



CANADA

Debates of the Senate

2nd SESSION

•

37th PARLIAMENT

•

VOLUME 140

•

NUMBER 39

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Thursday, February 27, 2003



THE HONOURABLE DAN HAYS
SPEAKER

CONTENTS

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

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

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

THE SENATE

Thursday, February 27, 2003

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

Prayers.

SENATORS' STATEMENTS

BLACK HISTORY MONTH

Hon. Edward M. Lawson: Honourable senators, it took us eight hours to walk out, with the 2,000 or 3,000 following us, to meet the main group of marchers and then return to the capital grounds, where there were now between 15,000 and 20,000, mostly Blacks, on the grounds. The first speaker was James Meredith, who had recovered from his wounds sufficiently to rejoin the march a couple of days previously. The second speaker was Stokely Carmichael, from the Student Nonviolence Coordinating Committee. He called upon all Negroes "to build a power base...so strong that we will bring them [whites] to their knees every time they mess with us." He then stood up and chanted "Black Power, Black Power," and the crowd went wild. You could cut the tension with a switchblade knife.

The next speaker was the soft-spoken Reverend Abernathy. They had been singing *We Shall Overcome*. Reverend Abernathy said, "That is a good song and it served us well, but we need to change the words. Not we shall overcome, but we shall overthrow." The crowd jumped to its feet and roared its approval. Those handful of us Whites standing there had an anxious moment. If someone said "Let us get rid of the Whites," we were gone. Fortunately, the next speaker was Martin Luther King. He started by saying, over the roar of the crowd, "My dream has turned to a nightmare," referring to the assassination attempt on James Meredith. He then made his usual speech about peace and love and brotherhood and understanding, and quietened the crowd down. We then made the presentation of our union's cheque for \$25,000 and the rally was over.

In a quiet moment, I said to Dr. King, "I must tell you that there were a couple of times during those speeches ahead of yours when I felt fear. How difficult it must be for you facing this every day." He said, "Not since I made my decision." I said, "Your decision?" He said, "Yes. When I accepted the probability I would be assassinated on this job, and there was nothing I could do about it, any fear I had disappeared." Of course, history tells us that on April 4, 1968, he was killed by an assassin's bullet, by a sniper.

I think it is fitting that Dr. Martin Luther King, one of the great civil rights leaders, truly one of the great men of the last century, will live forever in the hearts and minds of those of us who care about civil rights and the protection of those rights for others.

I do not know how much time I have left, but there is one final point. We then left. We went to the airport to catch our flight. We were told it had been cancelled. It had not been cancelled. We had made a mistake. We were still wearing our "Meredith for Freedom" march badges and we were not welcome on the flight. We could not buy a magazine in the store, and three jumper flights later we made it back to the convention in Florida.

I thought that I would share this little part of Black history with fellow senators.

NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

FLOOD IN BADGER

Hon. Ethel Cochrane: Honourable senators, we have all seen news reports in the last two weeks about the devastating flood in Badger, Newfoundland and Labrador. Today, I rise not only in recognition of this awful event but also to applaud the people of the area for their inspiring display of human courage, their strength and their generosity.

The problems began when an ice jam caused the waters of the Badger Brook and the Exploits and Red Indian Rivers to rise and engulf the town. Reports say the flood exceeded the 100-year mark, which means there was only a 1 per cent chance of flooding ever occurring. It happened swiftly and without warning. Within minutes, the town's 1,100 residents were forced from their homes. In fact, when the waters rushed in at 8:30 in the morning, many people sought safety while still in their pyjamas. Many did not even have time to grab a pair of socks.

The flood was only part one of the assault on Badger. Cold temperatures caused the water to quickly freeze, encasing houses, cars, snowmobiles, ATVs, virtually everything in the community, in ice. You had to be there to see it. The television does not display the true picture.

According to early estimates, more than 130 homes have been damaged and millions of dollars will be needed to replace everything lost in the flood. Again, in this tragedy, as in others in which the province has played a role, we find examples of incredible grace and goodness. We find people in communities banding together. While some people have moved in with family and friends in the region, about 400 families are currently staying in makeshift shelters at a former senior citizens' home and in two Pentecostal churches.

When the waters began rising, people thought not only of their own safety but also of the safety of their neighbours. One volunteer firefighter said of his first rescue effort, "The truck was floating on the way back. It was a crazy thing to do, but you are just trying to save people. You do not even think."

Honourable senators, the general public is also responding to the disaster. Thus far, \$515,000 has been raised through the Canadian Red Cross fundraising campaign.

• (1340)

I was especially happy to learn this morning that Parliament Hill is also responding. Proceeds from this year's "All-Party Party" will go to the Badger Relief Fund. Thank you all very much. I encourage all senators to fully support this event and to join in the efforts to help the people of Badger.

HEART MONTH

Hon. Wilbert J. Keon: Honourable senators, as you know, February is Heart Month. It is a month where literally tens of thousands of volunteers across Canada make an attempt to draw to the attention of our population that the leading health problem in our country remains heart disease. Although the progress and the management of heart disease has been truly enormous, still it is responsible for 37 per cent of deaths in men. More shocking, it is now responsible for 41 per cent of deaths in women.

A great deal remains to be done. I congratulate the Heart and Stroke Foundation of Canada for all it has done over the years in raising funds and sustaining research. Indeed, when I was actively involved as a scientist myself, their support was enormous.

This coming weekend, at the Heart Institute here in Ottawa, we will have our annual telethon. Over the past 10 years, the greater Ottawa community has contributed \$28 million to these telethons, which run pretty much non-stop for 24 hours. This year, we hope to generate about \$3 million, or perhaps a bit more.

As I step out of my medical career and devote more time to you here, I would like to see us throw enormous energy into the prevention of heart disease. I have spent my whole professional life operating on people whose disease, in 50 per cent of cases, was preventable. Heart patients undergo enormous trauma, emotional and physical, for something that never had to happen. Surely, we must get together and see that this kind of thing does not go on forever. As I step out of the Heart Institute, I leave knowing that it will continue to provide the population, at least in this region, with state-of-the-art facilities — educational facilities, screening facilities, treatment facilities and counselling facilities — for the prevention of heart disease. A major portion of the money raised this weekend will go towards that new installation.

I also want to say a few words about all of you, honourable senators, and the MPs in the other place. You are in one of the heart disease highest-risk groups of people in the country because of your lifestyles. Senator Morin spoke to me about this a short time ago. He has been over to the Heart Institute and is talking about arranging a program for MPs and senators. I recommend that you listen to what he will have to say along the way.

[Senator Cochrane]

CANADA-UNITED STATES RELATIONS

Hon. Gerry St. Germain: Honourable senators, once again I am forced to rise and speak out against what has clearly become the government's policy towards the United States. Yesterday a member of the other place made the following comments about the American's position on Iraq:

"That man is ready to go."

"He doesn't care. He is gunning for a fight."

The member closed her remarks with, "Damn Americans. I hate those bastards."

Honourable senators, this clearly shows a trend against the United States. First, it was the Canadian Ambassador to the U.S., Mr. Raymond Chrétien, the Prime Minister's nephew. He expressed the government's position on the American election by saying that they preferred Gore over Bush. Then the Prime Minister's personal press director, Françoise Ducros, declared to the press that the President is a moron. Now we have Ms. Carolyn Parrish's comments.

We sit here in wonderment that the government is not resolving the softwood lumber crisis, the agricultural crisis, the cross-border trade and security challenges, the dramatic drop in our standard of living and so on. We ask why we cannot resolve these matters, and yet we characterize our only bordering neighbour, our largest business partner and the only friend we can count on when we need immediate help, and the American leadership as morons and other things.

The federal government has once again further eroded our relationship with the U.S. The government has been wishy-washy on several matters, on terrorism, on Iraq. Still our government does not understand why the Americans have put all of our disputes on the back burners. The Liberal Party and government sentiment is one of anti-Americanism.

Honourable senators, in our democratic society, we are free to hold our own opinions. Public office-holders must be held to a higher standard. The government's anti-American position, as so eloquently expressed by senior officials, senior advisers and caucus members, is not helping Canadians. It is clear; the time has come to change the leadership of this country. Canada needs leadership that will build relationships and build futures for our people.

TORONTO POLICE SERVICE

Hon. Consiglio Di Nino: Honourable senators, this past New Year's Eve, I had the privilege of accompanying Police Chief Julian Fantino as he joined with the men and women of the Toronto Police Service on night patrol. While at RIDE sites that night, I was once again impressed with the professional and courteous manner of the officers. Somewhat surprising, though, was the reaction of the drivers and passengers of the vehicles that were stopped. Many of them, if not most, actually thanked the police for doing their part in keeping our streets safe.

During our visit to the communications centre, I was reminded once again of the critical role played by the men and women of this division. These people are the lifeline on which the officers on the street depend for the vital information they need to resolve, in a safe and effective manner, the dangerous situations they confront daily.

However, the most important lesson for me that night was realizing the value of Traffic Division, usually the division most disliked by the average citizen. Honourable senators, last year, in the city of Toronto, there were 60 homicides. However, 94 people died as a result of traffic accidents. There were also the usual vehicular crashes which, as everyone knows, take an enormous physical, mental and economic toll on those involved and, indeed, on the country. That there were so few traffic deaths is due in part to the hard work of the Toronto Police Service.

One of the reporters from *The Toronto Sun*, who was with me that evening, a gentleman by the name of Joe Warmington, put it this way, and I thought he hit the nail right on the head: "These guys save lives."

The night I spent with the men and women of the Toronto Police Service increased my respect for them and reinforced my belief that we in Toronto and, indeed, all Canadians owe an enormous debt of gratitude to those who choose to dedicate their lives to protecting our families and our communities.

If I may, to each and every one of the police officers across Canada and on behalf of all honourable senators, I extend our gratitude and appreciation.

• (1350)

[Translation]

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

THE OPENING OF THE PARLIAMENT OF CANADA

DOCUMENT TABLED

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, as promised, I have the pleasure to table, in both official languages, a copy of the document entitled: "The Opening of the Parliament of Canada" and dated February 2003.

[English]

Honourable senators, on October 29, 2002, on points of order raised with respect to the opening of the second session of the Thirty-seventh Parliament, I undertook to table a document to better explain the traditions, practices and etiquette of the opening of a Parliament. This document and my covering letter will be distributed to all senators.

ENERGY, THE ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO REFER DOCUMENTS FROM TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE STUDY ON BILL S-26 IN PREVIOUS SESSION TO STUDY ON BILL S-10

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

That the papers and evidence received and taken by the Standing Senate Committee on Transport and Communications during its study of Bill S-26, An Act concerning personal watercraft in navigable waters, in the first session of the Thirty-seventh Parliament be referred to the Standing Senate Committee on Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources for its study of Bill S-10, An Act concerning personal watercraft in navigable waters.

The Hon. the Speaker: Is this a notice, Senator Banks?

Senator Banks: I ask for leave that it be done now.

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

Hon. Anne C. Cools: I am curious. Honourable senators, why is leave required?

Senator Banks: It is a motion that would normally require notice, and I am asking that the period of notice be waived.

Senator Cools: I know what the rule says. I am asking why the honourable senator is invoking it?

Senator Banks: Honourable senators, with this authority, when we return to work on March 18, we will immediately be in a position to consider that evidence in our study of the bill. Also, additional government legislation will be coming to that committee, and we do not want to stall it.

Senator Cools: When we return, when will your committee meet?

Senator Banks: Tuesday, March 18.

Senator Cools: Honourable senators, I am just curious. Leave like this is supposed to be asked for under unusual circumstances and when there is some pressing matter before us. I am curious as to why. All the honourable senator has said is that he wants it done in a hurry. However, he is not telling us why.

Senator Banks: Honourable senators, we should like to consider that evidence at our next meeting on Tuesday, March 18. This is the last sitting of the Senate prior to that date. That is the only reason.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

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

Motion agreed to.

NATIONAL FINANCE

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE TO ENGAGE SERVICES

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

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

[Translation]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

COMMITMENTS OF FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS TO GUARANTEE ACCOUNTABILITY— NOTICE OF INQUIRY

Hon. Jean-Robert Gauthier: Honourable senators, I give notice that on Tuesday, March 18, 2003:

I will call the attention of the Senate to the official languages commitments that should be made by all federal departments in order to guarantee the accountability of senior managers, language training, partnership and the right to work in the official language of one's choice.

[English]

QUESTION PERIOD

NATIONAL DEFENCE

HMCS *IROQUOIS*—CRASH OF SEA KING HELICOPTER

Hon. Terry Stratton: Honourable senators, I would like to address these questions on behalf of Senator Forrestall, who is travelling with the National Security and Defence Committee.

Today we learned the unfortunate news that a Sea King had crashed on the deck of the HMCS *Iroquois*. Initial reports state that the helicopter had taken off, developed problems in the air, then hit the deck so hard that it actually rolled over. There is extensive damage to the ship, and it is now on its way back to port in Halifax.

Can the Leader of the Government tell us the condition of the two injured crewmen? Are their injuries extensive?

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government): I thank the honourable senator for his question. The incident took place at 10:30 a.m., Halifax time. It took place during takeoff. The helicopter, I understand, was at no point airborne. It rolled over on to the surface of the deck. There were four airmen on board. Two of them were injured in a very minor way, and their families have been informed.

The honourable senator is quite correct, the deck has been damaged. The Sea King remains on its side on the deck at the present moment. The ship is on its way back to Halifax for deck repair.

Senator Stratton: Can the Leader of the Government in the Senate tell us if there is any indication of the cause of the accident?

Senator Carstairs: No, my understanding is they are waiting until the ship and the helicopter arrive back in Halifax because that is where the team that normally conducts the investigations is located. They are only 600 nautical miles from Halifax, and one would assume they should be back within one or two days.

Senator Stratton: The honourable senator has told us that the initial assessment of damages was to the deck. Is that the extent of the damage, to her knowledge? Is there any indication of how long it will take to repair the ship?

Senator Carstairs: Honourable senators, I have given you all the information that I have available. Obviously, until the Sea King is removed from the deck, the actual extent of damages to the ship will not be known. They are not moving the helicopter until such time as it reaches Halifax and can be removed. At that point, an assessment of the damage to both the Sea King and to the HMCS *Iroquois* will be made.

Senator Stratton: Can the Leader of the Government in the Senate tell us if the rest of the Sea King fleet has been put on flight restrictions, pending the determination of the cause of the crash?

Senator Carstairs: Honourable senators, I do not know the answer to that. I know that in previous cases when the cause of damage to a plane was not clearly understood, other similar planes were not allowed to fly until the cause was understood.

I have given the honourable senator every scrap of information that I have at this time.

• (1400)

REPLACEMENT OF SEA KING HELICOPTERS— TIMING OF PROCUREMENT PROJECT

Hon. Terry Stratton: Can the Leader of the Government in the Senate tell us if the government will now move forward with the maritime helicopter procurement to replace the Sea King?

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, as the honourable senator knows, before Christmas, the government made an important decision to speed up the helicopter project. That project is now ongoing. The budget that was tabled just a few short weeks ago contains the funding for the procurement project, and one anticipates that it will go forward as quickly as possible.

THE ENVIRONMENT

BUDGET ALLOCATION FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF KYOTO PROTOCOL—STATEMENT BY MINISTER

Hon. Gerald J. Comeau: Honourable senators, my question is directed to the minister and deals with the \$1.7 billion for climate change initiatives contained in the recent budget.

Environment Minister David Anderson publicly stated that the federal government has to guard against this money being used to “finance hobby horses and pet projects of Liberal cabinet ministers.” Would the minister explain what the Minister of the Environment was getting at with this statement?

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I do not know what the Honourable Minister of the Environment meant when he made that statement. However, it is very clear that the purpose of the \$1.7 billion that has been granted to meet our Kyoto obligations must be used for that purpose.

Senator Comeau: I would assume, therefore, honourable senators, that there was no discussion in cabinet of hobby horses and pet projects.

It is important that the federal government take an approach that has the support of industry and other levels of government. The Minister of the Environment seems to be predicting that any funds directed toward addressing climate change might disappear into a black hole unless some controls are put into place.

Could the Leader of the Government in the Senate please tell us whether the government has a concrete strategy to engage provincial and other levels of government as partners in this budget spending measure with respect to climate change? Is a concrete strategy now in place?

Senator Carstairs: Honourable senators, the Minister of the Environment, along with the Minister of Natural Resources, is responsible for implementation of the Kyoto Protocol. He is extraordinarily concerned that the issues encompassed within that protocol get the dollars necessary for Canada to meet its targets.

I can assure the honourable senator that I, too, am very supportive of these dollars being used for the purpose of fulfilling our international obligations, and I believe that is the position of the entire cabinet.

Senator Comeau: Honourable senators, in his remarks about this money not becoming a slush fund for pet projects, the minister went on to say that he would be proposing that a control group of four so-called “disinterested” departments would be responsible for deciding which greenhouse gas reduction projects would be funded.

Can the minister advise which four departments would be in that group?

Senator Carstairs: Honourable senators, I cannot advise the honourable senator whether that will be the approach, but I would refer him to the briefing book Budget 2003 in which the following is said about the approach on accountability:

Departments responsible for designing programs will submit their proposals and they will be evaluated through the appropriate Cabinet and Parliamentary approval process as required. Departments will be accountable for delivering on results.

UNITED NATIONS

POSSIBLE WAR WITH IRAQ— PLAN TO BRIDGE DIFFERENCES AMONG MEMBERS OF SECURITY COUNCIL

Hon. Douglas Roche: Honourable senators, my question is directed to the Leader of the Government in the Senate. For the past two days, I have been asking the leader to inform the Senate about the government’s plan concerning the Iraq crisis, a plan which has come to be known as “the Canadian compromise” and which the Prime Minister himself carried to Mexico.

The minister said that she did not have the paper. Well, honourable senators, I have that paper. If the minister cares to ask me, I will gladly tell her where I got it.

Will she table this paper, which is entitled “Ideas on Bridging the Divide,” so that all senators can read it?

Further, will the leader agree with me that this Canadian compromise paper is a highly praiseworthy initiative by Canada to bridge the divide in the Security Council and hold the United Nations together, at the most critical moment the UN has seen in several decades, and that this whole Iraq question should be debated in a government-sponsored motion in the Senate based on this timely paper?

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I certainly would concur 100 per cent that the initiative by the Government of Canada is highly praiseworthy.

I now have a copy of the paper, in English only, and I would say that it is a non-paper. It is entitled “Ideas on Bridging the Divide.” That is what it is. That is what the Government of Canada has decided would be the best approach to take to come, hopefully, to a positive conclusion by bringing the nations together.

As the honourable senator knows, the reaction so far has not been overwhelmingly positive although there is some positive support out there for the initiative. It has been, however, rejected by the United States as well as by Germany. That means that we must work with those countries that are so-called “non-aligned” on the issue at this time. Those countries seem to be reacting much more positively to the bridging that the Government of Canada is attempting to do.

Honourable senators, I cannot give you any more information than that other than to say that, as we leave this place for two weeks, we are all encouraged by any positive initiative that can be put forward by the Government of Canada.

Senator Roche: Honourable senators, I do not want to take up the time of the Senate with an arcane discussion about the difference between a paper and a non-paper. I have been in diplomacy and I know the difference. The point is that this is an initiative by the Government of Canada, which is extremely important, at a critical moment in the history of the world. I did not hear the leader say that she would table it, although I did hear her say that she had it in one language only, which is her problem and not mine. I hope that she can find a way to have this paper made available for all senators to read because it is well worthy of discussion.

Does the minister agree that if the Canadian compromise is accepted and if the UN inspectors report on March 28, that Iraq is in substantial compliance with resolution 1441, there would then follow increased numbers of inspections in the Iraq process and that war would be averted?

Senator Carstairs: Honourable senators, since Senator Roche has knowledge of how diplomacy works I would ask him to allow the government as much flexibility as possible. If we are to be successful in this initiative, we must not restrict ourselves to words on paper. We need to have genuine flexibility to bring forward the compromise that we are working so hard to achieve.

• (1410)

Senator Roche: Honourable senators, of course the government needs flexibility; that is not the point here. The point is that for there to be support for this Canadian compromise, the document must be shown, particularly to those six swing votes on the Security Council that are not yet locked in, one of which is Mexico, another of which is Chile. This is doubtless why the Prime Minister went to Mexico. There may be other things he is doing, but our Prime Minister is certainly talking to President Fox of Mexico, who was reported today as giving a positive reaction to the Canadian paper. I dare say that the Senate would be capable of giving such a positive reaction, if honourable senators had the paper before them to shore up the work of the Prime Minister in trying to influence those important other states on the Security Council to agree that we can solve this crisis without war. That is a worthy and noble effort that all Canada ought to stand behind.

Senator Carstairs: Honourable senators, first let me correct any misapprehension that the Prime Minister is in Mexico as a direct result of this initiative. The trip to Mexico has been planned for many months. The date happened to coincide with activities that were happening in the United Nations, but one has nothing to do with the other.

The Prime Minister has raised the paper that has been circulating in the United Nations with the President of Mexico. I am pleased that the President of Mexico has indicated some support for that initiative. However, I would remind the honourable senator that we are circulating ideas. We do not wish to lock ourselves into a situation where nothing can be changed or edited to reach further compromise. That would be a dangerous situation.

POSSIBLE WAR WITH IRAQ—PLAN TO BRIDGE
DIFFERENCES AMONG MEMBERS OF SECURITY
COUNCIL—REQUEST TO APPEND TO
DEBATES OF THE SENATE

Hon. Marcel Prud'homme: Honourable senators, I should like to make a concrete and positive suggestion. This is not an issue for debate; this is Canada's official proposal for a solution to the Iraq situation.

We will adjourn in a few hours for more than 15 days. I know the answer could easily be, "Well, write an e-mail," but there are so many hundreds of thousands of people who will read the *Debates of the Senate* for today. If there were an agreement of the Senate — and this is not partisan — to append to the debates Canada's proposal for a solution in Iraq, people who read the debates tomorrow and next week would not have to refer back to the Internet.

Therefore, honourable senators, I would ask for unanimous agreement to append Canada's compromise to the Iraq situation to the *Debates of the Senate*.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, this is Question Period, so I will take that as a supplementary question.

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I would be reluctant to file this paper as an addendum to the debates. I wish to make it clear that this paper is not an official proposal. This is a set of ideas that are subject to amendment and change. It would not be in the best interests of the Government of Canada to see that paper made an addendum to the debates of this house.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

POSSIBLE WAR WITH IRAQ—
REQUEST FOR BRIEFING BEFORE COMMITTEE

Hon. Marcel Prud'homme: Honourable senators, I never breach the rules by referring to the absence of an honourable senator. However, I know the honourable senator is not absent; the chairman of the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs is working on his committee. I follow the rules. As a gentlemen, I will not say, "Well, if he were here, I would ask the question." I have been trying to catch his attention. He is my friend and I want him to be here, but he is not.

Therefore, I would ask the Leader of the Government in the Senate to ask the Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee to reflect, during the next two weeks, on the possibility of having a full briefing session with the necessary witnesses. If the minister would transfer that message to the honourable senator officially, via her office, and the chairman were to concur, then senators would be better informed to participate in an issue that might explode in our face while we are absent.

The British Parliament has had this debate. The British Parliament voted. The only body that has not debated this issue is the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs. I am saddened by this reality. I will not say I am outraged. We should have had some initiative in this regard.

Would the Leader of the Government in the Senate kindly consider transmitting this message to the Chairman of the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs?

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators I would assume that the Chair of the Foreign Affairs Committee reads the *Debates of the Senate*. Thus, he will see the request when he reads the interventions in Question Period for today. I do not direct committees and I will not propose to do that today.

INTERNAL ECONOMY, BUDGETS AND ADMINISTRATION

FISCAL 2003-04— POLICY FOR TRAVELLING COMMITTEES

Hon. Mira Spivak: Honourable senators, my question is either for the Leader of the Government in the Senate or the Chairman of Standing Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration.

I am curious as to the policy for both foreign and domestic travel for the coming year. I know that there has been flexibility for this year. However, I should like to know whether that flexibility will carry forward, whether that decision has been made. Perhaps it is in some document that I have not yet seen. I wonder if that will be the policy.

Hon. Lise Bacon: Honourable senators, we have a set of guidelines for this year's budget. I mentioned the other day to the Honourable Senator Comeau that we would review the set of guidelines for the next budget. In part, it depends on the amount of money requested by the committees and the money available for the committees. We will certainly have another set of guidelines, but whether the situation will be the same, I do not know. We will have to see how much money is requested of us and what is available.

INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

LEGISLATION ON NATIVE WOMEN AND PROPERTY RIGHTS

Hon. Terry Stratton: Honourable senators, I should like to file with the minister approximately 15 additional questions, and I do not have time to ask them all today, with respect to various regulations and bills that were put in various Speeches from the Throne or reports on planning and priorities that perhaps she could take a look at over the break.

Specifically, I direct her to the item with respect to Aboriginal women and property rights, an issue that should concern all of us. I will file these questions and perhaps the leader could return to us with the responses. I believe these questions will bring us to over 20 questions respecting regulations and bills that have not been brought forward by this government.

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I am always pleased to obtain answers for any honourable senator, either through the formal process here or by written letter to me.

In regard to the question with respect to Aboriginal women and property rights, the honourable senator will be aware that earlier this week the members of the Standing Senate Committee on Human Rights were very positive about undertaking a study of the issue of Aboriginal women and property rights.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

THE COMMONWEALTH— EFFORTS TO ACCEPT RETURN OF ZIMBABWE

Hon. A. Raynell Andreychuk: Honourable senators, I should like to ask a question about Canada's plan of action, if there is one, on a development in the Commonwealth.

It would appear that Mr. Obasanjo and Mr. Mbeki are moving toward attempting to get Zimbabwe back into the Commonwealth. I should like to know what pre-emptive action Canada is taking.

In reference to a previous issue, if Canada is to have a leadership role, timing is of the essence. The best time to try to exert influence on the Commonwealth membership is while positions are not yet fixed.

Will the Leader of the Government in the Senate provide an assurance that Canada is not supporting any move to reinstate Zimbabwe into the Commonwealth as long as President Mugabe continues his action against his people? Further, I would ask that we prepare a plan of action to encourage all other members of the Commonwealth to hold to the position taken last year.

• (1420)

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I can assure the honourable senator that the Government of Canada took a firm stand with respect to Zimbabwe's place, or lack of place, if you will, in the Commonwealth. I have absolutely no indication that the plan has changed.

The honourable senator raised the possibility that others may be taking action. I will certainly draw her concern to the attention of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, that is, that it would be better if we had a plan sooner rather than later. I assure the honourable senator that I will support the initiative that she brought forward this afternoon.

[Translation]

DELAYED ANSWER TO ORAL QUESTION

Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I have the honour to table an answer to an oral question raised by Senator Gauthier on February 11, 2003, regarding official languages.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES ACT

(Response to question raised by Hon. Jean-Robert Gauthier on February 11, 2003).

Parliament is required to concur only if language rights or services are impaired (sect. 43.1 of the Northwest Territories Act). If these rights or services are improved, Parliament is not required to concur (sect. 43.2).

The amendments proposed by the NWT will be tabled on March 3, and only then will we be in a position to determine whether we will have a role to play in this issue.

In addition, the PM will announce the content of the Official Languages Action Plan on March 12, 2003, and the Plan will include an implementation framework.

[English]

POINT OF ORDER

Hon. Douglas Roche: Your Honour, I rise to raise a point of order and request that a determination be made as to the best resolution of this question concerning the Canadian paper on Iraq.

I should like to briefly take honourable senators through what has transpired.

On Tuesday, during Question Period, I asked the minister if she could elaborate on the plan to avert war in Iraq, that Canada's ambassador is putting before the Security Council. The minister replied:

Honourable senators, let me be clear: There is no concrete plan or initiative on the part of the Canadian government.

She went on to say that the government is sharing some ideas.

Yesterday, I came back and asked the minister:

Can she clarify her statement of yesterday that there is no concrete plan or initiative by Canada ...

I then cited the one-and-a-half page long document called, "Ideas on Bridging the Divide." I concluded my question by asking if the minister could table the paper so that senators could see it. The minister replied:

Honourable senators, I do not have the paper, so I cannot possibly table it.

Of course, I take the minister's statement that she did not have the paper and could not table it, but what are the implications of the minister telling this chamber two days in a row that she did not have the paper? One implication is that my question was not

important or not worthy of discussion: "Let's forget it. Go away and stop bothering me." I am concerned about the question being diminished two days in a row.

I then obtained the paper. I will tell senators where I obtained the paper. I obtained it from the CBC News Web site, and it is the official paper. It is stated that it is the complete text of the Canadian plan entitled "Ideas on Bridging the Divide." I will not read the text because it is my goal to have this paper put before the senators.

I will not discuss, honourable senators, the question of whether this is a paper or non-paper. That is totally irrelevant. This is an initiative that the Government of Canada, at the highest level possible, the Prime Minister himself, brought forward. Moreover, honourable senators, the Canadian Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Paul Heinbecker, a man for whom I have intense respect, called in the reporters and cameras yesterday to follow him around. He admitted those cameras to his conference room in the Canadian mission to the UN, where they were photographed discussing this very initiative, an initiative that we in the Senate are being told does not exist as an initiative, an initiative that the Prime Minister himself has carried forward.

The Hon. the Speaker: Senator Roche, I recognize that you are laying out the facts, but the purpose of a point of order is to deal with some proceeding or some error in the way we are proceeding in the chamber. I would urge you to get to that part of your point of order so we can determine whether or not matters are proceeding in order.

Senator Roche: Honourable senators, my point of order concerns, I suppose, the rights of all senators to receive accurate information on a timely basis. When a paper is asked for, it either exists or it does not exist. The paper does exist.

Today the minister completed her comments on this question by saying that she does now have the paper but cannot table it because it is not in both official languages.

I do not know what to make of this. I have only been here five years. Perhaps I have not been here long enough to figure out what is going on. I think that this is an important issue and that the Senate is the place where we should debate the most pressing issues of the day. Since this paper forms an initiative by Canada, why has it not been tabled?

I am uncertain whether this forms the basis of a real point of order, but I would like your view on this.

The Hon. the Speaker: I will ask if any others wish to intervene and then give you a last opportunity to comment, Senator Roche.

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government): With the greatest respect to the honourable senator, he does not have a point of order. What I said on Tuesday, on Wednesday and on Thursday was very clear. For his information, I received the document to which he refers at one o'clock today. That is the first time I saw it, and that is why it was part of my briefing books.

I also indicated to him, over and over again, that the Government of Canada was sharing ideas. It is still sharing ideas. It is not a proposal. It is not an official document. It is a sharing of ideas to promote a dialogue, a dialogue wherein, hopefully, the honourable senator and I have the same end in mind, which is to avoid a war with Iraq.

The Hon. the Speaker: I have been looking at the rules. I will take the matter under advisement and report back to the house.

I would apologize to Senator Prud'homme. I did look around. I did want to provide everyone with an opportunity to intervene but, in accordance with the rules, I must make a determination when I have heard enough. I have done so and I have indicated that I will take the matter under advisement.

[Translation]

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THE ESTIMATES 2003-04

NATIONAL FINANCE COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO STUDY MAIN ESTIMATES

Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Deputy Leader of the Government), pursuant to the notice of February 26, 2003, moved:

That the Standing Senate Committee on National Finance be authorized to examine and report upon the expenditures set out in the Estimates for the year ending March 31, 2004, with the exception of Parliament Vote 10 and Privy Council Vote 25.

Motion agreed to.

THE ESTIMATES 2002-03

NATIONAL FINANCE COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO STUDY SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (B)

Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Deputy Leader of the Government), pursuant to the notice of February 26, 2003, moved:

That the Standing Senate Committee on National Finance be authorized to examine and report upon the expenditures set out in the Supplementary Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2003.

Motion agreed to.

• (1430)

THE ESTIMATES 2003-04

VOTE 25 REFERRED TO OFFICIAL LANGUAGES COMMITTEE

Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Deputy Leader of the Government), pursuant to the notice of February 26, 2003, moved:

That the Standing Joint Committee on Official Languages be authorized to examine the expenditures set out in Privy Council Vote 25, of the Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2004.

Hon. Marcel Prud'homme: Honourables senators, instead of authorizing the Standing Joint Committee on Official Languages to examine the projected expenditures set out in Privy Council Vote 25, could this matter not be examined in the Committee of the Whole in the Senate?

Considering how important this issue is for one of our honourable senators, and since it is the first time that we have a Senate Committee on Official Languages, as opposed to a joint committee with the other place, perhaps the time has come to review the issue in Committee of the Whole.

For once, all senators, regardless of the party or the region that they represent, would have the opportunity to be apprised of this issue, and there is no better way to do it than to review it in Committee of the Whole. I notice that many senators around me are supportive of the idea and I invite them to take part in the discussion.

Senator Robichaud: Honourable senators, traditionally, votes for official languages were reviewed by the Standing Joint Committee on Official Languages of the Senate and of the other place.

The Senate now has an Official Languages Committee. This, therefore, is an opportunity to give a chance to that committee to point out the work that it does and to allow it to review budgets.

I also want to mention that all honourable senators can attend meetings and take part in the committee's debates.

Senator Prud'homme: Honourable senators, the deputy leader is well aware that we know the rules. All senators can attend all meetings, including in camera sittings of committees and preliminary meetings.

Honourable senators, much interest was generated when Senator Kinsella asked Mr. Radwanski to appear before the Committee of the Whole. Mr. Radwanski could have appeared before a committee. However, when he appeared before the Committee of the Whole, over half of the senators were there. Traditions are fine, but we can establish new ones to make Senate reviews even more lively. I am not pushing this. I am merely making a suggestion.

I think that, from time to time, there should be more reviews done in Committee of the Whole in the Senate. This would allow everyone to put questions to senior officials; our reviews would then have a greater impact. I already see that the Leader of the Government is objecting strenuously. I guess I will not have much success today.

Senator Robichaud: Honourable senators, the strenuous objections of the Leader of the Government in the Senate are to the effect that all committees can review the Estimates of the various departments. Of course, any senator who wishes to attend a meeting is welcome to do so, even when meetings are held in camera.

While taking Senator Prud'homme's suggestions into account, I believe it would be preferable to ask the Standing Committee on Official Languages to review expenditures for official languages.

Senator Prud'homme: Honourable senators, the deputy leader is using a lot of words to say that he is refusing my suggestion, end of discussion. I am no fool. I understand that you did not want to. I must say I am not in a good mood.

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

Motion agreed to.

VOTE 10 REFERRED TO STANDING JOINT COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Deputy Leader of the Government), pursuant to notice of February 26, 2003, moved:

That the Standing Joint Committee on the Library of Parliament, when and if the Committee is formed, be authorized to examine the expenditures set out in Parliament Vote 10 of the Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2004; and

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

Motion agreed to.

[English]

NATIONAL ANTHEM ACT

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING— DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Kinsella, seconded by the Honourable Senator Corbin, for the second reading of Bill S-14, to amend the National Anthem Act to reflect the linguistic duality of Canada.—(*Honourable Senator Banks*).

Hon. Tommy Banks: Honourable senators, I took the adjournment of the debate on this bill yesterday. I had heard the substance of the bill when Senator Kinsella first introduced it.

[Senator Prud'homme]

However, I had not looked at the bill. The first time I did was yesterday afternoon, during the debate. That is when I noticed that there was a piece of music attached to it. I do not know how often that happens. I suspect this might be only the second time, the first time probably having been in 1980.

I wanted to have a peek at it. Because I did not want to let honourable senators know how badly I sight read, I took a look at it in the privacy of the reading room.

Senator Stratton: You could sing it!

Senator Banks: Honourable senators, that would have the effect of clearing the joint out, and I do not want to do that. Perhaps Senator Kinsella will accept the invitation of yesterday. He is in much better voice than I, and I know that for a fact because he was among the sober singing senators who performed last Christmas.

I simply wish to remind honourable senators of what Senator Kinsella told us yesterday, that his bill in no way conflicts with Senator Poy's bill. In fact, they are quite complementary to each other. Neither is mutually exclusive. The point of Senator Poy's bill is to make the English lyrics of the anthem inclusive rather than exclusive.

One of the perfectly good points of Senator Kinsella concerns all the different versions of the anthem that we hear, not only in arenas at hockey games but at all sorts of other events, all across the country, in every province and territory. He wishes to ensure that there is, in those instances, an official bilingual version that actually makes sense, in which the lines actually lead to one another with some logic rather than what we sometimes hear, which is that they sometimes do not.

• (1440)

Therefore, I wish to urge two things upon honourable senators. The first is that we send Senator Kinsella's bill, Bill S-14, immediately to the appropriate committee for study and consideration, and I hope that at the same time and in virtually the same breath, we will send Bill S-3 to the same committee so that they can be considered in context, each with the other, which is an important consideration. I urge that we do that. I urge that when those motions come, honourable senators support them both with alacrity.

Hon. Eymard G. Corbin: Honourable senators, it will not be before I have had my say, so I adjourn the debate.

On motion of Senator Corbin, debate adjourned.

STATUTES REPEAL BILL

SECOND READING

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Banks, seconded by the Honourable Senator Wiebe, for the second reading of Bill S-12, to repeal legislation that has not been brought into force within ten years of receiving royal assent.—(*Honourable Senator Kinsella*).

Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, I wish to participate in this debate on Bill S-12, a very important bill, in my view, entitled: "Statutes Repeal Act." It is important for a number of reasons, not just in terms of housekeeping, but in terms of issues of substance.

Legislation that has gone through the two Houses and received Royal Assent very often has attached to it a coming into force date, either for the entire bill or for a section of the bill.

This bill deals with pieces of legislation with such a provision but that has never come into effect. The question becomes whether or not the intent of the legislators at the time the legislation was enacted was framed within circumstances of, *hic ad nunc*, the here and now, or the circumstances of the environment in which the legislation is being examined, and over time, those circumstances change. Therefore, there is no intent or continuing intent as far as the legislators are concerned. The bill proposes that, after a certain fixed period of time, if a bill or parts of a bill that have been enacted and given Royal Assent have not been put into force, they be repealed *ipso facto*.

There are a number of attractive features to that idea if you take a look at some bills. For example, section 248(4)(b) of the Emergencies Act was amended providing for the detention, imprisonment or internment of Canadian citizens or permanent residents within the meaning of subsection 2(1) of the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, on the basis of race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age or mental or physical disability. I find a provision like that in a statute to be morally and politically repugnant. Furthermore, it stands contrary to our international human rights obligations. For example, section 4 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights makes it perfectly clear that, even in times of national emergencies, when the life of the nation itself is threatened, discriminating on the basis of these prohibited grounds indicated here is never permitted. Certain rights, such as those with regard to torture, may never ever be derogated from.

We do have laws in the books. It received Royal Assent, it received the approbation of the two Houses of Parliament, but in their wisdom, the legislators who enacted those measures recognized that circumstances would be such that the state would never have to have those extra powers. The government of the day that brought them forward wanted to have measures available to call upon if it needed them in times of national emergency.

That provision has never been brought into force, happily. If the government, in other circumstances, felt that those kinds of powers were necessary after a 10-year period, then the government could come back to Parliament and say, "We still need to have these kinds of measures." There is a virtual principle or sunset principle contained in this bill that I find to be salutary from a human rights perspective, and it is one reason I support this bill.

My third point, in conclusion, honourable senators, is it seems to me that there should be some kind of accounting for measures not being brought into force. Parliament should be told why these measures have not been brought into force. The government has asked Parliament to give it an authority just in case. Maybe Parliament is entitled to hear the reason, and no doubt, in most circumstances, the government was not put in a position where it had to bring into force those provisions. It seems to me that such justification should be periodically tabled in Parliament.

The virtue of Bill S-12 is that that will happen as a matter of course in the legislative process. After some nine years, a measure that could have been brought into effect but was not, it would be *ipso facto* deleted. It does not stop the government from bringing the measure back, but that particular provision would cease to have force and effect and could not be called upon.

It is a good idea in terms of public policy. It is a good idea in terms of the security of the rights and freedoms of Canadians from measures that may have made sense at the beginning of a decade but make no sense at the end of a decade. The time line that is being proposed makes eminent sense. Therefore, I should hope that honourable senators will support the bill in principle and that it will make its way to the appropriate committee for detailed analysis.

Hon. Tommy Banks: I believe, honourable senators, if I speak, it will have the effect of closing debate on second reading.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, Senator Banks is correct in that if he speaks now, it will have the effect of closing the debate on second reading.

• (1450)

Senator Banks: Honourable senators, I thank Senator Kinsella for having put more clearly than I did, in my last comments on this bill, some of the specific dangers to which I referred. There are other such dangers, but Senator Kinsella has raised a particularly cogent one.

I neglected to mention one point which I think is important to know before the bill, hopefully, is sent to committee for study. The proposal in the bill on the tabling of notices would, in effect, give the government nine or ten months' notice. During that nine or ten months, the government could bring that section of the act into force. That is to say, the list will be placed before us and before the other place at the first opportunity in the calendar year. By that list, the government will receive notice that, should they fail to bring into force that act or that section of the act by the following December 31, then that act or that section of the act is repealed. The government of the day has opportunity to bring the act or section into force during that time or, in the alternative, as Senator Kinsella has said, to come to Parliament and ask to continue the flexibility contained therein for bringing into force the act or section.

I hope that honourable senators will agree that we should proceed with this bill.

The Hon. the Speaker: Will the Honourable Senator Banks take a question?

Senator Banks: Sure.

Hon. Eymard G. Corbin: Honourable senators, I think I know what the expression “coming into force” means, but I want to make sure that its use here is limited to what I understand as “coming into force.” For example, if you take any government bill like Bill C-8, to protect human health and safety and the environment by regulating products used for the control of pests, you will see that the last clause is clause 90. It is entitled, “Coming into Force.” There is the marginal explanatory notation which also reads, “Coming into Force.” The clause states:

The provisions of this Act, and the provisions of any Act as enacted by this Act, come into force on a day or days to be fixed by order of the Governor in Council.

Am I to understand that the expression “coming into force” does indeed refer to, and refers only to, the decision of the Governor in Council to put it into force as of the date that it is signed and registered by the Clerk of the Privy Council? Is that the only meaning attached to the term, or is there a hidden meaning?

Senator Banks: Honourable senators, I am flattered that one would think I could put hidden meaning into a bill. There is no hidden meaning and Senator Corbin has exactly characterized the circumstances, the kind of act to which this would apply, and to which this bill would refer.

The “coming into force” provision contained in some bills states that the bill will be enacted, on a date certain or in the event of certain preconditions, or when another act or some provision of another act occurs. This bill refers only to those acts in which the coming into force clause specifically gives to the Governor in Council the flexibility to determine when and if the act will come into force, and to nothing else.

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

Motion agreed to and bill read second time.

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

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

On motion of Senator Banks, bill referred to the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs.

NATIONAL ANTHEM ACT

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING—
ORDER STANDS

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Poy, seconded by the Honourable Senator Banks,

for the second reading of Bill S-3, to amend the National Anthem Act to include all Canadians.—(*Honourable Senator Stratton*).

Hon. Terry Stratton: Honourable senators, I rise today to give assurance that I will speak to this matter. As I said to Senator Poy yesterday, I will speak to this upon our return after the break. She has graciously accepted that.

Order stands.

VIMY RIDGE DAY BILL

SECOND READING—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. Marie-P. Poulin moved the second reading of Bill C-227, respecting a national day of remembrance of the Battle of Vimy Ridge.

She said: Honourable senators, in the books of Canadian military history, Vimy Ridge stands out as the sole epic battle that defined us as a nation. It marked the first time, almost 86 years ago, that Canadians fought as a single entity. Canadians from coast to coast to coast — school teachers, lumberjacks, businessmen, fishermen, factory workers — united in an unprecedented esprit de corps to vanquish a formidable foe who had fended off for three years the armies of two other nations.

On a cold windy and sleet-driven morning — 5:30, to be exact — on Easter Monday, April 9, 1917, a hundred thousand of these citizen soldiers stormed out of the mud and pestilence of their trenches and from a warren of tunnels to overrun a curtain of cannon and machine-gun fire. Their heroic deeds marked the birth of a nation. By the middle of that afternoon, most of the ridge had been captured. Of the 100,000 Canadians who took part in the historic battle, more than 30,000 troops went over the top out of their filthy, miserable hovels into no-man’s land and up the cratered slopes. Within 24 hours, they achieved 70 percent of the target. By April 12, what was left of the German outposts along the ridge had been cleared up.

• (1500)

The first all-Canadian fighting force had triumphed, and a nation was forged. A nation forged in the mud and blood of Vimy Ridge, one of Germany’s most formidable strongholds in Europe, and the gateway to the mines and factories of occupied France that were feeding the German war machine.

The quick victory, and quick it was by the war standards of the day, exacted a high price. Canadian casualties numbered 10,602, of whom there were 3,598 dead.

Of the 70 Canadian soldiers who were awarded the Victoria Cross in the First World War, four were given for valour at Vimy Ridge, a strategic escarpment that was a vital point in the German defence systems, which ran clear to the coast of the English Channel.

Honourable senators, the story of Vimy Ridge is a hallowed reminder of the 66,665 Canadians who perished in that ugly and terrible war to end all wars, either in battle or as a result of their wounds.

The so-called Great War, alas, was not the end. Other wars followed and thousands upon thousands of more Canadian sons and daughters perished. Yet, Vimy stands out in our consciousness for what it symbolizes, the flowering of a nation — not to glorify war, but to remind us of the sacrifices made by our fellow countrymen and to be vigilant against the scourge of tyranny that casts darkness upon the soul and smothers the essence of our very own humanity.

That is why, honourable senators, I stand before you today as a proud and privileged Canadian to sponsor and lend my unequivocal support to Bill C-227. By supporting this bill, you too will enshrine in law a national day of remembrance of the Battle of Vimy Ridge, a moment etched in time when valiant colonial troops went and fought as one and came into their own as Canadians.

It pleases me enormously to note that the origins of this bill flow from my own native northern Ontario. It began as a millennium project by Robert E. Manuel of Elliott Lake and quickly found enthusiasm across a broad spectrum of Canada, from the National Council of Veteran Associations in Canada, the Royal Canadian Legion to politicians of all stripes.

The Hon. the Speaker: I am sorry to interrupt, but I am having difficulty hearing Senator Poulin's remarks. I would ask honourable senators to carry on conversations outside of the chamber.

Senator Poulin: Honourable senators, young Canadians have also been imbued with the spirit of the bill which was steered through the other place by my good friend Brent St. Denis, the Member for Algoma-Manitoulin, and received unanimous approval.

I should like to take a moment to read the conclusion of a captivating essay by a Grade 11 student from Lockerby Composite School in Sudbury. After a concise account of the events of the battle, Joel Ralph, who was 17 when he wrote this in 1999, summed it up by saying:

....(T)he attack proved the Canadians to be the best army in the world, and they accordingly would form the iron tip of the spearhead that would end the war in 1918. ...The troops came from Nova Scotia to Montreal, Ottawa to Winnipeg, Regina to Vancouver, even the North West and everywhere else in between...That morning when they set out to seize Vimy Ridge they were Commonwealth soldiers, but when they reached the summit they were Canadians.

By passing this bill, honourable senators, there will be a day of remembrance when the flag on the Peace Tower flies at half-mast every April 9. It will be a reminder to generations of Canadians

yet to be born, and of generations yet to come to our shores as immigrants, of the values we uphold in this land of freedom and opportunity.

It will be a reminder of our heritage, a heritage forged on the battlefields of Europe nearly nine decades ago, and of the principles that have been reinforced by our commitments to other conflicts to end wretched tyrants and to promote peace around the world.

The values that Canadians have suffered and died for on land, at sea, and in the air are fragile commodities. Too often we see erosion of the symbols that remind us who we are and where we come from.

Passage of Bill C-227 will initiate an annual reminder of the 619,000 men and women who fought in the Canadian Expeditionary Force of the First World War — of the more than one in ten who never came home to the country they helped create — and of the several thousand others in the Navy, the Merchant Navy, the Newfoundland Forces and the fledgling Royal Flying Corps who also perished in this gruesome conflict. They will learn of the formidable odds the Canadians faced, pitted against the German might which had repeatedly repelled the British and the French. The French, alone, lost 150,000 soldiers trying to take Vimy. The British losses pushed the figure over 200,000.

They will learn, too, that the Canadians did not cower at Vimy Ridge even though they had lost 24,000, killed or wounded, at the Somme the previous year and, in the months leading up to the all-out assault on Vimy, the Canadian Corps had suffered 9,953 casualties in the same sector.

Canadians, as the British Prime Minister Lloyd George said, distinguished themselves at the Somme as hard-hitting shock troops. He said:

...for the remainder of the war they were brought along to head the assault in one great battle after another. Whenever the Germans found the Canadian Corps coming into the line they prepared for the worst.

[Translation]

Honourable senators, the battles at Vimy Ridge were a turning point in the war. There are two main reasons for this: the ingenious planning and the unsurpassable bravery of our Canadian soldiers.

I mention these two reasons because they highlight the maturity that Canada had already reached as a country. Warfare at the beginning of the 20th century was based on attrition.

For years, the Allied forces and the Germans waged a war that went on and on. The Allied forces attacked the German barricades relentlessly. They were decimated by artillery rounds, automatic weapons and even by bayonets in man-to-man combat. Basically, the side that survived won.

At the express request of Sir Sam Hughes, Canada's Minister of Militia and Defence, the four divisions that made up the Canadian Corps were regrouped at Vimy instead of being distributed among British troops. Meanwhile, the Canadian commanders had learned terrible lessons from the unfortunate battles that had been fought earlier and that demonstrated the vulnerability of infantry launching frontal attacks against fortified trenches.

• (1510)

The Battle of Vimy Ridge was thoroughly planned to keep losses to a minimum. A network of underground tunnels was dug out to protect troops from shelling and enable them to launch attacks.

The troops, including the wounded, could get away from the line of fire. Ammunition and supplies could be stored. Electrical and telephone lines provided modern and flexible means of communication.

For each soldier to become perfectly familiar with the locations and the routes to reach their objectives after an assault on a seven-kilometre front, a replica of the Vimy battle area was laid out behind Canadian lines to prepare the attack.

Canadians adopted new methods of warfare, for instance, using machine guns as a weapon of light artillery instead of big rifles. The machine-gunners were shooting over the heads of their comrades involved in the attack and could stand in for regular artillery.

The thorough planning was carried out under the command of Sir Julian Byng and his right-hand man, Major General Arthur Currie, who was later knighted on the battlefield by King Georges V. They were driven by devotion to duty and the determination to succeed where others has failed.

Canadians have shown what they could accomplish together. This is a lesson that we have applied repeatedly. It is a lesson that we must not forget: power in unity.

Honourable senators, we recently attended a moving ceremony, as the Unknown Soldier was buried in front of the National War Memorial, just down the street from the Parliament Buildings.

The remains of the Unknown Soldier, who is known only to God, were repatriated following exhumation from one of the cemeteries on the battlefield at Vimy.

How fitting it is that we should designate a national day to commemorate victory in this decisive battle of World War I! This victory, on the morning of April 9, 1917, contributed to the liberation of Europe and, albeit involuntarily, to the birth of an independent nation.

The courage of Canadian soldiers earned us a seat at the table of the Imperial War Conference and we were one of the signatories of the Treaty of Versailles.

This is the least we can do for our comrades at arms who fought at Vimy Ridge, and for the women and men who are serving in our Armed Forces today, in times of peace and in times of war.

The Hon. the Speaker: Would Senator Poulin accept a question?

Senator Poulin: Yes.

Hon. Marcel Prud'homme: Honourable senators, I must begin by thanking Senator Poulin for her very moving speech. It is also very difficult to raise this question, which has been in my mind for a long time.

As senators know, I have a real problem with all these national days of remembrance. I have already said, in connection with other bills, that we have to be very cautious about days of remembrance. When the flag is lowered to half-mast, the event takes on a timeless quality.

We have, right here in this chamber, paintings of scenes from the Battle of Vimy Ridge, not Vichy, as the Minister of National Defence once said. On November 11, we celebrate Remembrance Day in honour of the 600,000 Canadian war veterans.

I am in a bit of an awkward position. I subscribe fully to what the honourable senator said. However, I disagree with designating a new day of remembrance.

I have been in Parliament for 40 years. I take part in all the days of remembrance connected with all tragedies with military overtones. The Armenians keep reminding us of what the Turks did, the Greeks of what the Italians did, and so on. Everybody's victories are celebrated. I wonder if our choice of November 11 does not already symbolize exactly what we want. If we start diluting the remembrance of this huge war effort of 1914-18, would we not end up with the impression that there are so many different events that they end up being meaningless?

I have not reached a decision on this bill, but I wonder if I might have some help in thinking this through. I am in a bit of a dilemma because of the position I have taken on this and the speeches I have given in the House of Commons on equally meritorious proposals. This one may well have more merit than those I have addressed in the past.

Senator Poulin: Honourables senators, I would first like to congratulate Senator Prud'homme. He is known and admired for his observance of days of remembrance. He is asking a very good question to the effect that the more our country commits to international peace, the more, over the years, we will be able to contribute at critical moments. Perhaps there will not be enough days on which to remember all the events that shaped the Canada of today and will shape the Canada of tomorrow.

What struck me in my research on the day of remembrance of April 9 was that this day is important not only for its military significance, but also its national and cultural significance. That is why this day will be especially meaningful from one end of the country to another. That is why this day would pay special tribute to the Canadians who fought at Vimy.

[Senator Poulin]

Senator Prud'homme: I discussed this with the countries involved. Certain Germans believe that they could have a day of remembrance for the terrible destruction of Dresden. One side strikes and the other says it will too. War is never pretty, as we shall soon see. I thank the Honourable Senator Poulin. I will talk about this at the appropriate time.

Hon. Jean-Robert Gauthier: Honourables senators, I would like to thank Senator Poulin for her speech, as well as Senator Prud'homme. I am somewhat familiar with this subject.

I grew up with a man named Louis-Philippe Gauthier, my grandfather. He brought me here when I was nine years old. He explained the paintings to me. Do you know why?

• (1520)

He was a doctor in 1911 and the member for Gaspé until 1917. He enrolled in 1915 and went to war. He fought at Vimy. He never said much about what he went through over there but, at times, he would tell me stories. With the help of these paintings, he told me almost everything he remembered.

He was injured and treated in London. He came back to Canada in 1919. He could no longer practice medicine. He had no military pension, and it was not easy to raise seven children and two grandchildren, namely my sister and me.

For me, Vimy is an emotional subject. I could talk about it for hours.

I simply wanted to say that my grandfather was a French Canadian who enrolled in 1915 to defend his country against the military aggression in Europe.

Lately, I have been receiving many letters relating to the issue of bilingualism in federal institutions. Some pointed out that French Canadians were cowards who never went to war.

This upsets me because I lived for several years with my grandfather, who did go to war, and he was not the only one. Many French and English Canadians fought for freedom.

My grandfather's friends would come by in the evening. They would take out their pipe and soon there was a cloud of blue smoke. I had asthma attacks because of that.

My grandfather ended his career in Ottawa. On Chapel Street, in Sandy Hill, he opened a hospital which was called Vimy Hospital. I have his book and the various details of his daily activities as a doctor in Ottawa. In 1932-33, he became a Clerk of the Senate and remained in that position until his death, in 1944.

I thank the Honourable Senator Poulin for her comments. Vimy is a historical moment and I support the motion to establish a day of remembrance for the Canadians who were there to defend democracy as we know it. We are very grateful to them.

Senator Prud'homme: I move adjournment of the debate.

Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, without wanting to rush things, I thought the opposition wanted to move adjournment for Senator Meighen, so that they could present their point of view.

On motion of Senator Robichaud, for Senator Meighen, debate adjourned.

[English]

LEGACY OF WASTE DURING CHRÉTIEN-MARTIN YEARS

INQUIRY—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the inquiry of the Honourable Senator LeBreton calling the attention of the Senate to the legacy of waste during the Martin-Chrétien years.—(*Honourable Senator Bryden*).

Hon. Gerald J. Comeau: Honourable senators, I rise today to speak to the inquiry launched by Senator LeBreton into the legacy of waste in the Martin-Chrétien years.

Honourable senators have heard in speeches about the long history of the Sea King replacement program and the costs associated with the new maritime helicopter fleet procurement process. What Canadians may not be aware of is how the current process has been manipulated to exclude competitors from a fair and open procurement process to purchase a modern maritime helicopter.

Up to August 2001, there were seven years of failure and risk as the Chrétien government stalled the Sea King replacement program so that our navy, their aircrews and their families would not see the helicopter.

Today we learned again of the consequences of this government's political manipulation of this file as a Sea King crashed on the deck of the HMCS *Iroquois*, which was on its way to the Persian Gulf to become the command ship in that area. What an embarrassment. This government does not even realize the shame that this throws on our country.

In regard to the procurement process, the government's announcement in August 2001 initiated the Maritime Helicopter Project. Since that time, the process has been fraught with pitfalls and trap doors to steer the contract away from the Cormorant EH-101, which Prime Minister Chrétien so hates. When the competition to replace the Sea King was announced in 2001, the procurement process called for a split contract, a contract for the basic vehicle and its support, and a contract for the mission systems and their support with a total value of \$2.9 billion.

The government capped the value of the 28 basic vehicles at \$925 million and based their selection criteria for the winner on the lowest price compliant criteria. This had two immediate effects. First, it meant that no matter what aircraft competed, even one of marginal capability, as long as it met the minimum requirement and it was the cheapest helicopter, it would be selected as the Sea King replacement. This would happen even if another aircraft was far more capable but more expensive.

This approach eliminated professional military judgment from the competition and meant that if an operationally marginal competitor was one dollar cheaper than a helicopter with far greater capability, then the cheap helicopter would win out. This process violates Treasury Board guidelines 9.1.1 and 9.1.2 and smacks of the gun registry fiasco.

Second, due to the lowest price compliant guidelines, the competition virtually eliminated the off-the-shelf Cormorant EH-101 before the competition had even started. The EH-101 has one more engine, is larger and more robust than the other competitors and, therefore, more expensive. As we have seen recently, the EH-101 is a very capable helicopter.

In addition, the letter of interest rules at first eliminated Sikorsky's new H-92 from competing for the contract. The competition guidelines stated that the competing helicopters must be certified prior to the basic mission vehicle portion of the contract being awarded in the summer of 2001. The competition was to be for an off-the-shelf helicopter, not a development aircraft. At the time, it was well-known in government circles that the H-92 would not be certified before the summer of 2002. Therefore, the H-92 would have been eliminated from the competition before it even started. It has been suggested that this occurred because the Chrétien government had already picked an aircraft to replace the Sea King: the French-owned Eurocopter Cougar, in return for French neutrality around the time of the government's controversial Clarity Bill.

The only group not disadvantaged by the competition as it was originally structured was the Eurocopter Cougar MK-2. It was and still is the cheapest aircraft and is based on 1970s technology and design. Indeed, the Cougar was excluded from a four-nation Scandinavian maritime helicopter competition in the challenging North Sea and Arctic Ocean environment, similar operationally to our cold, hazardous North Atlantic. It is not a proven naval helicopter, but it is the cheapest.

• (1530)

Canada had passed on the offer of the Eurocopter Cougar twice before to replace the Sea King under Prime Minister Brian Mulroney and then the Labrador search and rescue helicopter under Prime Minister Chrétien, so it has never been the helicopter of choice.

The only problem for Eurocopter and its Cougar MK II was the strict standards put into place by the Maritime Helicopter Project Office as set out in the Statement of Operational Requirements. Eurocopter pushed for several months in 2001 and 2002 to lower the Statement of Operational Requirements, and when the Department of National Defence dug in its heels in refusal, the French announced their withdrawal, but they also baited a trap for the government. The bait was the NH-90.

With the withdrawal of the Cougar, the French offered the NH-90, a new, highly capable naval helicopter, but like the Cougar, the NH-90 did not meet the Canadian requirements either and could not compete. Leveraging the threat to pull out of

the competition entirely, the French put pressure on Canada to roll back the requirements even further.

Although a modern naval helicopter, the NH-90 is actually smaller in size than the Cougar, and the naval variant is not even in production. It would, however, be cheaper than the competitors. However, there was another problem for the government to solve. For the NH-90 to compete, the government needed to change the procurement methodology and re-bundle the competition into one solicitation or contract. The NH-90 was built as a fully integrated weapon system, making it risky and expensive to separate the vehicle from its customized mission interior.

Lo and behold, last December, after two and one-half years of fighting with manufacturers and denying there was a problem to the opposition during Question Period, the Chrétien government announced a sweeping change to the Maritime Helicopter Project.

Defence Minister John McCallum proudly announced that henceforth the maritime helicopter procurement process would be re-bundled and moved forward with one prime contractor and one contract to replace all 28 Sea Kings.

The last obstacle for the French NH-90 had been removed, and to add to the charade, the requirement specifications had been made so low that the French may actually be considering the re-entry of their Cougar MK II into the competition. Many of the changes that have been made and that are continuing to be made to the operational specifications are associated not with making the maritime helicopter more capable but with allowing a smaller, cheaper helicopter to enter the competition and win.

Therefore, while the Statement of Operational Requirements that has been theoretically set in stone by the Canadian Forces has not changed, the Chrétien Liberals have carefully shaved the operational specifications downward to allow Eurocopter NH-90 and potentially the Cougar MK II to compete in the process — a competition that they are virtually guaranteed to win because they are the cheapest aircraft in a lowest-priced-sticker competition.

The charade that has become the Maritime Helicopter Project moves on and on without apparent end in sight, but with an apparent end-game in the Liberal mind. The game is to do anything possible to ensure that the EH-101, and the H-92 are excluded from winning the competition to replace the Sea King, and then buy a Eurocopter product, regardless of what it does to the taxpayer and to the members of the Canadian Forces who will have to fly the aircraft for the next 40 years.

Honourable senators, the waste and mismanagement associated with the procurement of helicopters is an ongoing and truly extraordinary story, one which may well be the jewel in the crown of the legacy of waste of the Martin-Chrétien government.

On motion of Senator Robichaud, for Senator Bryden, debate adjourned.

UNITED NATIONS

POSSIBLE WAR WITH IRAQ—PLAN TO
BRIDGE DIFFERENCES AMONG MEMBERS OF
SECURITY COUNCIL—DOCUMENT TABLED

Leave having been given to revert to Tabling of Documents:

Hon. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, when I returned to my office this afternoon, I learned that the non-paper, “Ideas on Bridging the Divide” was tabled in the House of Commons at about three o’clock this afternoon. I want this chamber to have full access to the same documentation. I would, therefore, table the non-paper, “Ideas on Bridging the Divide.”

Hon. Shirley Maheu (The Hon. the Acting Speaker): The tabling of this document disposes of the point of order raised earlier by Senator Roche. Therefore there is no need for a Speaker’s ruling on the issue.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: Senator Roche is not here. That is quite unfair.

TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

MOTION TO AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE TO STUDY
MEDIA INDUSTRIES—ORDER STANDS

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Day, seconded by the Honourable Senator Gauthier:

That the Standing Senate Committee on Transport and Communications be authorized to examine and report on the current state of Canadian media industries; emerging trends and developments in these industries; the media’s role, rights, and responsibilities in Canadian society; and current and appropriate future policies relating thereto; and

That the Committee submit its final report to the Senate no later than Wednesday, March 31, 2004.—(*Honourable Senator Stratton*).

Hon. Terry Stratton: Honourable senators, my intention is to speak to this issue immediately upon our return. Before we proceed, we want to ensure that our side is in agreement with certain aspects of this motion.

Order stands.

AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

FINDINGS IN REPORT ENTITLED “CANADIAN
FARMERS AT RISK”—INQUIRY—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the inquiry of the Honourable Senator Oliver calling the attention of the Senate to the findings contained in the report of the Standing Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry entitled *Canadian*

Farmers at Risk, tabled in the Senate on June 13, 2002, during the First Session of the Thirty-seventh Parliament.—(*Honourable Senator Gustafson*).

Hon. Terry Stratton: I rise today on behalf of Senator Gustafson. He does wish to speak to this inquiry but believes that it will be more appropriate to do so upon his return from travelling out West with the Standing Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on its study of global warming. With the approval of this chamber, I would ask that we rewind the clock until his return.

The Hon. the Speaker: Is it agreed, honourable senators, that Order No. 6 on Inquiries go to day one, as requested by Senator Stratton?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I would not want us to create a precedent. Since the Honourable Senator Stratton delivered a rather short speech, the clock is reset at zero rather than requiring that we give our consent for it to be brought back to zero. Do you understand what I am trying to say?

[*English*]

Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): As all honourable senators know, any senator can participate in a debate. In fact, I was hoping that we would have a rather fulsome debate on the matter in question.

I found interesting the observations of the Honourable Senator Stratton on the substance of the inquiry, and I look forward to hearing further from him.

• (1540)

The Hon. the Speaker: It is moved by the Honourable Senator Stratton, seconded by the Honourable Senator Meighen, that further debate be adjourned to the next sitting of the Senate, when he will speak for the balance of his time. Is it your pleasure, honourable senators, to adopt the motion?

Motion agreed to.

[*Translation*]

PARLIAMENTARY DELEGATION TO
KINGDOM OF MOROCCO

INQUIRY

Hon. Gérald-A. Beaudoin rose pursuant to notice of Tuesday, February 25, 2003:

That he will call the attention of the Senate to the visit of the parliamentary delegation from the Senate and the House of Commons to the Kingdom of Morocco at the invitation of the King, from January 19 to 26, 2003, in order to discuss trade issues, equality rights and other matters.

He said: Honourable senators, the Canadian delegation, comprised of 17 parliamentarians including five senators and 12 members representing four parties from the Parliament of Canada and led by Bernard Patry, Chair of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade, spent a week in Morocco at the invitation of King Mohammed VI.

The reception in Rabat, Casablanca, Laâyoune and Agadir was very warm.

A program had been developed by the Canadian parliamentarians, primarily Bernard Patry and Yvon Charbonneau, and by the Moroccan association. This program was packed, interesting and very instructive.

The Moroccan civil society, under Abderrahman Mekkaoui, went out of its way to meet our expectations. I have seldom seen such dedication.

The Moroccan Ambassador to Canada accompanied us all week long. Our Ambassador to Morocco, His Excellency Yves Gagnon, made himself very available and hosted a reception at the Canadian Embassy in Rabat.

It certainly was a week during which we were able to cover a great many topics, such as gender equality, the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, free trade between Morocco and Canada, among others, and to meet with many volunteer associations, good friends of Canada. In our discussions on free trade, the Moroccans talked about their free trade agreement with the United States. Why not have one with Canada?

The highlight of the visit came when we met with His Majesty on the Friday, in the middle of the afternoon. The King granted us a 45-minute audience, which is unusual for a delegation with no ministers. Yvon Charbonneau, a member of the House of Commons of Canada, was of great assistance in arranging this.

The Sahara issue was brought to our attention, and immediately caught my attention. There is a legal aspect and one of international public law involved in this issue, which, moreover, is set in a historical and highly political context. There does not appear to be any legal basis for the detaining of a large number of servicemen for more than 25 years; Chairman Bernard Patry and many other parliamentarians pointed out this fact. Therefore, it came as no surprise to us to learn that many personalities around the world had strongly condemned their detention.

I think that, if it has not already been done, this case must be brought to the attention of the International Lawyers Association, Canadian section, which I once chaired. I will hasten to do so, now that I am back. Especially since Madam Justice Claire L'Heureux-Dubé, a former Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, once was the international association's chairman.

This conflict between Morocco and Algeria must be resolved in accordance with the principles of public international law. Canada officially informed us that His Excellency Yves M. Gagnon, our Ambassador to Morocco, has remained neutral in this conflict.

We discussed rights and freedoms, and the equality of men and women.

Canada may be the country where this equality is the most clearly enshrined in the Constitution, as a result of an amendment made when it was patriated in 1982.

Some countries have adopted legislation on this matter. However, once equality is legislated, it takes time for changes to be seen in everyday life, depending on the country, due to delays or the difficulty of implementation. Although the 20th century was called the most violent century of all by British philosopher Issiah Berlin, it also produced the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948. Equal rights for men and women was a significant milestone of the 20th century. It compensates somewhat for the violence during that century.

We heard several women, who appeared before us and who pleaded their cause successfully and skilfully. We also heard the Chair of the Human Rights Commission speak on this issue; it was very enlightening.

Even in the most advanced countries, equality takes times. In Canada, enforcement of equality, as set out in the 1982 Charter of Rights and Freedoms, was to begin only three years after the Charter's adoption, in 1985. It took time.

In closing, a word on how beautiful this country is. I have always felt that the sea and the desert represent infinity. So I was quite impressed with the unending dunes of desert sand that wind up on the long beaches of the Atlantic, where waves subside under an immense blue sky. It was breathtaking. If only I could write like François René de Châteaubriand to do justice to this land where the earth, the sea and the desert meet.

Hon. Marcel Prud'homme: I thank the honourable senator for describing this meeting between representatives of Canada and Morocco. For the record, the official name of the association joining our two countries is the Association Canada-Maroc, or Canada-Morocco Association.

You will no doubt recall that the former Speaker of the Senate, Senator Molgat, organized a series of visits called "Speaker's visits."

• (1550)

I had the honour of being chosen to be part of the delegation to Algeria and Morocco, along with Senators Poulin, De Bané and Bolduc.

When we met with His Majesty, the King indicated a desire to have such an exchange of parliamentarians. There was no such thing. Senator Molgat, just by looking at me, indicated that there would be a Canada-Morocco parliamentary group as soon as we got back.

I will take time for a little aside to announce that I will shortly be giving a long speech on parliamentary associations. I far prefer that term to friendship groups. This makes it possible for senators and MPs to be members of all the associations without necessarily having a particular friendship for one country or another.

So, as I was saying, as soon as we got back, at the request of Senator Molgat again, I got busy looking for the required number of people. If anyone wants to create a political association, there is one thing that must be kept in mind. Before deciding on A, B or C, the framework has to be in place. We need to keep in mind that there are two chambers, the Senate, which must be protected, and the other place. There needs to be regional balance, and this is something whips tend to forget.

It must be remembered that the days of machismo are over. There are almost 100 women parliamentarians between both Houses; there needs to be a good representation of men and women, whenever possible.

Therefore, I invited Bernard Patry to join me as founding co-chair, and I am very pleased to name those from the Senate who are part the board of the Canada-Morocco Association. I did not want to do it, but Senator Beaudoin encouraged me to do so. I thank him for his intervention. I was unable to join the delegation for health reasons, and I am very sorry.

Allow me to introduce the members of the board. The Speaker of the Senate is the honorary co-chair with Peter Andrew Stewart Milliken, while Honourable Senators Finnerty and Cordy are the manager and the vice-president, along with the Honourable Senator Bolduc. The Honourable Senator Comeau agreed to accept the thankless task of treasurer. Honourable senators, we still have not used one cent of all the contributions that the members and senators have made to this association.

In the other place, there is Mr. Bachand, Mr. Bélair, Mr. Lee, Mr. Stoffer of the NPD, Ms. Phinney, Mr. Jaffer, Ms. Lalonde and Ms. Parrish. You can see that there is a balance between regions, men and women, and political parties.

It is this association that I had the honour of creating at the request of the Honourable the Speaker of the Senate, upon his return from his official visit. I did the same thing for Speaker Molgat with the Canada-Russia Parliamentary Association, and

with other ones such as the Canada-Argentina Parliamentary Association and the Canada-Brazil Parliamentary Association.

Speakers make commitments during their trips, but when they come back home, that is here in Parliament, someone must follow up on these commitments. I always offer my services to those who ask me to do something useful.

Some senators who are here were part of that delegation, including Senator Comeau and Senator Cordy. They came back with an extraordinary sense of what we had discovered. Honourable senators, this demonstrates the importance of all these exchanges and meetings among parliamentarians, in our new and complex world.

I will coin a new phrase. I call this the “new parliamentary diplomacy,” as opposed to the diplomacy of heads of state and ministers. The role that parliamentarians can play was clearly shown by the informative speech that Senator Beaudoin just delivered.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, if no other senator wishes to speak, the inquiry is deemed debated.

ADJOURNMENT

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

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

That when the Senate adjourns today, it do stand adjourned until Tuesday, March 18, 2003, at 2 p.m.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

The Senate adjourned until Tuesday, March 18, 2003, at 2 p.m.

THE SENATE OF CANADA
PROGRESS OF LEGISLATION
(2nd Session, 37th Parliament)
Thursday, February 27, 2003

GOVERNMENT BILLS
(SENATE)

No.	Title	1 st	2 nd	Committee	Report	Amend	3 rd	R.A.	Chap.
S-2	An Act to implement an agreement, conventions and protocols concluded between Canada and Kuwait, Mongolia, the United Arab Emirates, Moldova, Norway, Belgium and Italy for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion and to amend the enacted text of three tax treaties.	02/10/02	02/10/23	Banking, Trade and Commerce	02/10/24	0	02/10/30	02/12/12	24/02
S-13	An Act to amend the Statistics Act	03/02/05	03/02/11	Social Affairs, Science and Technology					

GOVERNMENT BILLS
(HOUSE OF COMMONS)

No.	Title	1 st	2 nd	Committee	Report	Amend	3 rd	R.A.	Chap.
C-3	An Act to amend the Canada Pension Plan and the Canada Pension Plan Investment Board Act	03/02/26							
C-4	An Act to amend the Nuclear Safety and Control Act	02/12/10	02/12/12	Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources	03/02/06	0	03/02/12	03/02/13	1/03
C-5	An Act respecting the protection of wildlife species at risk in Canada	02/10/10	02/10/22	Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources	02/12/04	0	02/12/12	02/12/12	29/02
C-8	An Act to protect human health and safety and the environment by regulating products used for the control of pests	02/10/10	02/10/23	Social Affairs, Science and Technology	02/12/10	0	02/12/12	02/12/12	28/02
C-10	An Act to amend the Criminal Code (cruelty to animals and firearms) and the Firearms Act	02/10/10	02/11/20	Legal and Constitutional Affairs	02/11/28	divided			
C-10A	An Act to amend the Criminal Code (firearms) and the Firearms Act	—	—	Legal and Constitutional Affairs	02/11/28	0	02/12/03		
C-10B	An Act to amend the Criminal Code (cruelty to animals)	—	—	Legal and Constitutional Affairs					
C-11	An Act to amend the Copyright Act	02/10/10	02/10/30	Social Affairs, Science and Technology	02/12/05	0	02/12/09	02/12/12	26/02

No.	Title	1 st	2 nd	Committee	Report	Amend	3 rd	R.A.	Chap.
C-12	An Act to promote physical activity and sport	02/10/10	02/10/23	Social Affairs, Science and Technology	02/11/21	0 + 1 at 3 rd 02/12/04 2 at 3 rd 03/02/04	03/02/04		
C-14	An Act providing for controls on the export, import or transit across Canada of rough diamonds and for a certification scheme for their export in order to meet Canada's obligations under the Kimberley Process	02/11/19	02/11/26	Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources	02/12/04	0	02/12/05	02/12/12	25/02
C-21	An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of Canada for the financial year ending March 31, 2003	02/12/05	02/12/10	—	—	—	02/12/11	02/12/12	27/02

COMMONS PUBLIC BILLS

No.	Title	1 st	2 nd	Committee	Report	Amend	3 rd	R.A.	Chap.
C-227	An Act respecting a national day of remembrance of the Battle of Vimy Ridge	03/02/25							
C-300	An Act to change the names of certain electoral districts	02/11/19							

SENATE PUBLIC BILLS

No.	Title	1 st	2 nd	Committee	Report	Amend	3 rd	R.A.	Chap.
S-3	An Act to amend the National Anthem Act to include all Canadians (Sen. Poy)	02/10/02							
S-4	An Act to provide for increased transparency and objectivity in the selection of suitable individuals to be named to certain high public positions (Sen. Stratton)	02/10/02							
S-5	An Act respecting a National Acadian Day (Sen. Comeau)	02/10/02	02/10/08	Legal and Constitutional Affairs					
S-6	An Act to assist in the prevention of wrongdoing in the Public Service by establishing a framework for education on ethical practices in the workplace, for dealing with allegations of wrongdoing and for protecting whistleblowers (Sen. Kinsella)	02/10/03							
S-7	An Act to protect heritage lighthouses (Sen. Forrestall)	02/10/08	03/02/25	Social Affairs, Science and Technology					
S-8	An Act to amend the Broadcasting Act (Sen. Kinsella)	02/10/09	02/10/24	Transport and Communications					
S-9	An Act to honour Louis Riel and the Metis People (Sen. Chalifoux)	02/10/23							
S-10	An Act concerning personal watercraft in navigable waters (Sen. Spivak)	02/10/31	03/02/25	Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources					

No.	Title	1 st	2 nd	Committee	Report	Amend	3 rd	R.A.	Chap.
S-11	An Act to amend the Official Languages Act (promotion of English and French) (Sen. Gauthier)	02/12/10							
S-12	An Act to repeal legislation that has not been brought into force within ten years of receiving royal assent (Sen. Banks)	02/12/11	03/02/27	Legal and Constitutional Affairs					
S-14	An Act to amend the National Anthem Act to reflect the linguistic duality of Canada (Sen. Kinsella)	03/02/11							
S-15	An Act to remove certain doubts regarding the meaning of marriage (Sen. Cools)	03/02/13							

PRIVATE BILLS

No.	Title	1st	2nd	Committee	Report	Amend	3rd	R.A.	Chap.

CONTENTS

Thursday, February 27, 2003

	PAGE		PAGE
SENATORS' STATEMENTS		Possible War with Iraq—Plan to Bridge Differences Among Members of Security Council—Request to Append to <i>Debates of the Senate</i>.	
Black History Month		Hon. Marcel Prud'homme	910
Hon. Edward M. Lawson	905	Hon. Sharon Carstairs	910
Newfoundland and Labrador		Foreign Affairs	
Flood in Badger.		Possible War with Iraq—Request for Briefing Before Committee.	
Hon. Ethel Cochrane	905	Hon. Marcel Prud'homme	910
Heart Month		Hon. Sharon Carstairs	911
Hon. Wilbert J. Keon	906	Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration	
Canada-United States Relations		Fiscal 2003-04—Policy for Travelling Committees.	
Hon. Gerry St. Germain	906	Hon. Mira Spivak	911
Toronto Police Service		Hon. Lise Bacon	911
Hon. Consiglio Di Nino	906	Indian Affairs and Northern Development	
<hr/>		Legislation on Native Women and Property Rights.	
ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS		Hon. Terry Stratton	911
The Opening of the Parliament of Canada		Hon. Sharon Carstairs	911
Document Tabled.		Foreign Affairs	
The Hon. the Speaker.	907	The Commonwealth—Efforts to Accept Return of Zimbabwe.	
Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources		Hon. A. Raynell Andreychuk	911
Committee Authorized to Refer Documents from Transport and Communications Committee Study on Bill S-26 in Previous Session to Study on Bill S-10.		Hon. Sharon Carstairs	911
Hon. Tommy Banks	907	Delayed Answer to Oral Question	
Hon. Anne C. Cools.	907	Hon. Fernand Robichaud	
National Finance		911	
Notice of Motion to Authorize Committee to Engage Services.		Official Languages	
Hon. Lowell Murray	908	Northwest Territories Act.	
Official Languages		Question by Senator Gauthier.	
Commitments of Federal Departments to Guarantee Accountability—Notice of Inquiry.		Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Delayed Answer).	
Hon. Jean-Robert Gauthier.	908	912	
<hr/>		Point of Order	
QUESTION PERIOD		Hon. Douglas Roche	
National Defence		Hon. Sharon Carstairs	
HMCS <i>Iroquois</i> —Crash of Sea King Helicopter.		912	
Hon. Terry Stratton	908	<hr/>	
Hon. Sharon Carstairs	908	ORDERS OF THE DAY	
Replacement of Sea King Helicopters—Timing of Procurement Project.		The Estimates 2003-04	
Hon. Terry Stratton	908	National Finance Committee Authorized to Study Main Estimates.	
Hon. Sharon Carstairs	908	Hon. Fernand Robichaud	
The Environment		913	
Budget Allocation for Implementation of Kyoto Protocol—Statement by Minister.		The Estimates 2002-03	
Hon. Gerald J. Comeau	909	National Finance Committee Authorized to Study Supplementary Estimates (B).	
Hon. Sharon Carstairs	909	Hon. Fernand Robichaud	
United Nations		913	
Possible War with Iraq—Plan to Bridge Differences Among Members of Security Council.		The Estimates 2003-04	
Hon. Douglas Roche	909	Vote 25 Referred to Official Languages Committee.	
Hon. Sharon Carstairs	909	Hon. Fernand Robichaud	
		Hon. Marcel Prud'homme	
		913	
		Vote 10 Referred to Standing Joint Committee on Library of Parliament.	
		Hon. Fernand Robichaud	
		914	
		National Anthem Act (Bill S-14)	
		Bill to Amend—Second Reading—Debate Continued.	
		Hon. Tommy Banks	
		914	
		Hon. Eymard G. Corbin	
		914	
		Statutes Repeal Bill (Bill S-12)	
		Second Reading.	
		Hon. Noël A. Kinsella	
		915	
		Hon. Tommy Banks	
		915	
		Hon. Eymard G. Corbin	
		916	
		Referred to Committee	
		916	

	PAGE
National Anthem Act (Bill S-3)	
Bill to Amend—Second Reading—Order Stands.	
Hon. Terry Stratton	916
Vimy Ridge Day Bill (Bill C-277)	
Second Reading—Debate Adjourned.	
Hon. Marie-P. Poulin	916
Hon. Marcel Prud'homme	918
Hon. Jean-Robert Gauthier	919
Hon. Fernand Robichaud	919
Legacy of Waste During Chrétien-Martin Years	
Inquiry—Debate Continued.	
Hon. Gerald J. Comeau	919
United Nations	
Possible War with Iraq—Plan to Bridge Differences Among Members of Security Council—Document Tabled.	
Hon. Sharon Carstairs	921

	PAGE
Transport and Communications	
Motion to Authorize Committee to Study Media Industries— Order Stands.	
Hon. Terry Stratton	921
Agriculture and Forestry	
Findings in Report Entitled “Canadian Farmers at Risk”— Inquiry—Debate Continued.	
Hon. Terry Stratton	921
Hon. Fernand Robichaud	921
Hon. Noël A. Kinsella	921
Parliamentary Delegation to Kingdom of Morocco	
Inquiry.	
Hon. Gérard-A. Beaudoin	921
Hon. Marcel Prud'homme	922
Adjournment	
Hon. Fernand Robichaud	923
Progress of Legislation	i



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