forces." It is so clear, not just to myself, but I hope to many more, that at no time, or very seldom, in any event — and I have been here for coming up to 38 years — have we ever seen the Government of Canada pay such little attention to our defence forces.

• (1640)

When the Chrétien government came to power in 1994, it had a navy given to it on the cutting edge of medium-sized navies and a replacement program for the Sea King. With respect to the Sea King, I welcome a response from the Leader of the Government

in the Senate today, but I have a funny feeling that she roped me in and that I will have to read the “blues.” I congratulate the honourable leader on her doing something that has nothing to do with whether Eurocopter is back in the running as a replacement for the Sea King. If that should be the case, this will be an interesting chamber, because little will be done if no leave is granted — not until the honourable leader starts to tell the truth about the replacement of the Sea King helicopter.

The Sea King has a deferred maintenance problem that is second to none, and that effectively means that our TRUMP destroyers and operation support ships are on their way out with little sign of replacement. The government cancelled the Sea King replacement and replaced it at great monetary cost to the taxpayer with a process so questionable that it has been hung up for years. The only force that we now have that is capable of fighting alongside the best and against the best is in such rapid decline and deterioration that it is in the process of abandoning its entire task group concept.

The air force is essentially landlocked to Canada until we have a strategic refuelling capability that this government scrapped. The CF-18s are in need of replacement before the end of the decade. All of our air fleets, save the EH-101 Cormorants purchased by this government, have declining rates of availability. We are critically short of pilots and technicians.

Then there is the lamentable state of the army, an army that liberated Vimy Ridge — a fact that is a surprise to our Minister of National Defence some 85 years later — and an army that liberated Holland, which the Dutch will never forget.

Honourable senators, we have not held brigade-level exercises since the early 1990s. We are incapable of meeting our white paper commitments and we cannot sustain, past one rotation in a peacekeeping environment, more than that one battalion group on overseas operations.

We have tanks that are so old they are not deployed. We have no attack helicopters. This country could not even ship stoves, toilets and fresh water purification systems to Afghanistan, let alone provide camouflage uniforms to our troops in the desert environment. I am now told that all of our reserve regiments, struggling to survive, have been told that their budgets will be cut. They still have only 37.5 days of training annually when they should have a minimum of 45 or 50 days of training. What of our recommendation to increase the size of the Canadian Armed Forces to 75,000 personnel — nothing. Alone, that would have solicited a thoughtful response such as, “Yes, we can do it” or “No, we cannot do it,” and the reasons.

Thus, it was with little surprise that the vacuous response came from the former Solicitor General of Canada who had a problem with knowing what he knew and when he knew it, and from the Minister of National Defence who does not know the difference between heroism at Vimy and traitorous activity at Vichy. It is terribly sad that these ministers are so out of touch with reality that they clipped and pasted past press releases together to form a response to our committee report, but it is little wonder, given the government’s lack of attention to the Canadian Armed Forces in the Speech from the Throne.

Honourable senators, a national institution that is the guardian of our democracy and of our nation state is under attack and is faced with irrelevance due to government inaction. This government’s response to the Standing Senate Committee on National Security and Defence is nothing more than a further illustration of this government’s apparent contempt for — or benign neglect of, if you will — national security and the people of Canada who rely on it.

The Hon. the Speaker: If no other senator wishes to speak, this inquiry is considered debated.

SOCIAL AFFAIRS, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO STUDY HEALTH ISSUES SURROUNDING REPORT ON STATE OF HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

Hon. Michael Kirby, pursuant to notice of December 10, 2002, moved:

That Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology be authorized to examine and report on issues arising from, and developments since, the tabling of its final report on the state of the health care system in Canada in October 2002. In particular, the Committee shall be authorized to examine issues concerning:

- (a) Aboriginal health;
- (b) Women’s health;
- (c) Mental health;
- (d) Rural health;
- (e) Population health;
- (f) Home care;
- (g) Palliative care.

That the papers and evidence received and taken by the Committee on the study of the state of the health care system in Canada in the Second Session of the Thirty-sixth Parliament and the First Session of the Thirty-seventh Parliament be referred to the Committee, and

That the Committee submit its final report no later than June 30, 2004.

He said: Honourable senators, during the committee’s recent health care study over the last two and one-half years, it became apparent that a number of the health topics listed in the motion deserve a substantially more in-depth examination than they received when the committee looked at the broad outlines of the whole health care system. It is our intention, over the next year or two, to do an in-depth piece of work on the narrowness of the specific topics.

The committee’s intention would be that the first such detailed study would be on the issues of mental health and mental illness.

Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): All honourable senators were pleased with the excellent work of the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology in the area of health care in Canada. Indeed, the leadership that our committee has given to addressing health care is receiving accolades from coast to coast.

We find ourselves in a circumstance such that when the house is faced with these proposals from committees to conduct studies, and given the available budgets for committees, it places a new responsibility on the chamber to precisely assess a committee's proposal to undertake a study and to receive the authority of the house to do so.

• (1650)

Senator Kirby has just stated that this is a fairly broad area, but that he and his committee colleagues would give priority to mental health. I am wondering whether the committee might go back and address the extremely broad frame of reference they are bringing to us. If the priority is for mental health, and from my own experience that is one area that has been neglected for a terribly long time in our country, then our committee might make a major contribution by giving detailed focus to that particular area of health.

Might it not be a good practice for this chamber to invite our committees to circumscribe the studies that are proposed? If, as the committee chair has told us, mental health is their priority, perhaps he could make the proposal to us that he wishes to address mental health. Then, the study could be somewhat more circumscribed.

Senator Kirby: Honourable senators, Senator Kinsella's comments are well taken. To expedite matters, I would be happy to move, seconded by Senator Kinsella, that my motion be amended so that the list disappears and the one topic that remains is the issue of mental health and mental illness. It will take us a year or so to do that study, and then we would return to the chamber with another topic. If it is in order, I would move that amendment because that is what we intend to do.

The Hon. the Speaker: Senator Kirby, could we treat your comment as one that other senators might wish to address? I know Senator Watt wishes to speak. I did not see him between the two of you because I took it that Senator Kinsella was asking you a question, not speaking to the report.

Hon. Charlie Watt: Honourable senators, I have a concern along the lines of Senator Kinsella's concern. At the same time, I should also like to make it clear that when we speak about Aboriginal health issues, there are many Aboriginal peoples in this country: the Metis, status Indians, non-status Indians, on reserve, off reserve, as well as the Inuit. How does Senator Kirby plan to deal with those groups? They all have problems in regard to health issues.

Senator Kirby: Honourable senators, my response to Senator Kinsella deals with that issue. Down the road, when the committee decides that it is finished with the mental health issue and then decides to start a study of Aboriginal health, we would return to the chamber with a much more detailed term of reference. In a sense, by amending the motion the way we have

discussed amending it, I believe that will ensure that any concerns that Senator Watt may have about the nature of the study we might do on Aboriginal health would be dealt with separately and, therefore, would not be approved by the chamber this afternoon.

Senator Watt: Honourable senators, my problem with Senator Kirby's proposition is that it puts Aboriginal issues on the back burner. This is one area that is very important to the Aboriginal people in this country. Health is in a critical state for most. They should not be put in the position of having to wait until one issue is dealt with before Aboriginal health is dealt with. We will have to find a better solution than that.

Senator Kirby: I do not dispute the crisis nature of health care for Aboriginal Canadians. In terms of having to choose between a significant number of important areas, I am only saying that the committee has concluded that it would prefer to deal with the mental health issue before it takes on other issues. Obviously, a significant part of what we will do will have an impact on the health status of Aboriginals, for example, because of addiction and other things, all of which are mental health issues. The committee did not decide that the other issues were unimportant; rather, it decided that this issue is the one we should do first. It is not a question of putting it on a back burner, but rather setting priorities amongst tough, competing issues.

Senator Watt: Honourable senators, along the lines of what was considered by Senator Kinsella and what seems to be agreed upon, as long as Aboriginal health issues in a broad sense are not left with the "we will deal with that some other time" approach, I have no difficulties with that.

Honourable senators are probably also aware that when it comes to Aboriginal health issues, the housing problem is a contributing factor because people are crowded in small houses. There are also a huge number of young people committing suicide. Perhaps we could spearhead this debate from the standpoint of a mental health issue. That would be very important.

Senator Kirby: To summarize the comments of Senator Kinsella and Senator Watt, the suggestion is that the items listed under (a) to (g) be brought to a single one called "mental health and mental illness" and that is the position I hope the chamber would adopt.

[Translation]

Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, the committee is to table its final report on June 30, 2004, at the latest. Would it be possible for the committee to table it earlier in June when the Senate is sitting, so that honourable senators can read it and discuss it with the committee Chair and members?

[English]

Senator Kirby: Honourable senators, recognizing the debate that ensued as a result of tabling our final health report on a Friday, I am happy to agree to give this house my word that we will agree to make the final report available on a day when the Senate is sitting.

MOTION IN AMENDMENT

Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, I now rise to speak in order to facilitate the procedure. We have before us a motion. I move that the motion be amended by striking letters (a), (b), (d), (e), (f) and (g) and changing letter (c) to be without a letter and that the date in the last line, June 30, be changed to May 30.

Hon. Michael Kirby: I am happy to second that amendment.

The Hon. the Speaker: One clarification, arising out of Senator Kirby's comments. He mentioned mental health and mental illness. Is that important?

Senator Kirby: I would prefer to put both together because that is what the profession and other people do. I see Senator Kinsella nodding. I take it that is also part of his amendment.

• (1700)

Hon. Charlie Watt: Could the honourable senator also agree to include the Aboriginals, to ensure that they are not left behind?

Senator Kinsella: The clear understanding, as discussed earlier, is that mental health and mental illness applies to all communities in Canada. From our experience, we know that there is a tremendous amount of work to be done coast to coast to coast in our First Nations communities. The big umbrella is mental health and mental illness. Within that, special focus must be given to our First Nations communities and to other communities as well.

Senator Kirby: Definitely.

Senator Watt: I am not sure whether the honourable senator is agreeing to include the Aboriginals when dealing with the mental health issue.

Senator Kirby: Honourable senators, I understand Senator Watt's concern. Having said that, I worry about singling out a single community that happens to have a high incidence of mental health problems in the terms of reference because then the issue becomes: Why did I not single out other communities? The honourable senator has my assurance that among the issues of mental health and mental illness that we will be talking about will be some of the issues he mentioned, such as the suicide rate, the addiction rate and so on, for which there is a higher incidence among the Aboriginal populations than among others. I would prefer not to single out a particular subgroup of the population because it then looks like we are ignoring others.

The honourable senator has my word that that will be one of the topics we will be studying. I believe it would be a mistake to put it in the formal title of the study.

Senator Stratton: Hear, hear!

Senator Watt: Can we then say that we are doing it for all?

Senator Kirby: Yes.

Senator Watt: My experience is that it is not that simple. The government at times has decided to have only fixed numbers of Aboriginal people recognized by law; therefore, they are the only ones that the government should have expenditures on. For that reason, I am trying to ensure that they are included.

If you look at the original motion and the reference to women's health, many Aboriginal women have difficulties. If we are to start making a list, let us ensure that we include everyone. That is all I am trying to say.

Senator Kirby: Honourable senators, let me try once more.

What I said is, first, that we would do a study on mental health and mental illness. Second, if we were to do a comprehensive health study — and our track record based on the last health care study is a good indication that it will be comprehensive — it would include all the major subgroups of the population for whom the incidence of mental health and mental illness in particular is significantly greater than the population as a whole, one of which, but not the only one of which, happens to be Aboriginal Canadians.

The Hon. the Speaker: Is the house ready for me to put the amendment of Senator Kinsella?

Senator Stratton: Yes.

The Hon. the Speaker: It was moved by the Honourable Senator Kinsella, seconded by the Honourable Senator Kirby, that the motion be amended as follows: that we delete all of those items in the motion starting with the letter (a), (b), (c), (e), (f) and (g), so that the second sentence of the motion will read:

In particular, the Committee shall be authorized to examine issues concerning mental health and mental illness.

Senator Kirby: I am sorry, Your Honour. The other part of the motion was that the June 30 date would be changed to May 30.

The Hon. the Speaker: Sorry, you are correct.

Further, that the last sentence of the motion be amended by substituting the word "May" for the word "June." The last sentence would read:

That the Committee submit its final report no later than May 30, 2004.

Is there debate?

Hon. Joseph A. Day: I have a point of clarification, Your Honour. When you read the amendment, I heard you read that parts (a), (b) and (c) would be deleted. That should be (a), (b) and (d).

The Hon. the Speaker: You are quite right, Senator Day. If I said (c), I was in error.

I will repeat the proposed amendment by going to the last part of the amendment. Perhaps this is the best way to do it, that the motion be amended so that the second sentence reads:

In particular, the Committee shall be authorized to examine issues concerning mental health and mental illness.

Senator Kirby: Dispense.

The Hon. the Speaker: Is the house ready for the question?

Senator Stratton: Yes.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

The Hon. the Speaker: Carried.

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

Motion agreed to, as amended.

The Senate adjourned until Wednesday, February 5, at 1:30 p.m.

APPENDIX

Officers of the Senate

The Ministry

Senators

(Listed according to seniority, alphabetically and by provinces)

Committees of the Senate

THE SPEAKER

The Honourable Daniel P. Hays

THE LEADER OF THE GOVERNMENT

The Honourable Sharon Carstairs, P.C.

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

The Honourable John Lynch-Staunton

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

Paul Bélisle

DEPUTY CLERK, PRINCIPAL CLERK, LEGISLATIVE SERVICES

Gary O'Brien

LAW CLERK AND PARLIAMENTARY COUNSEL

Mark Audcent

USHER OF THE BLACK ROD

Terrance J. Christopher

THE MINISTRY

According to Precedence

(February 4, 2003)

The Right Hon. Jean Chrétien	Prime Minister
The Hon. David M. Collenette	Minister of Transport
The Hon. David Anderson	Minister of the Environment
The Hon. Ralph E. Goodale	Minister of Public Works and Government Services Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians
The Hon. Sheila Copps	Minister of Canadian Heritage
The Hon. John Manley	Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Minister of Infrastructure
The Hon. Anne McLellan	Minister of Health
The Hon. Allan Rock	Minister of Industry
The Hon. Lucienne Robillard	President of the Treasury Board
The Hon. Martin Cauchon	Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
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 Vancilief	Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
The Hon. Herb Dhaliwal	Minister of Natural Resources
The Hon. Claudette Bradshaw	Minister of Labour
The Hon. Robert Daniel Nault	Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
The Hon. Elinor Caplan	Minister for National Revenue
The Hon. Denis Coderre	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
The Hon. Sharon Carstairs	Leader of the Government in the Senate
The Hon. Robert G. Thibault	Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
The Hon. Rey Pagtakhan	Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)
The Hon. Susan Whelan	Minister for International Cooperation
The Hon. William Graham	Minister of Foreign Affairs
The Hon. Gerry Byrne	Minister of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)
The Hon. John McCallum	Minister of National Defence
The Hon. Wayne Easter	Solicitor General of Canada
The Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew	Secretary of State (Children and Youth)
The Hon. David Kilgour	Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)
The Hon. Andrew Mitchell	Secretary of State (Rural Development) (Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario)
The Hon. Maurizio Bevilacqua	Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)
The Hon. Paul DeVillers	Secretary of State (Amateur Sport) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
The Hon. Gar Knutson	Secretary of State (Central and Eastern Europe and Middle East)
The Hon. Denis Paradis	Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa) (Francophonie)
The Hon. Claude Drouin	Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)
The Hon. Stephen Owen	Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification) (Indian Affairs and Northern Development)
The Hon. Jean Augustine	Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women)

SENATORS OF CANADA

ACCORDING TO SENIORITY

(February 4, 2003)

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.
Norman K. Atkins	Markham	Toronto, Ont.
Ethel Cochrane	Newfoundland and Labrador	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.
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.
J. Michael Forrestall	Dartmouth and Eastern Shore	Dartmouth, N.S.
Janis G. Johnson	Winnipeg-Interlake	Gimli, 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.
David Tkachuk	Saskatchewan	Saskatoon, Sask.

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
W. David Angus	Alma	Montreal, Que.
Pierre Claude Nolin	De Salaberry	Quebec, Que.
Marjory LeBreton	Ontario	Manotick, Ont.
Gerry St. Germain, P.C.	Langley-Pemberton-Whistler	Maple Ridge, B.C.
Lise Bacon	De la Durantaye	Laval, Que.
Sharon Carstairs, P.C.	Manitoba	Victoria Beach, Man.
Landon Pearson	Ontario	Ottawa, Ont.
Jean-Robert Gauthier	Ottawa-Vanier	Ottawa, Ont.
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.
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 and Labrador	St. John's, Nfld.
Ross Fitzpatrick	Okanagan-Similkameen	Kelowna, B.C.
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.
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 Cordy	Nova Scotia	Dartmouth, N.S.
Raymond C. Setlakwe	The Laurentides	Thetford Mines, Que.
Yves Morin	Lauzon	Quebec, Que.
Elizabeth M. Hubley	Prince Edward Island	Kensington, P.E.I.
Laurier L. LaPierre	Ontario	Ottawa, Ont.
Viola Léger	Acadie/New Brunswick	Moncton, N.B.
Mobina S. B. Jaffer	British Columbia	North Vancouver, B.C.
Jean Lapointe	Saurel	Magog, Que.
Gerard A. Phalen	Nova Scotia	Glace Bay, N.S.
Joseph A. Day	Saint John-Kennebecasis	Hampton, N.B.
Michel Biron	Mille Isles	Nicolet, Que.
George S. Baker, P.C.	Newfoundland and Labrador	Gander, Nfld.
Raymond Lavigne	Montarville	Verdun, Que.
David P. Smith, P.C.	Cobourg	Toronto, Ont.
Maria Chaput	Manitoba	Sainte-Anne, Man.
Pana Pappas Merchant	Saskatchewan	Regina, Sask.
Pierrette Ringuette-Maltais	New Brunswick	Edmundston, N.B.

SENATORS OF CANADA

ALPHABETICAL LIST

(February 4, 2003)

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
Baker, George S., P.C.	Newfoundland and Labrador	Gander Nfld.	Lib
Banks, Tommy	Alberta	Edmonton, Alta.	Lib
Beaudoin, Gerald-A.	Rigaud	Hull, Que.	PC
Biron, Michel	Mille Isles	Nicolet, Que.	Lib
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, P.C.	Manitoba	Victoria Beach, Man.	Lib
Chalifoux, Thelma J.	Alberta	Morinville, Alta.	Lib
Chaput, Maria	Manitoba	Sainte-Anne, Man.	Lib
Christensen, Ione	Yukon Territory	Whitehorse, Y.T.	Lib
Cochrane, Ethel	Newfoundland and Labrador	Port-au-Port, Nfld.	PC
Comeau, Gerald J.	Nova Scotia	Church Point, N.S.	PC
Cook, Joan	Newfoundland and Labrador	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	Nova Scotia	Dartmouth, N.S.	Lib
Day, Joseph A.	Saint John-Kennebecasis	Hampton, N.B.	Lib
De Bané, Pierre, P.C.	De la Vallière	Montreal, Que.	Lib
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
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
Hubley, Elizabeth M.	Prince Edward Island	Kensington, P.E.I.	Lib
Jaffer, Mobina S. B.	British Columbia	North Vancouver, B.C.	Lib

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address	Political Affiliation
Johnson, Janis G.	Winnipeg-Interlake	Gimli, 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
Kolber, E. Leo	Victoria	Westmount, Que.	Lib
Kroft, Richard H.	Manitoba	Winnipeg, Man.	Lib
LaPierre, Laurier L.	Ontario	Ottawa, Ont.	Lib
Lapointe, Jean	Sauvel	Magog, Que.	Lib
Lavigne, Raymond	Montarville	Verdun, Que.	Lib
Lawson, Edward M.	Vancouver	Vancouver, B.C.	Ind
LeBreton, Marjory	Ontario	Manotick, Ont.	PC
Léger, Viola	Acadie/New Brunswick	Moncton, N.B.	Lib
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
Merchant, Pana Pappas	Saskatchewan	Regina, Sask.	Lib
Milne, Lorna	Peel County	Brampton, Ont.	Lib
Moore, Wilfred P.	Stanhope St./Bluenose	Chester, N.S.	Lib
Morin, Yves	Lauson	Quebec, Que.	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
Phalen, Gerard A.	Nova Scotia	Glace Bay, N.S.	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
Ringuette-Maltais, Pierrette	New Brunswick	Edmundston, N.B.	Lib
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
Smith, David P., P.C.	Cobourg	Toronto, Ont.	Lib
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
Tkachuk, David	Saskatchewan	Saskatoon, Sask.	PC
Watt, Charlie	Inkerman	Kuujuuaq, Que.	Lib
Wiebe, John	Saskatchewan	Swift Current, Sask.	Lib

SENATORS OF CANADA
BY PROVINCE AND TERRITORY
 (February 4, 2003)

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 Francis William Mahovlich	Toronto	Toronto
19 Vivienne Poy	Toronto	Toronto
20 Isobel Finnerty	Ontario	Burlington
21 Laurier L. LaPierre	Ontario	Ottawa
22 David P. Smith, P.C.	Cobourg	Toronto
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	Kuuujuaq
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 Lucie Pépin	Shawinigan	Montreal
15 Marisa Ferretti Barth	Repentigny	Pierrefonds
16 Serge Joyal, P.C.	Kennebec	Montreal
17 Joan Thorne Fraser	De Lorimier	Montreal
18 Aurélien Gill	Wellington	Mashteuiatsh, Pointe-Bleue
19 Raymond C. Setlakwe	The Laurentides	Thetford Mines
20 Yves Morin	Lauzon	Quebec
21 Jean Lapointe	Saurel	Magog
22 Michel Biron	Milles Isles	Nicolet
23 Raymond Lavigne	Montarville	Verdun
24	De Lanaudière	

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 Cordy	Nova Scotia	Dartmouth
9 Gerard A. Phalen	Nova Scotia	Glace Bay
10	

NEW BRUNSWICK—10

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
1 Eymard Georges Corbin	Grand-Sault	Grand-Sault
2 Brenda Mary Robertson	Riverview	Shediac
3 Noël A. Kinsella	Fredericton-York-Sunbury	Fredericton
4 John G. Bryden	New Brunswick	Bayfield
5 Rose-Marie Losier-Cool	Tracadie	Bathurst
6 Fernand Robichaud, P.C.	Saint-Louis-de-Kent	Saint-Louis-de-Kent
7 Viola Léger	Acadie/New Brunswick	Moncton
8 Joseph A. Day	Saint John-Kennebecasis	Hampton
9 Pierrette Ringuette-Maltais	New Brunswick	Edmundston
10	

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—4

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
1 Eileen Rossiter	Prince Edward Island	Charlottetown
2 Catherine S. Callbeck	Prince Edward Island	Central Bedeque
3 Elizabeth M. Hubley	Prince Edward Island	Kensington
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	Gimli
3 Terrance R. Stratton	Red River	St. Norbert
4 Sharon Carstairs, P.C.	Manitoba	Victoria Beach
5 Richard H. Kroft	Manitoba	Winnipeg
6 Maria Chaput	Manitoba	Sainte-Anne

BRITISH COLUMBIA—6

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
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 Mobina S.B. Jaffer	British Columbia	North Vancouver

SASKATCHEWAN—6

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
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 Pana Pappas Merchant	Saskatchewan	Regina

ALBERTA—6

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
1 Daniel Phillip Hays, <i>Speaker</i>	Calgary	Calgary
2 Joyce Fairbairn, P.C.	Lethbridge	Lethbridge
3 Thelma J. Chalifoux	Alberta	Morinville
4 Douglas James Roche	Edmonton	Edmonton
5 Tommy Banks	Alberta	Edmonton
6

SENATORS BY PROVINCE AND TERRITORY

NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR—6

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

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES—1

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
1 Nick G. Sibbeston	Northwest Territories	Fort Simpson

NUNAVUT—1

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
1 Willie Adams	Nunavut	Rankin Inlet

YUKON TERRITORY—1

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
1 Ione Christensen	Yukon Territory.	Whitehorse

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF STANDING, SPECIAL AND JOINT COMMITTEES

(As of February 4, 2003)

*Ex Officio Member

ABORIGINAL PEOPLES

Chair: Honourable Senator Chalifoux

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Robertson

Honourable Senators:

Carney,	Christensen,	* Lynch-Staunton,	Sibbeston,
* Carstairs,	Gill,	(or Kinsella)	St. Germain,
(or Robichaud)	Hubley,	Pearson,	Stratton,
Chalifoux,	Leger,	Robertson	Tkachuk.

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Carney, *Carstairs (or Robichaud), Chalifoux, Christensen, Gill, Hubley, Johnson, Léger, *Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella), Pearson, Sibbeston, St. Germain, Tkachuk.*

AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

Chair: Honourable Senator Oliver

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Wiebe

Honourable Senators:

* Carstairs,	Fairbairn,	LeBreton,	Oliver,
(or Robichaud)	Gustafson,	* Lynch-Staunton,	Tkachuk,
Chalifoux,	Hubley,	(or Kinsella)	Wiebe.
Day,	LaPierre,	Moore,	

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

**Carstairs (or Robichaud), Chalifoux, Day, Fairbairn, Gustafson, Hubley, LaPierre, Lapointe, LeBreton, *Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella), Moore, Oliver, Tkachuk, Wiebe.*

BANKING, TRADE AND COMMERCE

Chair: Honourable Senator Kolber

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Tkachuk

Honourable Senators:

* Angus,	Hervieux-Payette,	* Lynch-Staunton,	Prud'homme,
Carstairs,	Kelleher,	(or Kinsella)	Setlakwe,
(or Robichaud)	Kolber,	Meighen,	Tkachuk.
Fitzpatrick,	Kroft,	Poulin,	

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Angus, *Carstairs (or Robichaud), Fitzpatrick, Hervieux-Payette, Kelleher, Kolber, Kroft, *Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella), Meighen, Poulin, Prud'homme, Setlakwe, Taylor, Tkachuk.*

ENERGY, THE ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Chair: Honourable Senator Banks

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Spivak

Honourable Senators:

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

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

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

FISHERIES

Chair: Honourable: Senator Comeau

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Cook

Honourable Senators:

Adams,	Cochrane,	Johnson,	Meighen,
Baker,	Comeau,	* Lynch-Staunton,	Moore,
* Carstairs,	Cook,	(or Kinsella)	Phalen,
(or Robichaud)	Hubley,	Mahovlich,	Watt.

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Adams, Baker, *Carstairs (or Robichaud), Cochrane, Comeau, Cook, Hubley, Johnson, *Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella), Mahovlich, Moore, Phalen, Robertson, Watt*

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Chair: Honourable Senator Stollery

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Di Nino

Honourable Senators:

Andreychuk,	* Carstairs,	Di Nino,	* Lynch-Staunton,
Austin,	(or Robichaud)	Grafstein,	(or Kinsella)
Bolduc,	Corbin,	Graham,	Setlakwe,
Carney,	De Bané,	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), Setlakwe, Stollery.*

HUMAN RIGHTS

Chair: Honourable Senator Maheu

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Rossiter

Honourable Senators:

Beaudoin,	Fraser,	* Lynch-Staunton,	Poy,
* Carstairs,	Jaffer,	(or Kinsella)	Rivest,
(or Robichaud)	LaPierre,	Maheu,	Rossiter.
Ferretti Barth,			

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Beaudoin, *Carstairs (or Robichaud), Ferretti Barth, Fraser, Jaffer, LaPierre,
Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella), Maheu, Poy, Rivest, Rossiter.

INTERNAL ECONOMY, BUDGETS AND ADMINISTRATION

Chair: Honourable Senator Bacon

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Atkins

Honourable Senators:

Angus,	Bryden,	Gauthier,	* Lynch-Staunton,
Atkins,	* Carstairs,	Gill,	(or Kinsella)
Austin,	(or Robichaud)	Jaffer,	Poulin,
Bacon,	De Bané,	Kroft,	Robichaud,
Bolduc,	Eyton,		Stratton.

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Angus, Atkins, Austin, *Carstairs (or Robichaud), Bacon, Bryden, De Bané, Doody, Eyton, Gauthier,
Gill, Jaffer, Kroft, *Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella), Poulin, Robichaud, Stratton.*

LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS

Chair: Honourable Senator Furey

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Beaudoin

Honourable Senators:

Andreychuk,	* Carstairs,	Jaffer,	Nolin,
Baker,	(or Robichaud)	Joyal,	Pearson,
Beaudoin,	Cools,	* Lynch-Staunton,	Smith,
Bryden,	Furey,	(or Kinsella)	Stratton.

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Andreychuk, Baker, Beaudoin, Bryden, Buchanan, *Carstairs (or Robichaud), Cools, Furey,
Jaffer, Joyal, *Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella), Nolin, Pearson, Smith.*

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT (Joint)

Joint Chair:

Vice-Chair:

Honourable Senators:

Bolduc, Forrestall,	Lapointe,	Morin,	Poy.
------------------------	-----------	--------	------

Original Members agreed to by Motion of the Senate

Bolduc, Forrestall, Lapointe, Morin, Poy.

NATIONAL FINANCE

Chair: Honourable Senator Murray

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Day

Honourable Senators:

Biron, Bolduc, * Carstairs, (or Robichaud)	Comeau, Cools, Day, Doody,	Ferretti Barth, Finnerty, Furey, Gauthier,	* Lynch-Staunton, (or Kinsella) Mahovlich, Murray.
---	-------------------------------------	---	---

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Biron, Bolduc, *Carstairs (or Robichaud), Cools, Day, Doody, Eyton, Ferretti Barth, Finnerty, Furey, Gauthier, *Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella), Mahovlich, Murray.*

NATIONAL SECURITY AND DEFENCE

Chair: Honourable Senator Kenny

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Forrestall

Honourable Senators:

Atkins, Banks, * Carstairs, (or Robichaud)	Cordy, Day, Forrestall,	Kenny, * Lynch-Staunton, (or Kinsella)	Meighen, Smith, Wiebe.
---	-------------------------------	--	------------------------------

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Atkins, Banks, *Carstairs (or Robichaud), Cordy, Day, Forrestall, Kenny, *Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella), Meighen, Smith, Wiebe.*

VETERANS AFFAIRS**(Subcommittee of National Security and Defence)****Chair: Honourable Senator Meighen****Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Day****Honourable Senators:**

Atkins,	Day,	* Lynch-Staunton,	Meighen,
* Carstairs,	Kenny,	(or Kinsella)	Wiebe.
(or Robichaud)			

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES**Chair: Honourable Senator Losier-Cool****Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Keon****Honourable Senators:**

Beaudoin,	Comeau,	Lapointe,	* Lynch-Staunton,
* Carstairs,	Gauthier,	Léger,	(or Kinsella)
(or Robichaud)	Keon,	Losier-Cool,	Maheu.

Original Members agreed to by Motion of the Senate

*Beaudoin, *Carstairs (or Robichaud), Comeau, Ferretti Barth, Gauthier, Keon, Lapointe, Léger, Losier-Cool, *Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella), Maheu.*

RULES, PROCEDURES AND THE RIGHTS OF PARLIAMENT**Chair: Honourable Senator Milne****Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Andreychuk****Honourable Senators:**

Andreychuk,	Grafstein,	Murray,	Rompkey,
Bacon,	Joyal,	Pépin,	Smith,
* Carstairs,	* Lynch-Staunton,	Pitfield,	Stratton,
(or Robichaud)	(or Kinsella)	Robertson,	Wiebe.
Di Nino,	Milne,		

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Andreychuk, Bacon, *Carstairs (or Robichaud), Di Nino, Grafstein, Joyal, Losier-Cool, *Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella), Milne, Murray, Pépin, Pitfield, Robertson, Rompkey, Smith, Stratton, Wiebe.*

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS (Joint)

Joint Chair: Honourable Hervieux-Payette

Vice-Chair:

Honourable Senators:

Biron,	Hubley,	Moore,	Phalen.
Hervieux-Payette,	Kelleher,	Nolin,	

Original Members as agreed to by Motion of the Senate

Biron, Hervieux-Payette, Hubley, Kelleher, Moore, Nolin, Phalen.

SELECTION

Chair: Honourable Senator Rompkey

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Stratton

Honourable Senators:

Bacon,	De Bané,	Kolber,	Rompkey,
* Carstairs,	Fairbairn,	LeBreton,	Stratton,
(or Robichaud)	Kinsella,	* Lynch-Staunton,	Tkachuk.
		(or Kinsella)	

Original Members agreed to by Motion of the Senate

*Bacon, *Carstairs, (or Robichaud), De Bané, Fairbairn, Kinsella, Kolber, LeBreton, *Lynch-Staunton, (or Kinsella), Rompkey, Stratton, Tkachuk.*

SOCIAL AFFAIRS, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Chair: Honourable Senator Kirby

Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator LeBreton

Honourable Senators:

Callbeck,	Cordy,	Kinsella,	* Lynch-Staunton,
* Carstairs,	Di Nino,	Kirby,	(or Kinsella)
(or Robichaud)	Fairbairn,	LeBreton,	Morin,
Cook,	Keon,	Léger,	Roche.

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Callbeck *Carstairs (or Robichaud), Cook, Cordy, Di Nino Fairbairn, Keon, Kirby, LeBreton, *Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella), Morin, Pépin, Robertson, Roche.*

TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS**Chair: Honourable Senator Fraser****Deputy Chair: Honourable Senator Gustafson****Honourable Senators:**

Adams,	Day,	Graham,	* Lynch-Staunton,
Biron,	Eyton,	Gustafson,	(or Kinsella)
Callbeck,	Fraser,	Johnson,	Phalen,
* Carstairs,		LaPierre,	Spivak.
(or Robichaud)			

Original Members as nominated by the Committee of Selection

*Adams, Biron, Callbeck, *Carstairs (or Robichaud), Day, Eyton, Fraser,
Graham, Gustafson, Johnson, LaPierre,*Lynch-Staunton (or Kinsella), Phalen, Spivak.*

CONTENTS

Tuesday, February 4, 2003

	PAGE		PAGE
New Senators		Citizenship and Immigration	
The Hon. the Speaker.	734	Backlog of Refugee Claims.	
Introduction.		Hon. Donald H. Oliver.	741
The Hon. the Speaker.	734	Hon. Sharon Carstairs	741
Hon. Sharon Carstairs	734		
Hon. John Lynch-Staunton	735	Official Languages	
Hon. Marcel Prud'homme.	735	Northwest Territories Act.	
Hon. Herbert O. Sparrow	735	Hon. Jean-Robert Gauthier.	741
		Hon. Sharon Carstairs	741
		Hon. Gérald-A. Beaudoin	742
SENATORS' STATEMENTS		International Trade	
		United States—Renewal of Softwood Lumber Agreement.	
Alberta		Hon. Gerry St. Germain	742
Calgary—Loss of Students of Strathcona-Tweedsmuir School in		Hon. Sharon Carstairs	742
Avalanche.			
Hon. Joyce Fairbairn	736	Solicitor General	
Hon. Dan Hays	736	United States Drug Enforcement Agency—	
		Illegal Activities in Canada.	
The Late Ms. Françoise Giroud		Hon. Pierre Claude Nolin	743
Tributes.		Hon. Sharon Carstairs	743
Hon. Lise Bacon	736		
Hon. Lucie Pépin	737	United Nations	
		Possible War with Iraq.	
Justice		Hon. Douglas Roche	744
Racial Profiling.		Hon. Sharon Carstairs	744
Hon. Donald H. Oliver.	737		
		The Senate	
		Government-Sponsored Debate on Possible War with Iraq.	
		Hon. Douglas Roche	744
		Hon. Sharon Carstairs	744
		Hon. Marcel Prud'homme.	745
ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS		Delayed Answer to Oral Questions	
		The Hon. Fernand Robichaud.	745
Privacy Commissioner			
2002 Annual Report Tabled	738	Industry	
		Auditor General's Report—Small Business Financing	
Library of Parliament		Program—Cost-Recovery Rate on Small Business Loans.	
2002 Performance Report Tabled.	738	Question by Senator Oliver.	
		Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Delayed Answer).	745
Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration			
Eighth Report of Committee Presented.		Answer to Order Paper Question Tabled	
Hon. Lise Bacon	738	Solicitor General—Anti-terrorism Act.	
		Hon. Fernand Robichaud	745
Rules, Procedures and the Rights of Parliament			
Seventh Report of Committee Presented.		Usher of the Black Rod	
Hon. Lorna Milne	738	Welcome.	
		The Hon. the Speaker.	745
Study on Need for National Security Policy			
Interim Report of National Security and Defence			
Committee Tabled.			
Hon. Colin Kenny	740		
Canadian NATO Parliamentary Association		ORDERS OF THE DAY	
Forty-Eighth Annual Session of NATO Parliamentary Assembly,			
November 15-19, 2002—Report Tabled.		Physical Activity and Sport Bill (Bill C-12)	
Hon. Pierre Claude Nolin	740	Third Reading.	
		Hon. Noël A. Kinsella	747
		Hon. Lowell Murray	747
		Hon. Fernand Robichaud	747
		Hon. Jean-Robert Gauthier.	748
		Hon. John Lynch-Staunton	748
		Hon. Sharon Carstairs	748
		Code of Conduct and Ethics Guidelines	
		Motion to Refer Documents to Standing Committee on Rules,	
		Procedures and the Rights of Parliament Adopted.	
		Hon. Herbert O. Sparrow	750

	PAGE
Motion in Amendment.	
Hon. Herbert O. Sparrow	751
Hon. Anne C. Cools.	751
Hon. John Lynch-Staunton	751
Hon. Fernand Robichaud	752
Hon. Lowell Murray	753
Energy, The Environment and Natural Resources	
Committee Authorized to Meet During Sitting of the Senate.	
Hon. Mira Spivak	754
Sanctioning of Military Action Against Iraq Under International Law	
Motion—Debate Continued.	
Hon. Bill Rompkey	755
Independence of Speaker in Westminster Model of Parliament	
Inquiry—Debate Continued.	
Hon. Terry Stratton	755

	PAGE
National Security and Defence	
Government Response to Report Entitled “Canadian Security and Military Preparedness”—Inquiry.	
Hon. J. Michael Forrestall	755
Social Affairs, Science and Technology	
Committee Authorized to Study Health Issues Surrounding Report on State of Health Care System.	
Hon. Michael Kirby	757
Hon. Noël A. Kinsella	758
Hon. Charlie Watt	758
Hon. Fernand Robichaud	758
Motion in Amendment.	
Hon. Noël A. Kinsella	759
Hon. Michael Kirby	759
Hon. Charlie Watt	759
Hon. Joseph A. Day.	759
Appendix	i



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