

peg, were also injured. They were injured in an armoured personnel carrier which ran over some anti-tank mines. Sad as I am to hear about these events, I think some questions arise from them. One of these soldiers happens to be a reservist from my own regiment, the Royal Winnipeg Rifles.

The questions that arise are these: What is the protection, medical or otherwise, for reserve personnel serving with the regular forces if, for example, they suffer permanent disability? What is their position with respect to their families? Is their protection identical to that of the regular forces personnel? Exactly what is their status?

As we are using a larger number of reservists, we surely have an obligation to ensure that they are treated equally in the process.

The second question that arises is as to the quality of the equipment that we are supplying to our soldiers in that area. My understanding is that these Winnipeg soldiers were in an armoured personnel carrier, a piece of military equipment that has been judged to be the slowest, oldest and the least protective of vehicles. Can it be ascertained if in fact this accident was caused by an APC running over land mines and whether the Canadian soldiers, either regulars or reservists, are using inferior equipment? Are we placing them in additional-risk situations that we should not be considering?

**Hon. Lowell Murray (Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, to take the second part of the question first, the Deputy Leader of the Government will table today a delayed answer to a question put by Senator Bosa on the matter of the equipment that our forces are working with in that exercise.

I will inquire into the details of the particular incident the honourable senator has asked about.

As to the first part of his question, it is a very good question. I should not jump to assume anything, although the honourable senator will be aware that the military leaders in this country have been talking for the last little while about the new total force concept in which regular permanent forces, full-time military and reservists, are trained and are expected to work together in peacekeeping and enforcement situations and, presumably, in combat situations. I should assume that the benefits they receive would be similar, if not equal.

It is a good question and I will get an official and authoritative reply on it next week.

**Senator Molgat:** I thank the minister. I realize that my questions are rather detailed and he will have to get the information.

I suppose I am doubly concerned in view of the fact that I am still involved with the militia. In spite of the total force

concept, I do not believe there is equality. There is certainly not equality of pay here in Canada. There may be on service overseas; I do not know. I would like to find out.

Some months ago we debated in this place a bill that governs the provision of pensions to the civil service. At that time I brought up the point that militia soldiers on full-time service, what we call "call-out", were not treated in the same way as regular force soldiers. There are anomalies.

If we are sending reservists into situations such as in Yugoslavia, or anywhere where they are in equal danger, I want to be sure that they are treated equally with the regular force.

• (1500)

**Senator Murray:** Let me ask for a comprehensive statement on that matter.

**The Hon. the Speaker *pro tempore*:** Honourable senators, I must advise you that the 30 minutes allotted to Question Period has expired.

#### NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

##### ACCESS NORTH AMERICA PROGRAM FOR BUSINESSES—PROTECTION OF DISPLACED WORKERS

**Hon. Gildas L. Molgat (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I was in the process of asking a second question, which had to do with NAFTA, so I will just terminate that one.

I refer to a press statement from the Canadian Press saying, according to Trade Minister Michael Wilson, that the Canadian government will spend \$20 million over four years to help Canadian businesses seize opportunities opened up by the North American free trade agreement. Apparently, key elements of the program called Access North America are focused on enabling Canadian companies to gain a foothold in Mexico.

It would certainly be good business practice to do anything we can to encourage Canadian companies to take advantage of NAFTA, if it proceeds. However, if we look back at what happened with the free trade agreement, one of the great concerns — and one of the great requests when the debate was on — was for the government to do something for the workers who were displaced as a result of the free trade agreement. The promises were made.

Subsequently, however, there was a so-called high level committee chaired by Mr. de Grandpré which studied the situation and came back and said they could not do anything for Canadian workers.

If we are to spend this money to help Canadian business gain access into Mexico, what will we do under NAFTA to protect Canadian workers?