

Agriculture and Forestry in its recent report on farm finance. The government also welcomes the Committee's advice and recommendations for initiatives. As the Committee has pointed out in its report, some Canadian farmers, especially in the Prairie provinces, are experiencing severe financial stress. At the same time, it is important to remember that the 1990 crop is not yet in the ground and the price that farmers will receive is not known. International markets are volatile and could change rapidly. Given the circumstances, the federal government, together with the provinces, is closely monitoring the situation.

As the Minister of Agriculture said in the other place, "We have at the present time a technical committee of assistant deputy ministers of the federal and provincial government assessing the situation. We are examining the situation both in terms of the impact of the lower commodity prices, the drought situation, and in some areas you have excessive moistures, and in other areas you have critical cash-flow problems. The technical committee of federal and provincial ADM's is assessing this and we will have the interim, preliminary data in our hands some time later this month and we hope at that particular time to assess the situation, to look at the application of the existing programmes, and if there needs to be further assistance the federal government and the provinces will come with a package.

2. With regard to the request made by Mr. Garf Stevenson, President of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, the federal government is currently reviewing the situation.

PANAMA

EFFECTS OF INVASION ON PANAMA CANAL TREATY

Hon. C. William Doody (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I have a delayed answer in response to a question asked in the Senate on December 20 last by the Honourable Senator Stollery respecting Panama—Effects of Invasion on Panama Canal Treaty.

(The answer follows:)

The Panama Canada Treaties are not affected by the USA military intervention of 20 December 1989. The Treaties have not been terminated.

CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL TRADE TRIBUNAL

AMALGAMATION OF CANADIAN IMPORT TRIBUNAL, TARIFF BOARD AND TEXTILE AND CLOTHING BOARD—REDUCTION OF MEMBERSHIP

Hon. C. William Doody (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I have a delayed answer in response to a question asked in the Senate on January 30 last by the Honourable Senator van Roggen respecting Canadian International Trade Tribunal—Amalgamation of Canadian

[Senator Doody.]

Import Tribunal, Tariff Board and Textile and Clothing Board—Reduction of Membership.

(The answer follows:)

The government has an obligation to respect the confidentiality provisions written into the agreements reached with four of the former members of the defunct boards. I can, however, inform you that of the ten people affected by the dissolution of the boards Messrs. P. Bertrand and A. Trudeau, have been appointed to the Canadian International Trade Tribunal; Messrs. D. Yeomans, G. Gorman, R. Guay and O. Thur have reached an agreement with the government; Mr. Clement Beauchamp has obtained a court order; and Messrs. J. Bertrand, H. Perrigo and K. Matthie have initiated procedures to bring their cases before the Federal Court. We remain open to negotiations with them.

● (1410)

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT EMPLOYMENT AND IMMIGRATION DEPARTMENT AND COMMISSION ACT

BILL TO AMEND—REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE—POINT OF ORDER—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming the debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Hébert, seconded by the Honourable Senator Thériault, for the adoption of the Third and Final Report of the Special Committee of the Senate on the Bill C-21, An Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act and the Employment and Immigration Department and Commission Act, (with ten amendments), presented in the Senate on the 14th February, 1990.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, I indicated yesterday that we on this side would attempt to convince doubters on the other side as to the regularity of the amendments that are proposed in the Senate report. The argument is so simple that I can understand why it has escaped more complex minds than mine. However, as one who takes a simple approach to these questions, I find the argument totally simple and totally convincing.

Senator Beaudoin and Senator Roblin, I believe, both made the same point, namely, that the amendments proposed in the committee report increased expenditures beyond those contemplated in Bill C-21, and that in order to do that a royal recommendation was necessary, or, alternatively, that the royal recommendation which was presented by the government did not authorize or contemplate these expenditures.

On the latter point, it is absolutely impossible to know from reading the royal recommendation what appropriations are proposed in Bill C-21. They are not specified. In the committee, at the request of Senator Stewart, the officials provided an answer on that point. We were told that neither the Department of Justice nor the sponsoring department had analyzed