

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.
Motion agreed to.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

THE ESTIMATES, 1990-91—PRIVY COUNCIL VOTE 20 REFERRED TO JOINT COMMITTEE

Hon. C. William Doody (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, with leave of the Senate and notwithstanding rule 45(1)(e), I move:

That the Standing Joint Committee on Official Languages be authorized to examine the expenditures set out in Privy Council Vote 20 of the Estimates for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1991; and

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

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.
Motion agreed to.

THE ESTIMATES, 1989-90

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (C) REFERRED TO NATIONAL FINANCE COMMITTEE

Hon. C. William Doody (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, with leave of the Senate and notwithstanding rule 45(1)(e), I move:

That the Standing Senate Committee on National Finance be authorized to examine and report upon the expenditures set out in the Supplementary Estimates (C) for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1990 (Sessional Paper No. 342-526).

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.
Motion agreed to.

QUESTION PERIOD

THE CONSTITUTION

MEECH LAKE ACCORD—RESCISSION BY GOVERNMENT OF NEWFOUNDLAND—POSITION OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, may I ask the Leader of the Government whether he can make any comments today about the plans of the government with respect to Meech Lake in light of recent developments? Premier Wells has given notice that he may

[Senator Doody.]

rescind the Newfoundland adherence to the Meech Lake Accord, following which Premier Peterson has suggested that Meech Lake is not dead but requires some oxygen, and he calls upon the Government of Canada to provide that oxygen. I wonder what the Government of Canada has in mind at this stage, whether it is to stand pat waiting for developments or to take some lead itself.

● (1450)

Hon. Lowell Murray (Leader of the Government and Minister of State for Federal-Provincial Relations): Honourable senators, I think it is fair to note that while the Newfoundland government, in the Speech from the Throne, gave notice of its intention to rescind the Meech Lake Resolution that had been passed by a previous House of Assembly in that province, Premier Wells has put no date on that action and has not indicated when he would bring this measure forward or expect to have it voted on.

I think it is fair to say that Premier Wells agrees with the statement we have made to the effect that his commitment in November last was not to rescind so long as discussions were ongoing. He himself is engaged in contacts with other governments, and, therefore, I would not expect that he would be moving quickly or immediately to rescind the Meech Lake Resolution.

So far as Premier Peterson's statement is concerned, yes, Meech Lake is not dead and, yes, it does need oxygen. What is the federal government doing? We are party to many of the discussions that are taking place among governments and we are kept informed on other discussions that are taking place. Beyond that I do not think it would be helpful for me to go for the moment.

MEECH LAKE ACCORD—NEED FOR FIRST MINISTERS' CONFERENCE—REPORTED STATEMENT OF FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS MINISTER—REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, I wonder whether the Leader of the Government would clarify for us the recommendation which he is reported in the press to have made to the Prime Minister, namely, that it would not be useful to have a first ministers' conference on Meech Lake. Is it the case that that is the view of the minister, and, if so, what is the reasoning for that particular position?

Hon. Lowell Murray (Leader of the Government and Minister of State for Federal-Provincial Relations): Honourable senators, it is the prerogative of the Prime Minister, of course, to convene a first ministers' conference whenever he wishes. At a similar stage in the process which led to the Meech Lake Accord I was in a position to advise him that the conditions seemed to me to lend themselves to the holding of a successful first ministers' conference.

Having toured the country and met all of the premiers, and having engaged in other discussions with ministers and officials, I am not in a position to advise him that the calling of a

first ministers' conference at this time would be justified. That is why further discussions are taking place now among governments at both the political and the official level. As I have said, I do not believe that the first ministers are ready to be brought together. When they are ready, I have no doubt that the Prime Minister will convene such a conference.

MEECH LAKE ACCORD—RELATION TO SENATE REFORM—
GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Leader of the Opposition): Just one other point, honourable senators. I notice that the Deputy Prime Minister, Mr. Mazankowski, said on the weekend that it would be helpful if Premier Bourassa were a bit more flexible on the question of Senate reform; likewise Premier Peterson, but particularly Premier Bourassa. Would I be justified in believing that the Deputy Prime Minister is expressing the view of the government on this point and that some invitation is going forward from the Prime Minister and the government to the Premier of Quebec to indicate some flexibility on the Meech Lake Accord, particularly with respect to Senate reform?

Hon. Lowell Murray (Leader of the Government and Minister of State for Federal-Provincial Relations): Honourable senators, there was a discussion of Senate reform as an issue at the time that the first ministers met here last November, but the situation was canvassed without success. There is no reason to believe that the question of Senate reform would hold the key to the ratification of Meech Lake. The situation is far more complex than that, as the honourable senator knows. There are many issues related directly to Meech Lake which have been discussed by those provinces that have not yet ratified or, in the case of Newfoundland, that wish to rescind.

MEECH LAKE ACCORD—STATUS OF NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN
FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS—ABSENCE OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Hon. H.A. Olson: Honourable senators, I have a supplementary question. The Leader of the Government and minister responsible for federal-provincial relations, including Meech Lake and all that, is reported to have said—in fact, I saw him on television saying it—that negotiations were ongoing.

Hon. Lowell Murray (Leader of the Government and Minister of State for Federal-Provincial Relations): Discussions!

Senator Olson: Whatever you want to call them. When that was put to Premier Wells he was surprised, and he said that, if there were any ongoing discussions or negotiations of any substance, he had not been called to any of them. I would like to know what the problem is. Are you having discussions and negotiations with some provinces and leaving Newfoundland out? If so, why?

Senator Murray: Honourable senators, the discussions we have taken part in, at either the political or the official level, have been bilateral with various provinces, and I am aware that there have also been discussions among provinces in which the federal government has not taken part. I had a very brief

conversation with Premier Wells on Sunday night, in the course of which he spoke to me of contacts that he had made with other provinces and of contacts he hoped to make in the future. I, of course, encouraged him to continue.

Senator Olson: Perhaps I could ask the Leader of the Government if he could tell us what these discussions or negotiations are which he said are ongoing and about which Premier Wells was not informed. What were you talking about when you said there were ongoing negotiations and to which Premier Wells was not invited to attend or to send a representative?

Senator Murray: The honourable senator persists in using the term "negotiations". I have never referred to negotiations. I have spoken of discussions that are taking place and I could not, without breaching the confidentiality that the honourable senator understands, divulge at this time, and in this place, the nature of the discussions—all of them informal and without commitment on either side—that have taken place between the federal government and different provinces, or that have been reported to me by different provinces.

THE SENATE

ALBERTA VACANCY—PRIME MINISTER'S RESPONSE TO PREMIER
OF ALBERTA

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn: Honourable senators, on the subject of the Senate, I should like to pursue one of my regular questions with the Leader of the Government in the Senate concerning the status of the candidacy of Stan Waters to fill the Alberta vacancy in this place. We understand that Premier Getty has now received a response from the Prime Minister to letters that he has written seeking, I suppose, a clear idea of what the Prime Minister proposed to do with Mr. Waters and the vacancy in Alberta.

Could the government leader indicate to us whether the Prime Minister was able to give the Premier of Alberta any concrete information on the future of Mr. Waters and that vacancy?

● (1500)

Hon. Lowell Murray (Leader of the Government and Minister of State for Federal-Provincial Relations): Honourable senators, I have reason to believe that a copy of that letter will be made available to honourable senators and to the public very soon.

Senator Olson: Does it say that he will make the appointment after June 23?

THE CONSTITUTION

MEECH LAKE ACCORD—RELATION TO SENATE REFORM—
POSITION OF PREMIERS OF ONTARIO AND QUEBEC

Hon. Dan Hays: Honourable senators, I should like to ask a supplementary question to this line of questioning. My question is more closely related to Senator MacEachen's last question.

first ministers' conference at this time would be justified. That is why further discussions are taking place now among governments at both the political and the official level. As I have said, I do not believe that the first ministers are ready to be brought together. When they are ready, I have no doubt that the Prime Minister will convene such a conference.

MEECH LAKE ACCORD—RELATION TO SENATE REFORM—
GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Leader of the Opposition): Just one other point, honourable senators. I notice that the Deputy Prime Minister, Mr. Mazankowski, said on the weekend that it would be helpful if Premier Bourassa were a bit more flexible on the question of Senate reform; likewise Premier Peterson, but particularly Premier Bourassa. Would I be justified in believing that the Deputy Prime Minister is expressing the view of the government on this point and that some invitation is going forward from the Prime Minister and the government to the Premier of Quebec to indicate some flexibility on the Meech Lake Accord, particularly with respect to Senate reform?

Hon. Lowell Murray (Leader of the Government and Minister of State for Federal-Provincial Relations): Honourable senators, there was a discussion of Senate reform as an issue at the time that the first ministers met here last November, but the situation was canvassed without success. There is no reason to believe that the question of Senate reform would hold the key to the ratification of Meech Lake. The situation is far more complex than that, as the honourable senator knows. There are many issues related directly to Meech Lake which have been discussed by those provinces that have not yet ratified or, in the case of Newfoundland, that wish to rescind.

MEECH LAKE ACCORD—STATUS OF NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN
FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS—ABSENCE OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Hon. H.A. Olson: Honourable senators, I have a supplementary question. The Leader of the Government and minister responsible for federal-provincial relations, including Meech Lake and all that, is reported to have said—in fact, I saw him on television saying it—that negotiations were ongoing.

Hon. Lowell Murray (Leader of the Government and Minister of State for Federal-Provincial Relations): Discussions!

Senator Olson: Whatever you want to call them. When that was put to Premier Wells he was surprised, and he said that, if there were any ongoing discussions or negotiations of any substance, he had not been called to any of them. I would like to know what the problem is. Are you having discussions and negotiations with some provinces and leaving Newfoundland out? If so, why?

Senator Murray: Honourable senators, the discussions we have taken part in, at either the political or the official level, have been bilateral with various provinces, and I am aware that there have also been discussions among provinces in which the federal government has not taken part. I had a very brief

conversation with Premier Wells on Sunday night, in the course of which he spoke to me of contacts that he had made with other provinces and of contacts he hoped to make in the future. I, of course, encouraged him to continue.

Senator Olson: Perhaps I could ask the Leader of the Government if he could tell us what these discussions or negotiations are which he said are ongoing and about which Premier Wells was not informed. What were you talking about when you said there were ongoing negotiations and to which Premier Wells was not invited to attend or to send a representative?

Senator Murray: The honourable senator persists in using the term "negotiations". I have never referred to negotiations. I have spoken of discussions that are taking place and I could not, without breaching the confidentiality that the honourable senator understands, divulge at this time, and in this place, the nature of the discussions—all of them informal and without commitment on either side—that have taken place between the federal government and different provinces, or that have been reported to me by different provinces.

THE SENATE

ALBERTA VACANCY—PRIME MINISTER'S RESPONSE TO PREMIER
OF ALBERTA

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn: Honourable senators, on the subject of the Senate, I should like to pursue one of my regular questions with the Leader of the Government in the Senate concerning the status of the candidacy of Stan Waters to fill the Alberta vacancy in this place. We understand that Premier Getty has now received a response from the Prime Minister to letters that he has written seeking, I suppose, a clear idea of what the Prime Minister proposed to do with Mr. Waters and the vacancy in Alberta.

Could the government leader indicate to us whether the Prime Minister was able to give the Premier of Alberta any concrete information on the future of Mr. Waters and that vacancy?

● (1500)

Hon. Lowell Murray (Leader of the Government and Minister of State for Federal-Provincial Relations): Honourable senators, I have reason to believe that a copy of that letter will be made available to honourable senators and to the public very soon.

Senator Olson: Does it say that he will make the appointment after June 23?

THE CONSTITUTION

MEECH LAKE ACCORD—RELATION TO SENATE REFORM—
POSITION OF PREMIERS OF ONTARIO AND QUEBEC

Hon. Dan Hays: Honourable senators, I should like to ask a supplementary question to this line of questioning. My question is more closely related to Senator MacEachen's last question.

I ask the Leader of the Government in the Senate to comment on a quote attributed to the Deputy Prime Minister, Mr. Mazankowski, found in one of today's newspapers. It states:

If there was something that could be coming, I think, from both Mr. Bourassa and Mr. Peterson, to the extent that there was a real willingness on their part to move on Senate reform, it would seem to me that it would draw more western Canadians and Atlantic Canadians on side.

My question is: Could the leader explain what was in the Deputy Prime Minister's mind that left him with the impression that there is no real willingness on the part of Premier Peterson and Premier Bourassa to "move on Senate reform"?

Hon. Lowell Murray (Leader of the Government and Minister of State for Federal-Provincial Relations): Honourable senators, my colleague is drawing an inference from Mr. Mazankowski's statement that he did not intend and that is not there. As a matter of fact, both Premier Bourassa and Premier Peterson have indicated considerable interest in Senate reform and in pursuing the issue at the top of the Round 2 agenda. That was the agreement among all the provincial premiers in August of 1986 at Edmonton. That was confirmed at Meech Lake and was most recently referred to again in the communiqué the first ministers issued after their conference last November.

Since that time Premier Peterson's government has taken the initiative by appointing a committee of the Ontario legislature to begin a study on Senate reform so that Ontario will be ready with a position when the First Ministers' Conference on Senate Reform is held in western Canada in November of this year.

Senator Hays: Can the leader report any similar progress with respect to the province of Quebec? Mr. Mazankowski is quoted—and I agree with him entirely—in the same article as follows:

Clearly Senate reform is the dominant issue on the minds of western Canadians.

As an Albertan, I share that with him, and it is a matter which has us in turmoil in Alberta, at least.

I would add from memory a quotation from an article found in a newspaper several months ago, and hopefully the leader can report some progress since then. It was to the effect that the Prime Minister of Quebec "was anxious that there be no elected representatives from Quebec in addition to MPs and MNAs."

When I read that I followed it up and called the Premier of Quebec's office and he did confirm that he did not say that, but his office would say nothing about the Government of Quebec's position. I am wondering if there is anything the leader can report emanating from Quebec along the same lines as Ontario.

Senator Murray: Honourable senators, Quebec has not appointed a legislative committee, for example. During his tour of western Canada Mr. Rémillard was very forthright in

[Senator Hays.]

his declarations of support for, and interest in, a reformed Senate.

My honourable friend will understand that Quebec is not prepared to enter into substantive negotiations on Senate reform, or indeed on any other constitutional matter, until the Meech Lake Accord has been proclaimed. That has been Quebec's understanding and that was the agreement the first ministers reached in August 1986.

ETHIOPIA

STARVATION IN NORTHERN PROVINCES—GOVERNMENT AID

Hon. Lorna Marsden: Honourable senators, I am sure we were all glad to see that the Canadian government gave aid last week to those people who are suffering from famine in Tigré province. At the same time it is profoundly depressing to see Canada raising the sovereignty issue instead of helping to open up the possibility of an airlift to the people of Tigré province. This is an old and repellant diplomatic nicety that has led many people to death and suffering in the past.

Will the Leader of the Government in the Senate tell us whether or not the government plans to take the initiative and airlift foodstuff to the starving people of that province? If not, what alternative is the government proposing to relieve their suffering?

Hon. Lowell Murray (Leader of the Government and Minister of State for Federal-Provincial Relations): Honourable senators, I expect there will be some further statement from my colleague, Mr. Clark, on this matter within the next little while.

CAPE BRETON DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

POINT ACONI POWER PLANT PROJECT—POSITION OF GOVERNMENT

Hon. Robert Muir: Honourable senators, my question is for the Leader of the Government in the Senate. However, before posing the question, may I express my thanks and those of many other people on Cape Breton Island for the leader obtaining proper funding in the Estimates to proceed, through the Cape Breton Development Corporation, with the Langan Mine. Whoever does the newspaper clipping for the leader may have passed on an article quoting union representatives, business people and management people in this regard. I also want to thank the leader for the cooperation he gave me and the United Mine Workers' Union respecting certain negotiations. He works behind the scenes, and I presume that is what the leader is doing respecting the Meech Lake Accord.

In any event, my question deals with an issue that was raised in the other place yesterday. The leader is aware that the Nova Scotia government will proceed with a coal-fired electrical power plant at Point Aconi on Cape Breton Island, which will provide employment and great benefits in the future for the people of that area and all of Cape Breton. A member of the socialist party, speaking in the other place yesterday, raised great objections to that plant going ahead. I am referring to

and for the miners who earn their livelihood in that occupation.

NATIONAL FINANCE

SELLING OF GOLD TO REDUCE DEFICIT

Hon. Sidney L. Buckwold: Honourable senators, I have a question for the Leader of the Government in the Senate, and I might add in advance that I do not know whether or not he will be able to answer it. One of the unusual features of federal government finance is that it operates on a cash basis and any disposal of assets is immediately considered as revenue for that given year. I must admit that I was rather astonished by a recent article in a well known newspaper in which the figures were given for the federal government's selling of gold during the last few years. The chart has the heading "Gold Windfall". It indicates that \$13.9 million worth of gold was sold in 1984 and \$12.1 million was sold in 1985. They do not relate it to sales; they say "profits", so I assume it is after the cost or whatever it was. The article says "profits". In 1986 the government found that it had a rather good thing going and \$196 million worth of gold was sold. In 1987 \$641 million was sold.

An Hon. Senator: Wow!

Senator Buckwold: In 1988 the profit was \$647 million, and in 1989 there was not quite as much sold; only \$444 million. In the last three years nearly \$2 billion of gold has been sold, the receipts from which have reduced our deficit by that amount.

My question to the minister is not one of criticism, because this is certainly within the orbit of the government, but I would like to know—and perhaps he could provide me with the information—on what basis is gold sold? Who makes the decision? Who determines what price should be paid? Is someone playing the gold market and waiting until it goes up or down or is it done under the pressure of the budget?

In addition to that, I would ask the Leader of the Government to report to this chamber the amount of other receipts during the last four years—1986 through to 1989—from the sale of assets which are not repeatable, such as the sale of Air Canada and other crown corporations; receipts which come into the current year's revenue of the government.

I am trying to find out, Senator Murray, how much of the government deficit was reduced in these years by the fact that there are one-shot revenue deals being used to reduce the deficit and minimize the problems that it creates. In addition, there is a wide variety of other ways in which the government could speed up the process of getting money: they could ask us to pay income tax faster; they could cut down on the remittance periods and could raise the interest rates. However, that can only be done once, and then next year we have to find another way of getting that revenue. I hope that information might be made available to us so that we can analyze the impact on the deficit of these revenue-producing activities, which most Canadians do not appreciate, especially the sale of gold, which I must admit comes as a surprise to me.

[Senator Murray.]

● (1520)

Hon. Lowell Murray (Leader of the Government and Minister of State for Federal-Provincial Relations): Honourable senators, I appreciate the admiration that the honourable senator has expressed for the ingenuity of the people in the Department of Finance. I am not in a position to give him a report in the detail that he seeks, but I shall ask my colleague, Mr. Wilson, to do so at an early date.

[Translation]

THE CONSTITUTION

MEECH LAKE ACCORD—ATTITUDE OF PRIME MINISTER AND PREMIER OF QUEBEC

Hon. L. Norbert Thériault: Honourable senators, I have a question for the Leader of the Government in the Senate, supplementary to other questions on Meech Lake by my colleagues.

I must say that unlike most of my colleagues in the Senate, I am worried about this country, as a francophone outside Quebec, and I want to congratulate the Leader of the Senate on the conciliatory tone he has maintained throughout this debate, and even more so today.

I want to ask him whether this conciliatory tone reflects a new approach by the Prime Minister of Canada and Premier of Quebec, who have finally realized that threats are no way to establish a constitutional consensus in this country. Could he give me the assurance that the federal government and its negotiators will maintain this approach until June 23?

Hon. Lowell Murray (Leader of the Government in the Senate and Minister of State (Federal-Provincial Relations)): Honourable senators, first of all, Senator Thériault referred to francophones outside Quebec. I may remind him that the *Fédération des francophones hors-Québec* is in favour of ratifying Meech Lake without any changes.

Second, I will simply add that our attitude has always been constructive. We are all looking for a way to resolve the deadlock. That being said, we cannot ignore what the consequences of failure would be.

Senator Thériault: Honourable senators, the Leader of the Government in the Senate must know I am aware of the position of francophones outside Québec and francophones in my own province. I do not totally disagree nor do I totally agree with their positions. It is my conviction that Canada has survived since Confederation for more than 120 years, thanks to a consensus that was reached every time after long, amicable discussions.

No one has a monopoly on the right or wrong solution, whatever the problem may be. I may remind the Leader of the Government in the Senate that according to the editorials his leader is so fond of quoting, many Canadians believe that so far, the rhetoric used by the Prime Minister of Canada and the Premier of Quebec and his principal spokesman, Mr. Rémi-lard, have done little or nothing to promote such a consensus.

I hope they have now learned their lesson and that the attitude taken this afternoon by the Leader of the Government in the Senate points to a new strategy.

[English]

REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

Hon. Jerahmiel S. Grafstein: Last Sunday was an historic moment in history when the Lithuanian Parliament, the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Republic, passed a declaration proclaiming:

... the restoration of the exercise of sovereign powers of the Lithuanian state, which were annulled by an alien power in 1940. From now on, Lithuania is once again an independent state.

I believe that all members of this house were gratified by the acts taken by members in the other House yesterday in a unanimous resolution that recognized Lithuania as a fully independent and sovereign republic.

Again, I should like to commend the government for the speedy response by the Right Honourable Mr. Clark, who, in response to a question by Mr. Flis in the other place, advised:

The position of the Government of Canada, as he has correctly said—

referring to Mr. Flis' question—

has been to recognize the political sovereignty of Lithuania.

Further on in the *Debates* yesterday Mr. Clark, in response to a further question by Mr. Flis, responded:

I think all members of the House would agree that we should encourage the Soviet Union and Lithuania to move as speedily as possible toward a situation which recognizes the *de facto* and *de jure* sovereignty and independence of Lithuania.

At the same time the minister mentioned that he had received an undertaking from Mr. Shevardnadze that there would be "no crackdown."

Again, in the international press today we are gratified that Mr. Ligachev and General Gromov, who is the commander in charge of the Kiev military, have confirmed that tanks do not help in this sort of situation, that they should not use force, and that this matter should be settled by political means.

My question, therefore, for the Leader of the Government in the Senate is: What concrete steps does the government intend to take in order to facilitate full *de jure* and *de facto* recognition of the Lithuanian independent republic, having in my mind that Mr. Gorbachev and others in the Supreme Soviet in the U.S.S.R. have indicated that they do not intend to negotiate with the Lithuanian people?

Hon. Lowell Murray (Leader of the Government and Minister of State for Federal-Provincial Relations): Honourable senators, I have read the statements that my friend has attributed to Mr. Clark and others on this subject. I have noted in particular that Mr. Clark indicates that the *de facto*

exercise of sovereignty may soon be a matter to which Canada can make some tangible contributions.

I would have to ask Mr. Clark whether he is ready to elaborate on that statement for the benefit of my honourable friend and others, and I shall do so in the next day or so.

Senator Grafstein: Perhaps, when the Leader of the Government is discussing this matter with the minister, he might refer to historic events where speed was of the essence. It is a very important position that the Lithuanian Parliament has taken, and concrete steps in this interim situation are very important. Any concrete steps taken by the free world certainly can facilitate a speedy and peaceful recognition of the independent Republic of Lithuania.

Senator Murray: I appreciate the point that Senator Grafstein has made. I will draw it to Mr. Clark's attention when I ask him for a full report on this matter.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN IN CANADIAN SOCIETY

EFFECT OF FEDERAL BUDGET CUTS—POSITION OF GOVERNMENT

Hon. Lorna Marsden: Like most Canadians and, I am sure, everyone in this chamber, I am concerned about the violence and discrimination against women in this country. However, the end of funding to various publications on health research studies serving women in Canada and the cuts to women's centres, especially perhaps in the more isolated areas of Canada, seem both gratuitous and counterproductive. The new minister responsible for the status of women, a woman I personally like and admire, says we must look to the provinces for funding, and that is fair because the provinces have jurisdiction. However, when women look to the provinces they see that their budgets have also been significantly diminished by this same federal government through cuts to transfer payments to provinces in a variety of forms. So the provinces are more pressed for money than ever before.

Meanwhile those facilities for women are needed more every day. Women in Canada are still the victims of beatings and violence by their husbands. Rape continues to occur at the rate of several cases a day. Women, as illustrated by the recent case in Calgary, are humiliated by their attackers and by members of the general public; children are sexually abused and battered, as the Social Affairs, Science and Technology Committee heard in testimony last week; students have been shot or, as happened this week, threatened by men with guns on campus; and women, even in the federal jurisdiction—in fact, even women working in the Senate—earn about two-thirds the wages of men.

● (1530)

I should like to ask the Leader of the Government in the Senate how the government justifies these particular cuts in the budget. Can he deny that the government has singled out the women of Canada for particular abuse?

Hon. Lowell Murray (Leader of the Government and Minister of State for Federal-Provincial Relations): Honourable senators, the answer to the first part of the senator's question is yes. As to the last part of the question, any objective examination of the facts will show that that is incorrect. I speak not only of our budgetary policy but also of the general policy of the government with regard to the status of women. I will bear the honourable senator's question in mind for the debate which her leader, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, is launching on Mr. Wilson's budget.

AGRICULTURE

WESTERN CANADA—DROUGHT RELIEF PROGRAM— GOVERNMENT POLICY

Hon. H.A. Olson: Honourable senators, I want to ask the Leader of the Government about an announcement with respect to agriculture, because it has been several weeks since we met.

On one or two occasions—and maybe more than that—the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Mazankowski, has said that if it is demonstrated that there is a need for a program for the drought areas of western Canada, particularly Saskatchewan and parts of Alberta, it will be forthcoming.

It is now March 13. Many of these people who have been devastated by six years of drought in succession are trying to make some plans to get their crops seeded this spring. Could the Leader of the Government advise us when this announcement will be made?

What is particularly disturbing today is that since we last met I have received a form letter signed by the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Mazankowski, the Minister of State for Agriculture and the Minister of State for Grains and Oilseeds. This letter does not say anything about the government having developed a plan. In fact, it discusses, for example, ways in which we can fully explore our options as we develop agricultural policy for the 1990s. It then talks about a meeting in Moncton in August, which is apparently where the ministers intend to have a meeting.

There is one encouraging note in this letter. It states that the timetable does not prevent us from forming agreements and implementing changes on specific issues along the way. It also states that the government has set up a committee as a safety net for grain and oilseed producers and will set up another committee to consider matters of financing, managing the family farm business, and so on.

I would appeal to the minister to carry this message to his colleague, the Minister of Agriculture: If he is serious about doing something in time to be of assistance to farmers, he should bear in mind that it is already March 13. In one month, or six weeks from now at the most, farmers in that drought-ridden area will be out on the land and will have to make commitments to buy fuel, fertilizer and all the other farm inputs. We are running out of time. Could we have an answer as to when a program will be announced?

[Senator Marsden.]

I also realize that the Premier of Saskatchewan has been in Ottawa in the last few days and that he made some representations with respect to this matter. However, when he returned to Saskatchewan he did not tell us whether or not he had received any program. He just said that there was no commitment. It is time for a commitment if we are to do anything for these people in 1990.

Hon. Lowell Murray (Leader of the Government and Minister of State for Federal-Provincial Relations): Honourable senators, I shall convey the representations of the honourable senator to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Agriculture. In the meantime I can tell him that the matters to which he refers are still under consideration.

Senator Olson: Would the Leader of the Government like to venture a guess as to whether or not there will be an announcement in time to assist in the cost inputs for seeding a crop in 1990?

Senator Murray: Honourable senators, I shall refer that question to my colleague as well.

THE CONSTITUTION

MEECH LAKE ACCORD—"DISTINCT SOCIETY CLAUSE"

Hon. Dougals D. Everett: Honourable senators, I have a question for the Leader of the Government in the Senate.

In a recent speech Mr. Chrétien stated that the original position of the Quebec Liberal Party and that of Mr. Rémillard was that the distinctiveness of Quebec's society should be recognized in the preamble to the Constitution.

Can the Leader of the Government tell us if that demand was made by Quebec in that way, or was the demand such that the recognition of distinctiveness was to be included in the body of the Constitution?

Hon. Lowell Murray (Leader of the Government and Minister of State for Federal-Provincial Relations): Honourable senators, that statement is not quite accurate with regard to Quebec's position or the position that Mr. Rémillard took on behalf of Quebec.

In any case, the point was made at the time, and an effort was made in 1982 to construct a preamble which would recognize the distinctiveness of Quebec society, linguistic duality in Canada, multiculturalism, aboriginal rights, and various features that go to make up the Canadian identity.

For whatever reason, the effort to draft a preamble failed. In the event, two important features of Canadian society were placed in the Constitution or the Charter. One was the recognition of our multicultural heritage and the other was aboriginal rights. So that when the time came to discuss Quebec's five conditions no preamble was on the table. The decision was made that the recognition of linguistic duality and the distinct society should be put in an interpretative clause in the body of the Constitution.

claiming Lithuania a sovereign power and an independent state;

That the Senate recognize the right of the Lithuanian government and democratically elected Supreme Council to declare the independence of Lithuania; and that the Senate express its wish that Lithuania will achieve full freedom and complete sovereignty;

That the Senate also urge the Government of Canada to support the will of the Lithuanian nation and the Supreme Council toward that goal; and

That the Honourable the Speaker send the text of this motion to the Chairman of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN IN CANADIAN SOCIETY

ORDER STANDS

On the Order:

Resuming the debate on the inquiry of the Honourable Senator Frith calling the attention of the Senate to the issue of violence against women in Canadian Society.—*(Honourable Senator Doody)*.

Hon. C. William Doody (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, with regard to the fourth order, I

do not intend to speak on that today and I may not be ready to do so for a while. If any other senator wishes to intervene at any time, please feel free to do so.

Order stands.

MEECH LAKE CONSTITUTIONAL ACCORD AND CANADIAN CHARTER OF RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS

DEBATE ADJOURNED

On the Order:

Resuming the debate on the inquiry of the Honourable Senator Beaudoin calling the attention of the Senate to the Meech Lake Constitutional Accord and to the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*.—*(Honourable Senator Corbin)*.

Hon. William J. Petten: Honourable senators, Senator Corbin has asked me to state that if any other senator wishes to take part in the debate at this time, it is fine with him, as he will resume it later.

I understand that Senator Everett would like to speak on this order tomorrow. If he agrees and the Senate agrees, I will adjourn this matter in the name of Senator Everett.

On motion of Senator Everett, debate adjourned.

• (1540)

The Senate adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m.