



CANADA

Debates of the Senate

2nd SESSION

•

35th PARLIAMENT

•

VOLUME 135

•

NUMBER 44

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Thursday, October 24, 1996

—

THE HONOURABLE GILDAS L. MOLGAT
SPEAKER

CONTENTS

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

Debates: Victoria Building, Room 407, Tel. 996-0397

Published by the Senate

Available from Canada Communication Group — Publishing, Public Works and
Government Services Canada, Ottawa K1A 0S9, at \$1.75 per copy or \$158 per year.

Also available on the Internet: <http://www.parl.gc.ca>

THE SENATE

Thursday, October 24, 1996

The Senate met at 2:00 p.m., the Speaker in the Chair.

Prayers.

SENATORS' STATEMENTS

HERITAGE CCANADA

STRATEGIC EVALUATION OF MULTICULTURALISM PROGRAMS—REPORT

Hon. Donald H. Oliver: I wish to draw the attention of honourable senators to the report prepared by Brighton Research for Heritage Canada. The report is entitled, "Strategic Evaluation of Multiculturalism Programs." It reaches one main conclusion: While most Canadians support multiculturalism, this government, the Chrétien government, does not.

This should not come as a surprise to those who have closely watched this government since it was sworn in in November of 1993. There are no members from Canada's visible minority population in cabinet. The social policy review undertaken by this government completely ignored the multicultural population of Canada. This government has failed to establish the Canadian Race Relations Foundation — and the list goes on.

The analysis of the government's lack of support for multiculturalism is well documented in the Brighton report. That report talks of the government's confused vision of multiculturalism, and I agree with this analysis.

It is time that we who support multiculturalism get the message out, because this government either cannot or will not. It seems to have caved in to the demands of those on the extreme fringes, such as were exhibited earlier this year by members of the Reform Party who believe that the best place for people of colour, for instance, is in the back rooms out of public view.

Multiculturalism in the 1990s is about removing barriers to the full participation, full contribution and full citizenship of all Canadians regardless of their background and cultural heritage. Its policies are aimed at breaking down the barriers to equal rights and responsibilities; barriers such as racism, discrimination, and low literacy levels.

Multiculturalism does not weaken the Canadian identity, as its critics would have us believe. Equality of opportunity and putting an end to racism, which are the basic tenets of multiculturalism, can hardly lead to a weakening of the Canadian fabric.

It is time the government took a long, hard look at how it has mishandled race relations and multiculturalism, and learned from its mistakes. I know that I, and others on this side of the chamber

who support multiculturalism, will not rest while this government, through its multiculturalism policies, continues to ignore the visible minority community in Canada.

UNITED NATIONS

INTERNATIONAL DAY FOR THE ERADICATION OF POVERTY

Hon. Erminie J. Cohen: Honourable senators, today is United Nations Day, and I wish to focus my remarks on Thursday last, October 17, which marked the International Day for the Eradication of Poverty. The year 1996 was declared the International Year for the Eradication of Poverty by the United Nations, and Canada was a signatory to that declaration.

I draw your attention to this day because most Canadians are unaware that there is a designated day and a designated year to highlight the eradication of poverty. Our governments, provincial and federal, have been slow to advertise this fact. Is that because so little has been done to combat poverty? We are well aware that the debt crisis must be solved. However, must it be done on the backs of the poor?

In the October 17 *Telegraph Journal*, an excerpt from a 12-page pastoral letter released that day from Halifax by Canada's Catholic bishops says it all:

Canada's failure to eliminate child poverty is akin to "child abuse" by federal and provincial governments. Women and children bear the brunt of government social and financial policies, and poverty must remain top priority. To think that almost one Canadian child in five lives in poverty in one of the richest societies in world history is nothing less than a damning indictment of the present socio-economic order.

The letter includes a quote from a recent report by another church coalition, which reads:

In our society, if a parent denies a child food, clothing and social security, that is considered child abuse, but when our government denies 1,362,000 children the same, it is simply balancing the budget.

In just two short years, honourable senators, the national standards for welfare and social service have been eliminated. Funding for health care, education, and welfare has been cut drastically by reducing transfer payments to the provinces by \$7 billion. The standard of living for unemployed and underemployed people is deteriorating as the social programs that, in the past, provided for their basic needs are being dismantled — at a time when Canadians need these programs most.

The World Bank ranks Canada second in the world for quality of life, and yet we see poverty increasing and jobs lost. We have food banks, soup kitchens and — a new phenomenon — poor-bashing. Poor-bashing is when people who are poor are humiliated, stereotyped, shunned, pitied, patronized and ignored. Poor-bashing is when people who are poor are falsely accused of being lazy, drunk, stupid, uneducated. Poor-bashing is like racism or sexism, only it is directed at people who are poor. It creeps into our attitudes when we are not looking, and it makes it a little easier to look the other way.

• (1410)

It permeates the media and government policies. You have heard the clichés, “Those people on welfare,” or “Sitting home collecting cheques,” or “Those welfare bums.” These are all examples of stereotyping. If we do nothing else to acknowledge this special day and year, let us promise to encourage our friends and neighbours to challenge poor-bashing whenever they hear it, be it on the radio or from a politician. Speak out or write a letter.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I regret that the time for Honourable Senator Cohen’s speech has expired. Is leave granted for her to continue?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Senator Cohen: I thank honourable senators.

Social programs have helped define our country and who we are as a people. Such programs enshrine the value which we used to hold dear; the one that says people should care for, and about, each other. We must not sacrifice our sense of compassion. Improving the lives of poor Canadians is a worthy objective, and yet it is overlooked these days. So many of us are unaware, or unconcerned.

The Year for the Eradication of Poverty is almost over and the federal government has yet to announce what it intends to do to mark this International Year. Honourable senators, I know what I will do. In December, I will release a report on poverty in Canada over the past 25 years. The report will highlight the burden that poverty places on too many Canadians. I hope the report will cause awareness and create a demand by Canadians that the government must move forward on a comprehensive anti-poverty plan which will create opportunities for low income Canadians to reach their true potential.

I shall do my best to push the issues of poverty wherever I speak because, in my opinion, poverty undermines our country and our communities.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

[Translation]

POVERTY IN PALESTINE

Hon. Marcel Prud’homme: Honourable senators, I am inspired by the comments of my colleague, who told us about poverty. Tomorrow evening, in Montreal’s Pierre Péladeau hall, a major event will be held to help provide medical assistance to Palestine. For the first time, Gilles Vigneault will sing songs relating exclusively to Palestine. Next week, when we come back, I will take a closer look at this issue.

Today, I am honoured and pleased to fully identify with the action of President Chirac, who is currently visiting the Middle East. This visit shows great courage on his part, the courage our heads of state sorely lack to look at the real issue that has been a concern for so long in Canada. In the 33 years that I have been in Parliament, this issue has divided the Liberal Party of Canada, of which I have been a faithful member.

Today’s events in Palestine are proving right those who, for 25 years, have been asking essentially for what we are finally beginning to realize and what could have contributed to a lasting peace in that part of the world. This is why I am very pleased to say a few words about poverty today.

If only honourable senators would listen to reason and not passion, and decide to see for themselves the terrible poverty and despair of this bullied, scorned and dishonoured population.

I really think the Senate would be prepared to look at the issue. The situation is getting worse and the whole Middle East peace process could be jeopardized if a solution to the Palestinian issue is not found.

It is not a matter of being for or against someone. It is matter of properly identifying the real situation in terms of human rights violations in that country. I wish honourable senators would set aside their blind and passionate partisanship and look at the events that have been taking place before our eyes for 30 years and that are developing increasingly faster. They would come to the same conclusion I arrived at 20 years ago.

I shall be providing honourable senators with articles published in 1983 by *The Toronto Star* to the effect that we should not deal with Arafat or talk to the PLO. Some of us may have been 15 or 20 years ahead of our time, but, regardless of the past, we should take a hard look at the current situation. We should be delighted that a head of state such as Mr. Chirac tells things as they are. I might add that the Canadian policy is in agreement with his views.

[English]

It is as though he were sent there.

I conclude without taking up as much time as my friend Senator Cohen, but I should like you to be men and women of courage and examine this question.

GOODS AND SERVICE TAX

EFFECTS ON TAXPAYERS OF HARMONIZATION WITH PROVINCIAL SALES TAXES

Hon. Mabel M. DeWare: Honourable senators, once again Atlantic Canada has been sold down the river. In New Brunswick, GST harmonization will lower the effective sales tax rate by 3 per cent. This all sounds very nice, but now the provincial sales tax will be applied in some new areas. New homes, gas, home heating fuel, clothing, footwear and various fees for professional services, such as hairdressing, lawyers, accountants, will all have a 15 per cent sales tax applied to them.

Who will deal with the brunt of this tax burden? Once again it will be the middle class, who already find it difficult enough to finance a new home, or pay the bills, or clothe their families. In fact, I would like to remind honourable senators on the other side that it was their party that so adamantly opposed taxes on homeheating fuel during the 1990 debate on the GST.

On November 6, 1990, the President of the Liberal Party of Canada, Senator Dan Hays, stated that a tax on home heating fuels would be extremely unfair on people with lower or middle incomes. He stated:

Heat supplied by electricity or fuel is a necessity in Canada. Spending a short time outdoors today was sufficient evidence that there is absolutely no question that heat is an absolute necessity. Water is a classic example of a situation where the government has recognized that. The same right to acquire basic groceries and prescription drugs without extraordinary burdens should apply to the right to purchase utilities necessary to heat one's home.

Honourable senators, what was appropriate for 1990 is also right in 1996, especially for those families who are still trying to make ends meet. Why is a 3-per-cent reduction in sales tax so palatable to our governments if they intend to take it back tenfold on other items?

ATOMIC ENERGY OF CANADA

SHUTDOWN OF PURE RESEARCH AT CHALK RIVER FACILITY

Hon. Mira Spivak: Honourable senators, for many months scientists worldwide have been appealing to the Minister of Natural Resources and to the Prime Minister to rethink the government's plan to abandon basic research activities at AECL's Chalk River laboratories.

Last April, soon after the government cut \$100 million from AECL's budget and the Crown corporation made its decision to shut down pure research, the letters of protest from scientists numbered 250 from almost 30 countries. Late in August, six Nobel laureates, six presidents of national physical societies and 35 directors of major world laboratories were joined by more than 600 other scientists in making an urgent appeal to the Prime Minister to preserve funding for TASC, the tandem accelerator superconducting cyclotron facility, at Chalk River.

Among those voicing astonishment and concern is Bertram Brockhouse, Canada's most recent Nobel laureate, who virtually invented neutron "scattering" at Chalk River, one of the many basic research achievements at the laboratories.

As these scientists point out, the TASC is merely five years old. It was built at a public expense of \$70 million and costs some \$6.5 million per year to operate. Former science advisor to the U.S. President D. Allan Bromley describes it as "the best of its kind in the world." About half the cost of operating TASC could come from industry, if the government shows patience and allows for the development of a five-year plan for an industry, academic and government consortium.

• (1420)

What are the costs to Canada of the closure of this and other basic research at AECL? Many of the 165 physicists and technicians who work at Chalk River will lose their jobs, and the loss of TASC will jeopardize more than 100 industrial projects and the research of hundreds of scientists and students around the world. It will mean a brain drain for Canada, not only of today's scientists but of young people who must go elsewhere to obtain competitive education and training.

We will not have a Canadian facility to test satellite computer chips, for example, and prevent the knockout of another \$300 million Anik satellite. We will have no new basic research work like that of Bertram Brockhouse, which has led to better booster rockets, stronger construction materials, better paints and safer, more effective pharmaceuticals. It means Canadian industry will be less competitive.

Removal of funding from the Chalk River facility could mean the cancellation of the government's agreement with the town of Deep River to store Canada's 740,000 cubic metres of low-level nuclear waste. Deep River agreed to accept that waste in return for a federal guarantee to maintain job levels at nearby Chalk River. How the government can place in jeopardy that \$345-million storage plan for the sake of a \$13-million yearly reduction in valuable research is beyond comprehension.

Honourable senators, TASC Director Dr. John Hardy drew an apt analogy to this government's basic attitude to pure research. He said, "It is like a family paying off its credit card balance by cancelling the kids' education — and then saying that it is for the kids' benefit, so that they will not be saddled with debt." I agree.

I simply suggest to the honourable senators opposite that they might ask the Prime Minister to intervene, to listen to the appeals from the world scientific elite, and to act in the best interests of Canada by restoring funding for basic research at Chalk River.

UNITED NATIONS DAY

Hon. Noël A. Kinsella: Honourable senators, as was mentioned by Senator Cohen, October 24 is United Nations Day. On the courtesy pole in front of the Parliament buildings, today we are flying the flag of the United Nations.

October 24 was chosen as United Nations Day because it was on October 24, 1945, several months after the signing at the San Francisco Conference — in which Canada participated and was a signatory — that the five permanent members of the Security Council deposited the Instrument of Ratification, together with 24 other member states. As a footnote, sadly, Canada was not amongst those first 24 member states who deposited that Instrument of Ratification on that early date.

Senator Corbin: Why?

Senator Kinsella: It may be a reflection on the government of the day.

It was on November 9, 1945, that the Instrument of Ratification was deposited for Canada. The good news, of course, is that over the years, under the various administrations, Canada has played a leadership role in many of the activities of the United Nations.

The very first functional commission established by the United Nations' Charter in 1945 was the Human Rights Commission. The first mandate of the Human Rights Commission was the drafting of a universal charter of human rights. It was under the able leadership of Eleanor Roosevelt, representing the United States, that work was done by the Human Rights Commission and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was drafted. Mrs. Roosevelt was ably assisted by a great Canadian, John Humphrey, a professor at McGill University. It was on December 10, 1948, while meeting in Paris, that the General Assembly of the United Nations proclaimed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, a charter which has become known as the Magna Carta of the 20th century.

Therefore, honourable senators, we shall be celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1998. I would urge the Government of Canada to commence preparatory plans to mark that fiftieth anniversary. We on this side, who expect to be on that side when that anniversary comes around, hope that the work would be commenced forthwith.

DISTINGUISHED VISITOR IN GALLERY

The Hon. the Speaker: I would like to draw the attention of honourable senators to the presence in our gallery of a visitor, none other than our old friend Norbert Thériault.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

THE ESTIMATES, 1996-97

TABLING OF SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (A)

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Deputy Leader of the Government) tabled the Supplementary Estimates (A) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1997.

NATIONAL FINANCE COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO STUDY SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (A)

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Deputy Leader of the Government) moved:

That with leave of the Senate and notwithstanding rule 58(1)(f), the Standing Senate Committee on National Finance be authorized to examine and report upon the expenditures set out in the Supplementary Estimates (A) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1997.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

BANKRUPTCY AND INSOLVENCY ACT COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENTS ACT INCOME TAX ACT

BILL TO AMEND—FIRST READING

The Hon. The Speaker informed the Senate that a message had been received from the House of Commons with Bill C-5, to amend the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act and the Income Tax Act.

Bill read first time.

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

On motion of Senator Graham, bill placed on the Orders of the Day for second reading on Monday next, October 28, 1996.

• (1430)

QUESTION PERIOD

THE SENATE

ABSENCE OF GOVERNMENT LEADER

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, regrettably, the Leader of the Government in the Senate is not present today for Question Period.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: Maybe we will get an answer, then.

Senator Graham: As honourable senators will appreciate, she is attending the national convention of the Liberal Party. On a very happy note, at this very moment she is —

Senator Doody: She is out burning the Red Book.

Senator Graham: — attending the annual meeting of the national women's commission and she is speaking on increasing the participation of women in politics.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

Senator Doody: I hope her speech is more effective than her GST statement.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

JUDGES ACT

BILL TO AMEND—THIRD READING—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming the debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Bryden, seconded by the Honourable Senator Stollery, for the third reading of Bill C-42, to amend the Judges Act and to make consequential amendments to another Act.

The Hon the Speaker: Honourable senators, this order stands in the name of the Honourable Senator Cools.

Hon. Pierre Claude Nolin: Honourable senators, I wish to speak on this matter, if it is agreed.

The Hon. the Speaker: Would the Honourable Senator Cools yield to the Honourable Senator Nolin?

Hon. Anne C. Cools: Yes, Your Honour.

[Translation]

Hon. Pierre Claude Nolin: Honourable senators, I believe that Bill C-42 was not scrutinized by the House of Commons as it should have been. This is why we have undertaken an in-depth review of this bill, both in this house and in the Legal Affairs Committee.

If we are to believe what we were told by the minister and by our colleague in this chamber who sponsored this bill on behalf of the government, it is housekeeping legislation providing for technical amendments, and — if you can read between the lines — we should not overly concern ourselves with it. Although I do not have that much experience in this house, I have come to the conclusion that, when the government tells us that we are dealing with a housekeeping bill of no great significance and that we must expedite it, this is when we have to be extra cautious and look very closely at the bill sent to us.

The purpose of this bill is to amend the Judges Act. The Canadian Judges Act is a set of fundamental rules to protect democracy and this country's fundamental and democratic values.

Even though our Constitution does not define the separation of powers in very specific terms, the decisional law inherited from

Great Britain and all the rulings on the importance of separating the judiciary from the other two powers of Canada leads to the conclusion that the separation of powers in Canada is fundamental to the respect of our values.

Unfortunately, the bill before us attacks that separation. It attacks the independence of the Canadian judiciary and that is why I will propose an amendment to that bill.

I will address two important points. First, can the Canadian judges perform judicial functions or other functions outside Canada? After having heard experts and read documents on the question, I came to the conclusion that Canadian judges should limit themselves to their judicial functions, except for whatever exceptions are provided in the Judges Act.

At present, the exceptions mentioned in that act allow a federal or a provincial government to give a judge an almost quasi-judicial responsibility in the creation of a board of inquiry or a quasi-tribunal to study an issue of public interest. I do not think it would be appropriate to expand the realm of these exceptions.

The government is right in wanting to expand its judicial responsibilities. If a court's workload permits — and this is very important — Canadian judges should be allowed to do legal work abroad, within a very specific judicial framework.

I do not believe a Canadian judge should be allowed to participate in international activities unless they are defined. As well, I do not think a Canadian judge should participate in technical assistance programs abroad. Our judges must judge. They are paid by the Parliament of Canada to do just that until they resign or reach 75 years of age. I think that such a measure protects the independence of the judicial function.

• (1440)

My second point is: Who may pay a judge's salary? Honourable senators, the Constitution is very clear on that point. Section 100 of the British North America Act says that salaries and allowances of judges shall be set and paid by the Parliament of Canada.

In committee we heard an expert who did not seem to know about the issue. When we asked him for his interpretation of section 100, which I just quoted, if I understood his answer, the Parliament of Canada pays judges for their judiciary duties, but must not pay them if they perform other duties. In other words, in their wisdom, the Fathers of Confederation and, since that time, all the Parliaments of Canada that have given effect to the current Judges Act, provided for judges in Canada to be part-time judges.

I oppose this interpretation of section 100 of the British North America Act. I think that judges in Canada must perform only one duty, that is to sit on the bench, and nothing else.

That is why I think a judge may sit on a bench abroad, but must be paid by the Parliament of Canada to do so.

MOTION IN AMENDMENT

Hon. Pierre Claude Nolin: For those reasons, I move the following motion:

That Bill C-42 be not now read the third time but that it be amended:

a) in clause 4 on page 3:

(i) by replacing line 13 with the following:

approval of the Council.,

(ii) by replacing line 15 with the following:

granted pursuant to subsection (1), the chief, and

(iii) by deleting lines 23 to 31; and

b) in clause 5, by replacing lines 11 to 45 on page 4 and lines 1 to 35 on page 5 with the following:

56.1 (1) A judge on leave of absence granted pursuant to subsection 54(1) may, with the approval of the Council granted pursuant to subsection (2), perform judicial or quasi-judicial duties for an international organization of states or an institution of such an organization and may receive in respect thereof reasonable moving or transportation expenses and reasonable travel and other expenses from the Government of Canada.

(2) Where a judge requests a leave of absence pursuant to subsection 54(1) to perform judicial or quasi-judicial duties for an international organization of states or an institution of such an organization, the Council may, at the request of the Minister of Justice of Canada, approve the undertaking of the duties.

I submit these amendments to you in both official languages. I draw your attention to the importance of the Judicial Council.

Even though I believe he acted questionably at times, the then Right Honourable Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Pierre Elliott Trudeau, acted very wisely in creating the Judicial Council. He came up with a process whereby we could bring together in a council all chief judges and associate chief judges of all the courts under the Parliament of Canada. He brought together in one council, the so-called Judicial Council, all these individuals whose duty is, shall we say, to manage federal Canadian courts.

It is important that we give this council the power to authorize judges who so request it to travel abroad and perform judiciary duties for international organizations. That is why I introduced these amendments that are before you.

The Hon. the Speaker: Can you tell us who is seconding your proposal?

Senator Nolin: Senator Doody.

The Hon. the Speaker: It is moved by the Honourable Senator Nolin, seconded by the Honourable Senator Doody:

That Bill C-42 be not now read the third time but that it be amended:

(a) in clause 4 on page 3:

(i) by replacing line 13 with the following:

approval of the Council.,

(ii) by replacing line 15 with the following:

granted pursuant to subsection (1), the chief, and

(iii) by deleting lines 23 to 31; and

(b) in clause 5, by replacing lines 11 to 45 on page 4 and lines 1 to 35 on page 5 with the following:

56.1 (1) A judge on leave of absence granted pursuant to subsection 54(1) may, with the approval of the Council granted pursuant to subsection (2), perform judicial or quasi-judicial duties for an international organization of states or an institution of such an organization and may receive in respect thereof reasonable moving or transportation expenses and reasonable travel and other expenses from the Government of Canada.

(2) Where a judge requests a leave of absence pursuant to subsection 54(1) to perform judicial or quasi-judicial duties for an international organization of states or an institution of such an organization, the Council may, at the request of the Minister of Justice of Canada, approve the undertaking of the duties.

Is it your pleasure, honourable senators, to adopt the motion? If no other senator wishes to speak at this stage —

[English]

Senator Cools: Honourable senators, I would love to speak on this matter, but I had intended to speak to the main motion. I am not ready to speak to Senator Nolin's motion in amendment. Given the situation, I am happy to move the adjournment.

The Hon. the Speaker: Senator Cools, I did not hear you.

Senator Cools: My understanding is that an amendment has just been placed before us; is that not the case?

The Hon. the Speaker: It is a motion in amendment, and it can be spoken to or it can be adjourned.

Senator Cools: That is what I said.

The Hon. the Speaker: Or it can be voted on.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: It can be adopted as well.

The Hon. the Speaker: Yes, it could be adopted, but having had some trouble recently in this regard, first, I will ask, does any other senator wish to speak?

Senator Cools: Honourable senators, I wish to speak on this matter, but I would like to see the amendment in writing. I would like to be able to speak to it with some intelligence. Could we have copies of it?

Senator Doody: Are you proposing the adjournment of the debate?

Senator Cools: Yes, that is what I said, but His Honour indicated that he did not hear me.

On motion of Senator Cools, debate adjourned.

NEWFOUNDLAND

CHANGES TO SCHOOL SYSTEM—AMENDMENT TO TERM 17 OF CONSTITUTION—REPORT OF COMMITTEE—MOTION IN AMENDMENT—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming the debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Rompkey, P.C. seconded by the Honourable Senator De Bané, P.C., for the adoption of the thirteenth report of the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs (*respecting Term 17 of the Terms of Union of Newfoundland with Canada set out in the Schedule to the Newfoundland Act*), deposited with the Clerk of the Senate on July 17, 1996.

And on the motion in amendment of the Honourable Senator Doody, seconded by the Honourable Senator Kinsella, that the Report be not now adopted but that it be amended by deleting the words “without amendment, but with a dissenting opinion” and substituting therefor the following:

with the following amendment:

Delete the words in paragraph (b) of Term 17 that precede subparagraph (i) and substitute therefor the words: “where numbers warrant.”

Hon. Lorna Milne: Honourable senators, it is with some interest that I have followed the debate so far on the proposed resolution to amend Term 17 of the Terms of Union of Newfoundland with Canada. The education of young people is one of my primary concerns.

Some of you will know that I spent many years as a school trustee in Ontario, and I served as an instructor and as a member of the Senate of the University of Guelph. For the sake of brevity,

however, I will confine my remarks to the amendment proposed by Senator Doody.

I am opposed to the amendment put forward by the honourable senator for two reasons. On the one hand, I favour the resolution as approved by the Newfoundland legislature, and I do not see how it is improved by the proposed amendment. On the other hand, in my review of the Senate’s role in such matters, I have discovered both different and diverging opinions as to what happens if the Senate amends the resolution before it. I do not think we know what we are getting into if we decide to amend it. Finally, I do not think it is the role of the Senate to act as negotiator in the constitutional process. By amending, we are proposing an alternative. I think it is much more appropriate for the Senate to restrict itself to either approving or rejecting the proposal.

• (1450)

First, let me cover my substantive objections to the amendment. The initiative of the Government of Newfoundland to rationalize its school system is certainly an understandable one in the prevailing climate of fiscal restraint. The House of Commons saw fit to adopt the resolution authorizing the Governor General to amend the Constitution. For the Senate to oppose this resolution as put forward by Newfoundland, it seems to me that we must find some serious, even outrageous, flaw in the proposal. I find no such flaw.

I do not share Senator Doody’s view about the nature of the rights concerned. The persons affected are not an oppressed minority. Indeed, all concerned are privileged groups due to their status in the Constitution when you compare them to other minority groups who have no such protection, such as non-Christian groups and aboriginal peoples.

Furthermore, these so-called “minority groups” constitute, in the aggregate, a majority of the population of the province. Having reviewed the various objections in committee testimony, I cannot find anything to convince me that the adoption of this resolution would place the several faiths affected in any situation of oppression. Their rights — some would say “special” rights — would remain, but the Government of Newfoundland would be able to make organizational changes to meet its budgetary constraints.

As I see it, the children of these minority groups will continue to receive an education. Instruction in religious doctrine is preserved. The rights in that regard are unaffected. What is more, I fail to see how denominational schools would be jeopardized in all but the most unusual cases, since the language of the resolution is clear in stating:

...schools established, maintained and operated with public funds shall be denominational schools, and any class having rights under this Term as it read on January 1, 1995 shall continue to have the right to provide for religious education, activities and observances for children of that class in those schools.

At the risk of sounding somewhat flippant, I am tempted to ask: What more could they want? In fact, it strikes me that such protections for what effectively constitutes a religious majority in a province could even be described as unnecessary. The seven denominations, all Christian, maintain the guaranteed right to see that their particular faith is taught in schools. I believe that Senator Rompkey framed this well when he asked: "Will the rights of the Pentecostals, the Roman Catholics and others be affected?" His answer was:

Yes, but they will continue to have extensive, constitutionally guaranteed rights.

I do not quarrel with maintaining those rights. However, I think it is important to allow the Newfoundland government to make reasonable changes to its school systems in keeping with those rights. For that reason, I support the resolution as adopted by the Province of Newfoundland.

Senator Doody proposes to substitute the words "where numbers warrant" for the words "subject to provincial legislation that is uniformly applicable...". Thus, the decision on what is the magic number would rest with the courts, not with the government. Senator Kinsella conceded yesterday that he is "uncomfortable with the whole resolution," but noted that some parties concerned would be reassured by those words. Why does he not simply oppose the resolution? He was asked yesterday whether he would vote for the resolution if the amendment he supports were to carry, and he really did not give a direct answer to that question.

We already know that the amendment we are debating has been considered and rejected by the Newfoundland House of Assembly. The motion in amendment is futile; the Senate should do its duty and either adopt or reject the original resolution.

This last point leads me to examine our process in dealing with the resolution. I have concerns about adopting an amendment to a resolution to authorize an amendment to the Constitution. Since the current amending formula came into being in 1982, we have had little experience with it as an authorizing legislature. The *Rules of the Senate of Canada* do not provide for any special process for such resolutions. We have few, if any, precedents or practices to follow.

Is a resolution simply a motion before the Senate, or does it constitute legislation on the constitutional order — meaning that we should treat it like a bill? What happens if we amend it? With the Meech Lake Accord, the Senate amended the government's resolution and took the decision to send appropriate messages to the House of Commons, the other legislatures, and the four major aboriginal organizations in Canada. This single precedent suggests that in amending the resolution, the Senate was embarking on a new amending process, separate and distinct from the one already underway. In this theory, the Senate had not adopted or rejected the government's proposal. Instead, it proposed a new constitutional solution and asked the relevant legislatures to approve the initiative to authorize the Governor General to proclaim an amendment to the Constitution.

On July 12, 1988 — and some of you were here at that time — Senator Lang gave a very interesting interpretation of the amending formula. I am a bit concerned about his analysis, which he gave in a speech during the Meech Lake process. The analysis is a bit involved. I will not take the time of the Senate with it today, but I do have copies of it with me. His conclusion was that the Senate, by innocently adopting an amendment to the Meech Lake resolution, might inadvertently exercise a form of absolute veto over it. I am no lawyer, but I found his analysis well reasoned. I have no doubt that there are lots of lawyers prepared to argue it for clients who are opposed to this resolution, should we give them an opening by adopting an amended resolution on Term 17.

My point in all this, honourable senators, is to suggest that we may be in for far more than we bargained for if we adopt an amendment. Maybe we will be overridden by the House of Commons and that will be that. Or, just maybe, we will induce a constitutional crisis. Will interested sectors go to court to challenge the Governor in Council's right to change the Constitution in the face of the Senate amendment to the resolution? Will we transmit the amended resolution to the House of Commons and the Newfoundland legislature? Does adopting an amended resolution mean we have rejected the proposal? There are too many questions.

We should know what we are doing. Perhaps this is a task for the Standing Committee on Privileges, Standing Rules and Orders of this house to look into the matter and to clarify our procedures. In the meantime, I implore honourable senators: Let us not get bogged down in this amendment.

In our British parliamentary tradition, it is for the government to "propose" legislation and for the legislature to "dispose" of it. Constitutional resolutions are a form of constitutional legislation. How can we, as the Senate, start a new process of constitutional amendment? We have not sat down with the Government of Newfoundland and negotiated an agreement, nor should we. We are not the Government of Canada. If the Senate does not like the proposal, it should defeat it. Amending the resolution serves no purpose. We should leave the constitutional negotiation process to the premiers and the Prime Minister and let the legislatures perform the function of approving or rejecting their proposals.

Over and above the fact that I feel the Senate could be getting into very deep water with this amendment, the evidence presented to the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs suggested to me that this entire debate is really about a power struggle. In his speech yesterday, Senator Kinsella noted that there is not a perfect symmetry when it comes to protection of minority rights. I think he is right on that point. However, where he would come down on the side of the parents and organized religion, I think it is preferable to err on the side of the children. It seems to me that we have forgotten the rights of the children in this entire debate. It seems to rest upon what is really a question of money — that is, who is entitled to spend it and for which purpose. The hierarchies of the denominations

involved are struggling desperately to retain the power that this money represents. It seems to me that the ordinary people of Newfoundland are crying to us through the only medium to which they all have access — their elected representatives. Let our children go!

• (1500)

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, unless any other honourable senator wishes to speak at this time, I move the adjournment in the name of Senator Pearson, who also happens to be speaking at the Liberal convention to the national women's commission on the subject of greater participation of women in politics.

On motion of Senator Graham, for Senator Pearson, debate adjourned.

NATIONAL UNITY

MOTION TO APPOINT SPECIAL COMMITTEE— DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming the debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Beaudoin, seconded by the Honourable Senator Lynch-Staunton:

That a special committee of the Senate be appointed to examine and report upon the issue of Canadian unity, specifically recognition of Quebec, the amending formula, and the federal spending power in areas of provincial jurisdiction;

That the committee be composed of twelve Senators, three of whom shall constitute a quorum;

That the committee have power to send for persons, papers and records, to examine witnesses, to report from time to time and to print such papers and evidence from day to day as may be ordered by the committee;

That the papers and evidence received and taken by the Special Committee of the Senate on Bill C-110, An Act respecting constitutional amendments, during the First Session of the Thirty-fifth Parliament be deemed to have been referred to the committee established pursuant to this motion;

That the committee have power to sit during sittings and adjournments of the Senate;

That the committee submit its final report no later than December 15, 1996; and

That, notwithstanding usual practices, if the Senate is not sitting when the final report of the committee is completed, the committee shall deposit its report with the Clerk of the Senate, and said report shall thereupon be deemed to have been tabled in this Chamber.—(*Honourable Senator Petten*).

Hon. William J. Petten: Honourable senators, I yield to Senator Bolduc.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Roch Bolduc: Honourable senators, last June, I wanted to speak about Canadian federalism, but circumstances prevented me from doing so until today. I wanted to draw your attention, honourable senators, to the importance of adapting our federal system to the new situation resulting in part from the latest referendum in Quebec. This explains my interest in Senator Beaudoin's motion.

Nearly half of Quebecers, if not more, expressed their discontent with the present situation. In my opinion, half of this half are truly sovereignists. They form the hard core that wants to get out of the federation, no matter what the consequences. They are mainly middle class citizens, public servants who would not suffer from the potential economic consequences of secession on their own future or the future of their community.

The other half includes moderate nationalist Quebecers who oppose the centralization of the present federal system. This centralization was not provided in the Constitution Act of 1867 or 1982, but follows from the government practice of applying its spending power intensively in jurisdictions given by the Constitution Act of 1867 to the provinces.

How could we rally these people to Canadian federalism? By changing the system, especially as regards the resulting federal spending power and distribution of jurisdictions, so that sociocultural issues and regional or local issues are administered mainly by provincial governments, at any rate in Quebec. If other provinces prefer federal intervention, that is their decision, but in Quebec, the majority clearly prefers that solution. One has only to reread the positions taken by various governments in Quebec in the past 50 years at federal-provincial conferences. These proposals have been made by Quebec premiers, from Duplessis to Bourassa. One can easily see, for example, that Quebec has had twelve governments since 1936. All of them have followed in the tradition of Mercier, Gouin and Taschereau, as regards their idea of federalism.

I am not saying that all Quebecers agree on that, but that the governments have agreed that Quebec requires enough political autonomy, within a decentralized system, to define its own development policies, because of its specific responsibilities towards the majority of its people who have to grow and develop on a continent whose inhabitants do not speak their language.

This is why for the past 50 years, especially during federal-provincial conferences or interprovincial meetings, the successive governments in Quebec have always asked for either exclusive or preponderant legislative power over culture, 50 times; over social and health policy, 40 times; over the federal spending power or compensation and transfers, 36 times; over justice and its various elements, 31 times; over education and research, 29 times; over a particular status for their distinct society, 26 times; over language, 16 times; over labour and immigration, 16 times; over natural resources, 9 times; over the veto power, 9 times. This clearly indicates what Quebec really wants, and we are taking it into consideration.

For example, Quebec is already controlling more areas than other provinces: — the Quebec pension plan, for instance, versus the Canada pension plan — immigration, police services, grants and loans to university students. Why should they not have control over all the other direct services to the population in general? Since 1867, they have had control over hospitals, welfare services, senior citizens' homes, schools, colleges, universities, courts and municipal affairs. And some control over the cultural industry as well.

However, some direct public services are still partially controlled by Ottawa, even if they are provincial areas of jurisdiction, things like resources, some forestry and mining activities, tourism, housing, recreation, labour training and employment programs.

Now is the time to settle these issues so that the Canadian government can focus its attention on what it does best. And I am not going to be partisan and say that the federal government has no role to play; it has many very significant roles to play. I should like to mention here: foreign policy, defence, international trade, monetary policy, fiscal policy and equalization, research, environment in its continental aspects, interprovincial transportation, competitiveness — which is very important in a market economy — drug and terrorism control, security, assistance to developing countries, the economic union, and certain aspects of regional development. So there are in fact many federal areas of jurisdiction.

As for economic union, it would be desirable to reinforce it with a new clause 121 to protect the free movement of goods, labour, services and capital — desirable in order to strengthen Canada's economic union. This clause would prohibit, in principle, discriminatory trade barriers introduced by the provinces or by Ottawa, for some barriers were indeed introduced by Ottawa in the form of tariffs, grants, laws, standards, regulations, conventions or other.

There is one exception to this general rule, though. This general prohibition would not affect the exceptional measures relating to the specific features of the Canadian federation, that is the existence of poorer provinces and regions, the traditional social justice of the Canadian people, and the francophone community.

Thus, there would be specific exceptions: equalization, which aims at promoting national equity by helping the poorer areas to

provide essential public services such as justice, protection services, health care, elementary and secondary education, and social assistance to the have-nots.

Then, there would be essential regulations concerning health and the environment on issues that have a broad incidence: acid rain and pollution of the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River, which, as we know, concerns three Canadian provinces and eight American states; these problems will not be solved by Quebec, but rather at the national if not the international level.

Finally, there is the regional development that, as I see it, is limited to pilot projects in single industry areas. There are regions like that in the province of Quebec and in other provinces as well.

So there are major federal roles in this concept of federalism. However, the crux of the problem today is what is referred to as the social union. This is a new expression used by the government and other people as well. It refers to the search for equity, not among regions, but among individuals.

I realize that, for 50 years, the federal government has invested money in the employment sector, health care, post-secondary education and social assistance.

• (1510)

During the post-war period, it was fashionable in Ottawa to justify federal intervention in these provincial areas by referring to the macro-economic stabilizing role of the Government of Canada. Today, we realize that politics has perverted these Keynesian views, bringing us to the brink of bankruptcy.

However, the present government appears to maintain this vision, because we read in a government document, by Mr. Massé, published under the title "Getting Government Right," a document he gave us last year — the following sentence on pages 12 and 13, and I quote:

A federal government that is fiscally healthy is in a better position to allocate resources among individuals, families, regions and generations and to ensure that people in need are protected by social safety nets.

The old demon of wholesale redistribution by the state instead of letting market forces prevail is still present in this government's approach. However, political practice has demonstrated the disastrous impact of these otherwise generous concepts, both on the tax system and social assistance programs.

On page 14, after stating that the government wants to leave training programs up to the provinces, the document goes on to say, and I quote:

The federal government nevertheless retains a strong interest in facilitating the smooth functioning of labour markets, in helping people get back to work, and in promoting labour mobility among all regions of the country.

The document states that the federal government must do this by signing agreements on employment programs with the provinces. This heralds a return to balkanization and favouritism, which fails to respect the spirit of the Constitution as it concerns the respective roles of the federal government and the provinces.

This disturbs me a great deal, because it means the unemployed will continue to shuttle between federal unemployment insurance offices and provincial welfare offices. In Quebec, we have seen in the past 20 years that this was not an efficient way to put people back on the labour market. I am not saying it is the only reason why we have unemployment in our province. There are other reasons as well. In fact, our provincial government has practically all the tools it needs to coordinate programs. I have no illusions about the ability of governments to deal with this problem.

While our provincial government has practically all the tools to coordinate public programs for adjusting human resources, as required, to the challenges of globalization, Canada continues to make a distinction between unemployment insurance and the remaining measures, which are all provincial, claiming that this has been under federal jurisdiction since 1941.

It is unfortunate that governments are still fighting at the expense of the unemployed. It is vital for Quebec to ensure the quality of its human resources, particularly in this era of economic globalization. Just as the federal government must be allowed to play its fundamental role in economic matters, Quebec must be allowed to play its fundamental role in sociocultural matters. A minority such as ours cannot let go of control in that area if we are to avoid extinction.

Nonetheless, that is the strong feeling that prevails in what I call grassroots Quebec.

Some federal bureaucrats argue that the provinces do not have the necessary resources to play this role, and they give as evidence the positive unemployment insurance transfers to Quebec. My answer is very simple: The very purpose of equalization is to correct those things. If it is insufficient at the moment for the people of Eastern Canada in general, including part of Quebec, let us make it better and let us get rid of the many ad hoc programs that often divert equalization from its purpose. Let us not forget that equalization is one aspect of the federal budget, but there is also the rest of the budget. However, equalization must not hinder the mobility of resources because that would be a problem also.

Therefore, I conclude that in this reform of our federalism, we must, through our political institutions and their operating rules, reconcile efficiency, that is, an economic union in a free market system across the country, and social equity, that is, essential public services to promote equal opportunity, so as to reflect people's wishes as much as possible. That is the political economy aspect of our federal system.

There are also other political objectives to be met. That is why, in a country such as ours, true federalism is so desirable. It allows for the sharing of sovereignty in order to protect citizens and businesses against any abuse of power by governments.

In this sense, it constitutes the equivalent in the public sector of the market in the private sector, for it places provincial governments in competition with each other, which is excellent from the citizen's point of view, as long as the federal government does not monopolize the situation with measures designed to standardize everything, thus preventing the mobility of resources and rigidifying the labour market, for example.

Healthy federalism also encourages public decisions and choices, particularly when it comes to values and culture, in a forum that is closer to the citizen. Is it not appropriate, for instance, that each province respond in its own way to these sorts of social needs by deciding on the mix of government and citizen involvement preferred by its own culture? This federalism also makes possible economies of scale, where appropriate, such as for defence, and, finally, it internalizes the possible effects of spill-over in certain types of pollution.

It is not a question of a battle to be won by a strong federal government or by strong provincial governments, but of reinforcing the freedom of citizens through a division of powers that places governments in competition, just as in a market economy competition among private businesses protects the consumer. Is it necessary to add as well that, even when a field of jurisdiction is granted to one level of government or another, this does not mean that they must intervene, but rather that they must balance the respective roles of the individual, or families, of the market, or businesses, and of the state, or governments?

Those, honourable senators, are my profound thoughts on Canadian federalism. I will close by saying that, for Quebec to be happy in Canada, only one thing is necessary: There must be some decentralization, but no more than in 1867. I can understand what has been done over the last 50 years. I studied it when I was young, at 15 or 20. I studied it like everyone else under the distinguished guidance of Professor Maurice Lamontagne. Having seen what has happened since, I think a little more moderation is in order. It is time for the federal government to take action, and it must do so urgently.

I think it is urgent for this issue to be resolved before next year. If we wait too long, we will have problems. It is important that Quebecers remain in Canada. I think that the majority of Quebecers will accept the wording in this proposal. I think that it will be acceptable to the rest of Canada as well.

[English]

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, is it understood that this order will stand in Senator Petten's name?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (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 to do stand adjourned until Monday next, October 28, 1996, at 8 p.m.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

The Senate adjourned until Monday, October 28, 1996, at 8 p.m.

THE SENATE OF CANADA
PROGRESS OF LEGISLATION
(2nd Session, 35th Parliament)
Thursday, October 24, 1996

GOVERNMENT BILLS
(HOUSE OF COMMONS)

No.	Title	1st	2nd	Committee	Report	Amend.	3rd	R.A.	Chap.
C-2	An Act to amend the Judges Act	96/03/19	96/03/20	Legal & Constitutional Affairs	96/03/21	none	96/03/26	96/03/28	2/96
C-3	An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code (nuclear undertakings) and to make a related amendment to another Act	96/03/27	96/03/28	Social Affairs, Science & Technology	96/05/01 96/05/15	none none	96/05/08 referred back to Committee 96/05/16	95/05/29	12/96
C-4	An Act to amend the Standards Council of Canada Act	96/06/18	96/06/20	Banking Trade & Commerce	96/09/24	none	96/09/25	96/10/22	24/96
C-5	An Act to amend the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act and the Income Tax Act	96/10/24							
C-6	An Act to amend the Yukon Quartz Mining Act and the Yukon Placer Mining Act	96/10/21	96/10/23	Aboriginal Peoples					
C-7	An Act to establish the Department of Public Works and to amend and repeal certain Acts	96/03/27	96/03/28	National Finance	96/05/14	none	96/06/12	96/06/20	16/96
C-8	An Act respecting the control of certain drugs, their precursors and other substances and to amend certain other Acts and repeal the Narcotic Control Act in consequence thereof	96/03/19	96/03/21	Legal & Constitutional Affairs	96/06/13	fifteen	96/06/19	96/06/20	19/96
C-9	An Act respecting the Law Commission of Canada	96/03/28	96/04/23	Legal & Constitutional Affairs	96/05/09	none	96/05/14	96/05/29	9/96
C-10	An Act to provide borrowing authority for the fiscal year beginning on April 1, 1996	96/03/26	96/03/27	National Finance	96/03/28	none	96/03/28	96/03/28	3/96
C-11	An Act to establish the Department of Human Resources Development and to amend and repeal certain related Acts	96/04/24	96/04/30	Social Affairs, Science & Technology	96/05/15	none	96/05/16	96/05/29	11/96
C-12	An Act respecting employment insurance in Canada	96/05/14	96/05/30	Social Affairs Science & Technology	96/06/13	none	96/06/20	96/06/20	23/96
C-13	An Act to provide for the establishment and operation of a program to enable certain persons to receive protection in relation to certain inquiries investigations or prosecutions	96/04/23	96/04/30	Legal & Constitutional Affairs	96/05/28	one	96/05/30	96/06/20	15/96

No.	Title	1st	2nd	Committee	Report	Amend.	3rd	R.A.	Chap.
C-14	An Act to continue the National Transportation Agency as the Canadian Transportation Agency, to consolidate and revise the National Transportation Act, 1987 and the Railway Act and to amend or repeal other Acts as a consequence	96/03/27	96/03/28	Transport & Communications	96/05/08	none	96/05/16	96/05/29	10/96
C-15	An Act to amend, enact and repeal certain laws relating to financial institutions	96/04/24	96/04/30	Banking, Trade & Commerce	96/05/01	none	96/05/02	96/05/29	6/96
C-16	An Act to amend the Contraventions Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts	96/04/23	96/04/25	Legal & Constitutional Affairs	96/05/02	none	96/05/08	96/05/29	7/96
C-18	An Act to establish the Department of Health and to amend and repeal certain Acts	96/04/24	96/04/30	Social Affairs, Science & Technology	96/05/08	none	96/05/09	96/05/29	8/96
C-19	An Act to implement the Agreement on Internal Trade	96/05/14	96/05/30	Banking, Trade & Commerce	96/06/11	none	96/06/12	96/06/20	17/96
C-20	An Act respecting the commercialization of civil air navigation services	96/06/05	96/06/10	Transport & Communications	96/06/19	one	96/06/19	96/06/20	20/96
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, 1996	96/03/21	96/03/26	—	—	—	96/03/27	96/03/28	4/96
C-22	An Act granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of Canada for the financial year ending March 31, 1997	96/03/21	96/03/26	—	—	—	96/03/27	96/03/28	5/96
C-26	An Act respecting the oceans of Canada	96/10/21	96/10/23	Fisheries					
C-28	An Act respecting certain agreements concerning the redevelopment and operation of Terminals 1 and 2 at Lester B. Pearson International Airport	96/04/23	96/05/30	Legal & Constitutional Affairs	96/06/10 defeated 96/06/19	seven defeated	96/06/19		
C-31	An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on March 6, 1996	96/05/28	96/05/30	National Finance	96/06/13	none	96/06/18	96/06/20	18/96
C-33	An Act to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act	96/05/14	96/05/16	Legal & Constitutional Affairs	96/05/28	none	96/06/05	96/06/20	14/96
C-36	An Act to amend the Income Tax Act, the Excise Act, the Excise Tax Act, the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions Act, the Old Age Security Act and the Canada Shipping Act	96/06/18	96/06/19	Banking, Trade & Commerce	96/06/20	none	96/06/20	96/06/20	21/96
C-42	An Act to amend the Judges Act and to make consequential amendments to another Act	96/06/18	96/10/02	Legal & Constitutional Affairs	96/10/21				
C-45	An Act to amend the Criminal Code (judicial review of parole ineligibility) and another Act	96/10/03	96/10/22	Legal & Constitutional Affairs					
C-48	An Act to amend the Federal Court Act, the Judges Act and the Tax Court of Canada Act	96/06/18	96/06/20	—	—	—	96/06/20	96/06/20	22/96
C-54	An Act to amend the Foreign Extraterritorial Measures Act	96/10/21							

No.	Title	1st	2nd	Committee	Report	Amend.	3rd	R.A.	Chap.
C-56	An Act for granting Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of Canada for the financial year ending March 31, 1997	96/09/24	96/09/26	—	—	—	96/10/01	96/10/22	25/96

COMMONS PUBLIC BILLS

No.	Title	1st	2nd	Committee	Report	Amend.	3rd	R.A.	Chap.
C-216	An Act to amend the Broadcasting Act (broadcasting policy)	96/09/24							
C-243	An Act to amend the Canada Elections Act (reimbursement of election expenses)	96/05/16	96/05/28	Legal & Constitutional Affairs	96/09/26	none	96/10/01	96/10/22	26/96
C-275	An Act to establish the Canadian Association of Former Parliamentarians	96/04/30	96/05/14	Legal & Constitutional Affairs	96/05/16	three	96/05/16	95/05/29	13/96

SENATE PUBLIC BILLS

No.	Title	1st	2nd	Committee	Report	Amend.	3rd	R.A.	Chap.
S-2	An Act to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act (Sexual orientation) Sen. Kinsella	96/02/28	96/03/26	Legal & Constitutional Affairs	96/04/23	none	96/04/24		
S-3	An Act to amend the Criminal Code (plea bargaining) (Sen. Cools)	96/02/28	96/05/02	Legal & Constitutional Affairs					
S-4	An Act to amend the Criminal Code (abuse of process) (Sen. Cools)	96/02/28							
S-5	An Act to restrict the manufacture, sale, importation and labelling of tobacco products (Sen. Haidasz, P.C.)	96/03/19	96/03/21	Social Affairs, Science & Technology					
S-6	An Act to amend the Criminal Code (period of ineligibility for parole) (Sen. Cools)	96/03/26							
S-9	An Act providing for self-government by the first nations of Canada (Sen. Tkachuk)	96/06/13							
S-10	An Act to amend the Criminal Code (criminal organization) (Sen. Roberge)	96/06/18							
S-11	An Act to amend the Excise Tax Act (Sen. Di Nino)	96/06/20							

PRIVATE BILLS

No.	Title	1st	2nd	Committee	Report	Amend.	3rd	R.A.	Chap.
S-7	An Act to dissolve the Nipissing and James Bay Railway Company (Sen. Kelleher, P.C.)	96/05/02	96/05/08	Transport & Communications	96/05/15	none	96/05/16	96/10/22	—
S-8	An Act respecting Queen's University at Kingston (Sen. Murray, P.C.)	96/06/06	96/06/10	Legal & Constitutional Affairs	96/06/13	none	96/06/13	96/06/20	—

CONTENTS

Thursday, October 24, 1996

PAGE

PAGE

SENATORS' STATEMENTS

Heritage Canada

Strategic Evaluation of Multiculturalism Programs—Report.
Senator Oliver 992

United Nations

International Day for the Eradication of Poverty.
Senator Cohen 992

Poverty in Palestine

Senator Prud'homme 993

Goods and Service Tax

Effects on Taxpayers of Harmonization
with Provincial Sales Taxes. Senator DeWare 994

Atomic Energy of Canada

Shutdown of Pure Research at Chalk River Facility.
Senator Spivak 994

United Nations Day

Senator Kinsella 994

Distinguished Visitor in Gallery

The Hon. the Speaker 995

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

The Estimates, 1996-97

Tabling of Supplementary Estimates (A).
Senator Graham 995
National Finance Committee Authorized to Study
Supplementary Estimates (A). Senator Graham 995

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act Companies' Creditors Arrangements Act Income Tax Act (Bill C-5)

Bill to Amend—First Reading. 995

QUESTION PERIOD

The Senate

Absence of Government Leader. Senator Graham 995

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Judges Act (Bill C-42)

Bill to Amend—Third Reading—Debate Continued.
Senator Nolin 996
Senator Cools 996

Newfoundland

Changes to School System—Amendment to Term 17
of Constitution—Report of Committee—Motion in
Amendment—Debate Continued. Senator Milne 998
Senator Graham 1000

National Unity

Motion to Appoint Special Committee—Debate Continued.
Senator Petten 1000
Senator Bolduc 1000

Adjournment

Senator Graham 1003

Progress of Legislation i



If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:
Canada Communication Group — Publishing
Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9