



CANADA

Debates of the Senate

2nd SESSION

•

35th PARLIAMENT

•

VOLUME 136

•

NUMBER 58

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Thursday, December 5, 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, December 5, 1996

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

Prayers.

SENATORS' STATEMENTS

NATIONAL DAY OF REMEMBRANCE

SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF TRAGEDY
AT L'ÉCOLE POLYTECHNIQUE

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government):

Honourable senators, this year marks the seventh time that we in Parliament have paused to observe an anniversary that reminds all of us that we live in a society in which violence against women is a regular occurrence. We did not choose tomorrow's date, December 6, as the day to remember that 14 young students died so tragically in 1989. That day was chosen for us by an individual with severe problems who took a semi-automatic rifle into a classroom at L'École polytechnique in Montreal, separated out the men, and gunned down the women, ending in an instant the hopes and dreams they had for the future.

We cannot forget their names: Geneviève Bergeron, Hélène Colgan, Nathalie Croteau, Barbara Daigneault, Anne-Marie Edward, Maud Haviernick, Barbara Marie Klueznick, Maryse Laganière, Maryse Leclair, Anne-Marie Lemay, Sonia Pelletier, Michelle Richard, Annie Saint-Arnault, and Annie Turcotte. They are not merely statistics, honourable senators. They represent our sisters, our daughters, and our friends.

We also remember their families, who live every day with the memories and the sorrow of their loss. Our thoughts and our prayers are with them.

The legacy of this memory must be collaborative action with all of our partners — be they governments, business, labour, communities, groups, or individuals — to counter violence of any kind against any individual of any age. As news headlines reveal, every day in Canada violence against women continues to take a startling toll. In 1993, Statistics Canada reported that 51 per cent of all Canadian women over the age of 16 had been subjected to at least one act of physical or sexual violence. The suffering in families is enormous. Increasing numbers of men have actively taken up the cause to advance awareness and find solutions.

Honourable senators, in recent years the government has taken a number of concrete steps to challenge this issue. In December of 1995, Bill C-68 strengthened Canada's gun control legislation. The Criminal Code has been amended ensuring harsher sentences for those who commit crimes of hate motivated by, among other things, the victim's sex.

Other amendments before the House of Commons now include measures to keep abusers away from victims, and changes to the anti-stalking law. Long-term-offender legislation that targets sex offenders has been adopted.

• (1410)

Last August, in Ottawa, the Canada-United States Women's Health Forum produced an agreement to exchange research and information on the issue of violence against women.

Honourable senators, we are dealing in part with entrenched attitudes that will only change over time. However, we also have the opportunity and clear obligation to attack the economic and social problems that foster that fear, insecurity and ignorance, which, in turn, breed anger, desperation and violence.

We remember the 14 young women and their families with sadness, not only on this day, but every day. They are painful symbols of each and every individual who is threatened, abused or forfeits a life through violence anywhere in Canada. It cannot be tolerated. We in this Parliament must do everything possible to take a leadership role in finding solutions and creating better understanding.

POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

PARTICULARS OF TUITION FEES CHARGED
AT VARIOUS UNIVERSITIES

Hon. Ethel Cochrane: Honourable senators, in reply to the concern about tuition fees raised on Tuesday by Senator Prud'homme, I would like to offer some information about tuition at selected universities for 1996-97.

Memorial University of Newfoundland charges tuition of \$2,670 for an arts or science undergraduate. The University of British Columbia charges \$2,295. McGill University charges \$1,668 in tuition fees.

Next year, the Government of Quebec plans to charge tuition fees of \$2,900 for out-of-province students while tuition fees will remain the same, \$1,668, to use the McGill example, for residents of Quebec.

Neither Newfoundland and Labrador nor British Columbia has announced any intention to charge discriminatory fees for students from other provinces. The amount of the fees was not the subject of the question I raised on Tuesday. My question concerned the discrimination against Canadians from outside Quebec that has been introduced by this tuition policy.

I will send a copy of the schedule of fees for universities in Canada to Senator Prud'homme.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marcel Prud'homme: Honourable senators, I am most grateful to Senator Cochrane for supplying me with these details. However, I would like the honourable senators to take note of them. This proves exactly what I was saying. One can pick a random example or two.

If, for instance, I take the case of engineering students in Quebec, their tuition fees are \$1,600, while students elsewhere are paying \$2,005, \$3,008, \$3,004, or \$3,002.

Medical students in Quebec pay \$1,600, \$1,500. In Newfoundland, they pay \$3,125, in Ontario, \$3,800, \$3,700, \$4,800, \$4,700. This is precisely the point I raised yesterday.

I thank Senator Cochrane for distributing this list, which would prove what I was trying to say yesterday. One province does not charge enough and the others charge too much. We can see that, in Quebec, university students are privileged members of society. They may not know it. They may not want to believe it. Quebec has the lowest tuition.

The point raised was that many students attend McGill University not to learn French, because most of them do not, but because the tuition fees are half what they are elsewhere. I can understand how thrilled they are to be in Montreal.

I would point out that, if we are to have a full debate, and I will see that it is a full one, I would be very pleased to provide all the other details in due course to those honourable senators who are interested, concerning the number of students from outside Quebec, not from abroad, but from elsewhere in Canada, who are attending institutions such as Concordia, McGill and Lennoxville. The percentage is very high, while students from the rest of Canada attending Laval, the Université de Montréal and the Université de Sherbrooke, can be counted on the fingers of one hand, compared to those who choose McGill.

Perhaps we can all compare the figures, in order to have an intelligent debate on this issue.

[*English*]

THE SENATE

COMMENTS BY SENATOR CRITICIZING PRIME MINISTER

Hon. Shirley Maheu: This is the first time I have felt the necessity to rise in this house and make a comment pursuant to Senators' Statements.

Violence can take many forms. It can be physical; more often, however, abuse takes the form of verbal violence. One of our honourable senators passed over the line of acceptable behaviour yesterday. One can be partisan, and one may say what one has to say. All I ask is that our colleagues on the other side of this house take a good look at what happened during the last election when

an attempt was made to crucify our candidate, who is the current Prime Minister of Canada.

That same senator also criticized the Prime Minister's wife, Aline Chrétien. We must remember that she is our "First Lady," and I place the emphasis on "lady."

I cannot accept that someone would publicly criticize our Prime Minister and his wife. I caution that senators who make such comments will get what they deserve; that they should remember what happened during the last election, and stop making the kinds of sleazy comments that should stay in the bottom of the bucket.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

REPORT OF SOCIAL AFFAIRS, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
COMMITTEE REQUESTING AUTHORIZATION TO TRAVEL
PRESENTED AND PRINTED AS APPENDIX

Hon. Mabel M. DeWare: Honourable senators, I have the honour to present the tenth report of the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology, which respectfully requests that the Subcommittee on Post-Secondary Education be empowered to adjourn from place to place within Canada for the purpose of its examination, and that the said subcommittee be permitted to refer the special expenses involved as outlined in *Procedural Guidelines for the Financial Operation of Senate Committees*.

I ask that this report and the budget appended thereto be printed as an appendix to the *Journals of the Senate* of this day, and that it form part of the permanent record of this house.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, is it agreed that this report be printed as an appendix?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

(*For text of report, see today's Journals of the Senate.*)

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, when shall this report be taken into consideration?

On motion of Senator DeWare, report placed on the Orders of the Day for consideration at the next sitting of the Senate.

• (1420)

CRIMINAL CODE

BILL TO AMEND—REPORT OF COMMITTEE

Hon. Sharon Carstairs, Chair of the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs, presented the following report:

Thursday, December 5, 1996

The Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs has the honour to present its

SEVENTEENTH REPORT

Your Committee, to which was referred Bill C-45, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (judicial review of parole ineligibility) and another Act, has, in obedience to the Order of Reference of Tuesday, October 22, 1996, examined the said Bill and now reports the same without amendment but with the following proposal:

It is the proposal of your Committee that the Minister of Justice use whatever measures at his/her disposal to inform the public about section 745.6, including discussions with provincial Attorneys General, so that together they may find the means by which victims' families could have full knowledge of this section.

Respectfully submitted,

SHARON CARSTAIRS
Chair

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

On motion of Senator Milne, bill placed on the Orders of the Day for third reading at the next sitting of the Senate.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO MEET
DURING SITTING OF THE SENATE

Hon. John B. Stewart, Chairman of the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, with leave of the Senate and notwithstanding rule 58(1)(a), moved:

That the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs have power to sit at 3:30 p.m. today, even though the Senate may then be sitting, and that rule 95(4) be suspended in relation thereto.

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

Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE
TO MEET DURING SITTING OF THE SENATE

Hon. Sharon Carstairs: Honourable senators, I give notice that on Tuesday next, December 10, 1996, I shall move:

That the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs have power to sit at 3:15 o'clock in the afternoon on Wednesday, December 11, 1996, even though the Senate may then be sitting, and that rule 95(4) be suspended in relation thereto.

QUESTION PERIOD

TRANSPORT

PEARSON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT—LEASE TO
GREATER TORONTO AIRPORTS AUTHORITY—ACCURACY
OF NEWS RELEASE REGARDING PREVIOUS AGREEMENTS
WITH PRIVATE CONSORTIUM—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. John Lynch-Staunton (Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, my question arises from a news release issued by Transport Canada on December 2, 1996, explaining the reasons for transferring the control of the Pearson airport to the Greater Toronto Airports Authority.

A background document to the press release is entitled "The Difference between Today's Transfer of Pearson International and the T1T2 deal." That is the actual heading to the background document.

It says:

There are several important differences between today's transfer of Lester B. Pearson International Airport to a Canadian Airport Authority and the cancelled deal to sell the airport's terminals 1 and 2 to the private-sector developer T1T2 Ltd. Partnership.

The word that strikes me is "sell." It indicates there that the previous government had agreed, in the agreement between the private consortium and the government, to sell the airport's terminals one and two. This is an absolute falsehood. There was nothing in the agreement about selling terminals one and two. There was an agreement to lease terminals one and two for 57 years.

Can the minister explain to me why the Department of Transport, in its desperation over the entire Pearson affair, would go so far as to lie about the basic condition of the agreement between the government and the private consortium?

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I have not seen the press release to which the Honourable Senator Lynch-Staunton refers. I will make it my business to see it, and I will transmit his question to the minister.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: This is a cabinet decision, and the matter has been discussed in cabinet. I am asking the minister what happens when basic cabinet decisions are taken. Is she not part of them?

There are three or four absolute falsehoods in this press release. Let me point out a second one to the minister. It states:

Under the previous approach, —

Meaning the agreement reached between the Conservative government and the consortium —

— control over the airport would have rested in a number of hands.

The communiqué goes on to say:

One private-sector group would have operated the terminals. It was proposed that another take over the airport's runways. And it was unclear who would look after the remainder of the airport...

There was nothing in the agreement between T1T2 and the Government of Canada regarding who would take over the runways and who would be responsible for the rest of the airport. All that was in the agreement was that the consortium would be responsible for renovating the two terminals and, in return, hopefully make a profit.

How dare the Government of Canada today lie — and I use the word “lie” — about conditions in the agreement and pretend that there was an arrangement beyond that agreement to the extent that another party would be taking over the airport's runways? At no time during the negotiations that went on for some three years was there any discussion — and this was proved before the Senate inquiry chaired by Senator MacDonald last summer — about anyone taking over the runways in Toronto. Nowhere was it suggested that only the Government of Canada would be responsible for the operation of the airport, including supervision over the administration of T1T2 by private enterprise.

How can the minister justify her government coming out with an absolute fabrication regarding the agreements between private enterprise and the previous government? These are lies — L-Y-E-S — falsehoods —

Senator Doody: Caustic.

Senator Maheu: Careful.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: These are lies.

Senator Gigantès: You cannot even spell the word.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: I am spelling it to emphasize that I am not using the word loosely.

Senator Gigantès: You are spelling it to show us that you do not know how to spell it.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: At no time were these terminals to be sold; yet this press release issued by the Government of Canada says that the terminals were to be sold. At no time was it ever said that the runways would be run by one party and the rest of the airport by another.

How can the minister's government justify such falsehoods?

• (1430)

Senator Fairbairn: Honourable senators, my honourable friend has used strong language.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: I can spell it for you again, if you like. “Liar” is another word.

Senator Fairbairn: I have listened carefully to my honourable friend — to both his comments and his language, which is very strong. I will take that document and obtain answers for him, concerning it.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: Before Christmas?

Senator Fairbairn: I will undertake to try to do that.

PRIME MINISTER

VERACITY OF COMMENTS TO STUDENTS IN
MANITOBA—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. David Tkachuk: Honourable senators, I read the newspapers this morning and I watched the news last night on television, and I was a little surprised. I did not know all these things about our Prime Minister. While I was shocked at the revelation, I want the Prime Minister's office to be given an opportunity to defend itself.

I was intrigued by a speech given by the Prime Minister to students in Manitoba in which he said that he speaks to a homeless man and chats regularly on an Ottawa street corner with a homeless person. He said that, “We just sit with a chair at the corner of the street.” Was he telling the truth in telling the students in Manitoba that story about how he gets his advice in Ottawa?

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I am interested in the line of questioning. Perhaps it indicates the nature of a strategy for an upcoming event.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: Speak to the “Rat Pack” and what you did to Mulroney! Come on!

Senator Berntson: We are talking about integrity!

Senator Gigantès: You are the ones who cannot talk about integrity!

Senator Lynch-Staunton: If that is the only defence you have, tell the truth for once.

Senator Tkachuk: Answer the question!

Senator Fairbairn: On the question of the Prime Minister, his character, and position of Madam Chrétien —

Senator Lynch-Staunton: We are talking about the homeless, not about Mrs. Chrétien.

Senator Fairbairn: — I have only a couple of comments to make. I will make them, and then that will be the end of my comments.

I have been around Parliament Hill for 34 years. I have watched the Right Honourable Jean Chrétien since he came here as a young member of Parliament. In my experience in those 34 years, I have not seen anyone who has made a greater commitment to this country, who has worked harder for this country, and who has done so with more honour than the Right Honourable Jean Chrétien.

Senator Tkachuk: Answer the question!

Senator Graham: The answer hurts, that is why; listen for a change!

Senator Fairbairn: I am giving my honourable friend an answer to his question. The Prime Minister of Canada is a man of intense commitment, honour and integrity, and that is how he is running this government. That is how Canadians are observing this government.

As far as Madam Chrétien is concerned, there is not a finer, more gracious and stronger lady in this country than Aline Chrétien.

Senator Gigantès: And she did not spend millions decorating 24 Sussex Drive!

Senator Fairbairn: Those are my answers. There will be no "Delayed Answers" to these questions.

Senator Tkachuk: Honourable senators, the Leader of the Government in the Senate did not answer the question that I asked, and I think there is an opportunity here to answer the question.

This great guy is talking to a bunch of high school students in a gym — students as old as my son or my daughter. He is spinning a yarn here. When this honourable man, the Prime Minister, gets caught in a mistruth or a whoops, he says "I see. I said I saw. I said I see a person in the streets sometimes when I am travelling in the city. I said I see a man in Ottawa. I did not say I talked to him."

When he gets caught again, he then says, "I talked to him before I was the leader of the government." Is he telling us that he sits in a chair sometimes in downtown Ottawa with a homeless guy, when he is either the leader of the opposition or a minister of the government, getting advice on how he should run

the country, and he does not remember that it happened? I think we all would remember something like that.

Senator Gigantès: He does not have ministers who packed the CBC with separatists!

Senator Tkachuk: I think we hit a nerve last night. I want to know a simple thing: Did the Prime Minister meet with homeless people, sit in a chair — as he told the students in Manitoba — and talk about the future of the country? He even related what he was told on that occasion. He said that this man said that he liked being homeless. That is what he said. I want to know the answer to that question: "Yes" or "No"?

Senator Maheu: Dirty politics will get you nowhere.

Senator Tkachuk: I will not learn anything from the Liberals, I will tell you that.

Senator Gigantès: You cannot, because you are a Tory.

Senator Tkachuk: I will not learn anything from the Liberals — and not from you, especially!

Senator Gigantès: The only thing you can learn is what you learn from other Tories, namely, that it is dishonest!

DELAYED ANSWERS TO ORAL QUESTIONS

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I have a response to a question raised in the Senate on October 31, 1996, by the Honourable Senator Atkins regarding the participation of Canada in expositions in Lisbon and Hanover.

WORLD EXPOSITIONS

PARTICIPATION OF CANADA IN EXPOSITIONS IN LISBON AND HANOVER

(Response to question raised by Hon. Norman K. Atkins on October 31, 1996)

On May 28, 1996, Cabinet approved Canada's participation in Expo '98 to be held in Lisbon, Portugal, from May 22 to September 30, 1998. The approved budget of \$6.6 million is composed of contributions from 7 federal departments and two provinces. Canada's participation at Expo '98 will include a Canada Pavilion and a modest cultural program.

No decision has been made yet regarding Canada's participation at Expo 2000 to be held in Hannover, Germany, from June 1 to October 31, 2000. The central theme of Expo 2000 is "Mankind - Nature - Technology". The Prime Minister responded to the invitation by Chancellor Kohl to participate by indicating that it was under consideration. A decision is expected in 1997. A budget has yet to be determined.

ANSWERS TO ORDER PAPER QUESTIONS TABLED

TRANSPORT—DETAILS OF AGREEMENT REACHED BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AND GREATER TORONTO AIRPORTS AUTHORITY CONCERNING OPERATION OF PEARSON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Deputy Leader of the Government) tabled the answer to question No. 60 on the Order Paper—by Senator Tkachuk.

TRANSPORT—COSTS INVOLVED REGARDING PEARSON AIRPORT INQUIRY DOCUMENTATION

Hon. Alasdair B. Graham (Deputy Leader of the Government) tabled the answer to question No. 61 on the Order Paper—by Senator Tkachuk.

PEARSON AIRPORT INQUIRY—INFORMATION ON COMPUTERS AND INDEXING

Hon. Alasdair B. Graham (Deputy Leader of the Government) tabled the answer to question No. 62 on the Order Paper—by Senator Tkachuk.

ORDERS OF THE DAY**CANADA LABOUR CODE**

BILL TO AMEND—THIRD READING

Hon. Peter Bosa moved the third reading of Bill C-35, to amend the Canada Labour Code (minimum wage).

Motion agreed to and bill read third time and passed.

**CANADA ELECTIONS ACT
PARLIAMENT OF CANADA ACT
REFERENDUM ACT**

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Bryden, seconded by the Honourable Senator Taylor, for the second reading of Bill C-63, to amend the Canada Elections Act, the Parliament of Canada Act and the Referendum Act.

Hon. David Tkachuk: Honourable senators, I wish to make a few remarks about Bill C-63, following the excellent presentations of Senators Murray and Oliver.

I think Bill C-63 is a flawed bill of the Liberal government. We have heard all of this before. This is just another attempt to

make amendments to the Elections Act, much like the Electoral Boundaries bill which, in effect, cancelled any chances for electoral boundary redistribution until approximately the next century. That particular bill was a politically motivated piece of legislation drawn up to satisfy the Ontario Liberal caucus, who did not want to have such a change in electoral boundaries in effect before the next election. In other words, they are cheating voters in Ontario and British Columbia of their fair share of seats.

The opposition parties in the House of Commons were — as they are still today — so lost in the complexities of their new surroundings, ferreting out barber shops and cheap meals, that it was left to the Conservative Party to put a halt to the devious manipulation of the Chrétien government and restore fair representation to the Canadian electorate.

What leads me to believe that this bill is flawed and is not about reform but about strategy for the next election? First, it was drawn up by the Liberals — the same group that forced a former Prime Minister to sue the federal government.

• (1440)

Honourable senators, this bill is about the upcoming election. After all, it was forced through the House of Commons by closure, and the six-month waiting period for amendments to the Canada Elections Act was repealed. This bill is about Minister Gray and his cabinet colleagues, probably with the participation of the Leader of the Government, surmising that because of their lead in the polls a shorter election period is to their advantage. In fact, in their perfect world, they would like to call the election today and have the vote tomorrow, lest they wake anyone up.

It is on the subject of a shortened election period that I want to spend some time, honourable senators. Why is it that they chose 36 days; why not 30 or 28 days? I understand the issues of technology, communication and improved transportation, but why are they a reason for shortening the election period? Following the logic of this argument, improvements in this area could continue to shorten the election period until one day voters will only see their leaders filtered by television news people, who already have too much power, or on 30-second television commercials selling our parties as the best place to shop.

Improved technology and transportation should rather be seen as an opportunity for the leaders and the candidates to visit with more Canadians face to face. This is what an election is all about; voters and candidates. An election is not an inconvenience. It is the most important act of citizenship in a democratic country. It is a time when societies like ours empower our citizens to take matters into their own hands. This is no small act. Every four years or so, for approximately 45 days, we listen to the political parties — 45 days out of 1,460. Three per cent of our time is spent discussing national issues such as defence, foreign affairs, health care, jobs and interest rates. Do we really believe that an election is not the time to discuss important policy issues? I do not believe that. It is the most important time.

It is also an issue of money. It is to the rich political parties that technology is beneficial — faster planes, satellites, high-technology, communications systems and advertising. New political parties and poorer political parties have not the resources to afford the best and the latest of technologies that are used as an excuse in this bill to shorten the election period. Voices of dissent, so important to our political system, will find it more difficult to sell their ideas and communicate their messages.

I want to spend a minute discussing enumeration. In Canada, we have the best enumeration system in the world. It is 92 per cent accurate; 95 per cent after revision. The enumeration system is based on members of a community placing their neighbours on a voters list. This is a great act. In what other country in the world would you place your neighbour on a voters list? In many countries, neighbours would take neighbours off the voters list. Here in Canada, we do not do that. The system works because it is based on a neighbourhood system, a system of asking your friends and neighbours to exercise their franchise. There is beauty in this simplicity. There is genius in this low-tech advantage we share in Canada. We are trying to replace it with a computerized system that would benefit absolutely no one, except to feed the beast that I call the government bureaucracy.

I predict that, if we pass this legislation, the list will be totally unreliable. While we can use the statistic of 16 per cent of electors moving in a given year, that is a misleading statistic because it takes into account rural and urban Canada together. In every major urban area in Canada, one-third of electors move every year. In a constituency in a high-density area with many apartment buildings, almost everyone moves. In the downtown core of Saskatoon, where everyone lives in apartments or condominiums, there is heavy movement. Every two years, the neighbourhoods change.

What good is a voters list that is one-third or one-half inaccurate? It is not much good to anyone except to people who use technology to get into lists. It is amazing that we would actually ask rural people to pay taxes to keep the urban voters list stable. North of Prince Albert, or in the Melfort-Tisdale area, that list will be good for years with very little change. The rural member has a good list from the last election, which he can update himself.

If you have a seat in a high-density apartment area, you are benefiting from the system immensely more than the rural areas of the country. We now pay citizens a little more than the minimum wage to do an excellent job of enumerating voters by going door to door. We will substitute for them \$40,000- to \$60,000-a-year civil servants to use technology to develop lists that will not work. Their hands will be on driver's licence records and income tax returns. We are told that voters will have the option of saying that they do not want their names disclosed. Let us try a little reverse marketing and have voters sign the box if they want their names released. Let us see what kind of response we get from the people who file income tax. Using tax returns and death lists is a morbid way of preparing a voters list which, in my opinion, has no value between elections.

The main purpose of a voters list is to help enfranchise our citizens; not to provide a convenient master list of all citizens for the Government of Canada.

Even if the Liberals believe the questionable reasons for which the bill is being rushed through the Senate, as it was rushed it through the House of Commons, we will still have an enumeration this year. Why is there such a rush? It is only for the purpose of having a 36-day campaign in the next election. I guarantee you, honourable senators, that if the Liberals were at 30 per cent in the polls, we would not be rushing this through. As a matter of fact, the bill would not be here. It took a few days for the opposition in the other place to figure this out. I cannot believe it took them so long, but we have been fighting the Liberals for a long time. We know them.

• (1450)

Honourable senators, let us take our time. If we want reform, let us have reform. What is the urgency in the matter? Let us take this bill to committee and study it. We have January, February and March. The Liberals are telling us that they will not call an election until the fall. What is the rush? Our enumerators are not going on strike. The people are there. If there is an election, the enumeration will be done and we will have an election. The system has been working since 1867. I guarantee, honourable senators, that it will work one more time.

Honourable senators, there is no justifiable reason to have this legislation passed so quickly. Let us take our time, do it right and not believe all that we hear from those experts about the money we can save.

We have been here a long time. Does anyone here believe a federal bureaucrat who says we will save money? The only time we save money is when we get rid of something. We do not save money when we change something. It always costs more money; it always has, and it always will.

We are not passing back-to-work legislation because there is a national emergency; rather, we are passing laws that apply to the centre of our electoral system. Let us tread carefully, honourable senators. Let us take our time and make the necessary changes because we owe it to the people of Canada.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I wish to inform the Senate that if the Honourable Senator Bryden speaks now, his speech will have the effect of closing the debate on second reading of this bill.

Hon. John G. Bryden: Honourable senators, I wish to say a few words at this stage. First, I listened carefully and then read carefully the remarks of Senator Murray. He expressed a number of concerns, including a concern that agreements with the provinces in some way be “nailed down,” to use his expression, so that we can be as sure as we can be that the updated voters register is accurate.

Further, Senator Murray expressed concerns in relation to the enumeration. Where Senator Tkachuk and I live, door-to door enumeration is no problem. In some parts of our country, it is difficult because of the safety of enumerators.

Senator Murray expressed concerns related to staggering the closing of polling hours to try to bring some equity to the situation. I listened and read those remarks with a great deal of interest. I am hoping that a good number of those concerns will be addressed when this bill is sent to committee.

Honourable senators, the principal concern of Senator Oliver related to the privacy of individuals and any infringement on that privacy. I, too, am concerned about privacy. I am protective of my own privacy. Once again, I hope that those concerns can be addressed in committee.

Honourable senators, today I listened to Senator Tkachuk. While it is tempting, I will not deign to enter into a rhetorical reply, but the concerns he expressed are a true mark of a campaign co-chair. He is concerned for his party's positioning in the next election. Indeed, it was interesting that the honourable senator commented that his party are positioning themselves for the next election, because it would not make any sense to position themselves for the last one.

I hope I will be forgiven when I say this, but one of the reasons ascribed for shortening the campaign period is that it would be to our party's advantage. This thought ran through my mind: I wonder how long the campaign period would need to be in order to advantage the Conservative Party in the next election campaign.

Honourable senators, I know that Senator Andreychuk wishes to speak to the principles of the bill, and address some of her concerns. I happened to meet her this afternoon, and she has indicated that she will not delay the referral of this bill to committee, and that she will be prepared to make her comments at debate on third reading.

It is my recommendation that as much time as is required be taken to examine the details of this bill in committee, that as many witnesses as are useful be brought before the committee and that, if necessary, we meet not only into next week but the week following to ensure that all of the concerns — some of which I have expressed, and many of which have been expressed by senators opposite — at least have the opportunity to be as thoroughly explored as possible.

Hon. Eric Arthur Berntson (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, would the Honourable Senator Bryden take a question at this time?

Senator Bryden: Certainly.

Senator Berntson: The honourable senator has indicated that we will spend as much time on this bill in committee as necessary, and call as many witnesses as are useful. I think those

were his words. Can my honourable friend tell us that this is not what I would categorize as a priority bill, and something that must be completed before the Christmas break?

Senator Bryden: Honourable senators, I understand that this is a priority bill. It is also my understanding that if it is necessary to report the bill by the Christmas break, we are prepared to stay until Christmas to get that done.

Senator Berntson: "If it is necessary," I believe the honourable senator said. Does that mean Christmas, New Year's Eve or Easter? At some point will the honourable senator be recommending closure? I am curious to know, so that we ourselves can make plans.

Senator Bryden: As usual, I fall back on my status as a rookie senator and indicate that those decisions are not left to a simple senator. They are in the hands of the leadership.

Senator Doody: There are no simple senators.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: There may be on the other side, but not on ours.

Motion agreed to and bill read second time.

• (1500)

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

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

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

CRIMINAL CODE

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Carstairs, seconded by the Honourable Senator Milne, for the second reading of Bill S-13, to amend the Criminal Code (protection of health care providers).—(*Honourable Senator Lavoie-Roux*).

Hon. Wilbert J. Keon: Honourable senators —

Hon. John Lynch-Staunton (Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, on a point of order, I have a question resulting from yesterday's intervention. This item stands in the name of Senator Lavoie-Roux, and she is not here. Has she yielded?

Some Hon. Senators: Yes, she has.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: I would ask for clarification, then. I asked this of the Speaker yesterday. What is the procedure? How does a senator in whose name the item stands control the determination of that item?

The Hon. the Speaker: Senator Lynch-Staunton, although you did not raise a point of order, you did raise a question. I will give an explanation next week on that matter. In the meantime, did Senator Keon receive an indication from Senator Lavoie-Roux that she was prepared to yield?

Senator Keon: Yes.

The Hon. the Speaker: Senator Keon may speak, and the item will remain in the name of the Honourable Senator Lavoie-Roux.

Senator Keon: Honourable senators, I rise today to voice my support for Senate Bill S-13, tabled in this house last week by the Honourable Senator Carstairs, calling for an amendment to section 45 of the Criminal Code.

This bill supports one of the key recommendations made by the Special Senate Committee on Euthanasia and Assisted Suicide with respect to withholding and withdrawal of life-sustaining medical treatment in certain circumstances.

I would like to briefly comment on the key factors that have led me to support the intent of this bill. The bill is comprised of one clause, which would add a new section 45.1 to the Criminal Code. This clause clarifies the Criminal Code by protecting health care providers from criminal liability when they withhold or withdraw life-sustaining medical treatment at the request of a patient or the patient's representative, or administer pain-relieving medication to alleviate a patient's physical pain in dosages that may shorten life.

Fundamental to the debate on this bill is the merit of seeking to clarify the ambiguities in the current law, particularly with respect to the obligations of physicians and nurses and other health professionals in the initiation and cessation of treatment.

Of paramount concern is the patient's right to choose. The amendment will eliminate the uncertainty for medical practitioners between giving the best possible treatment to their patients and heeding the wishes of patients without fear of prosecution.

Canadian courts have held that there is a common-law right of patients to refuse to consent to medical treatment or to demand that treatment after it has begun be withdrawn. In fact, the bill codifies what is already taking place in medical care of terminally ill patients across the country. Because of evidence from a wide variety of witnesses who testified during the special Senate committee's hearing as to the confusion that exists among health care providers and the general public, the committee unanimously recommended that the Criminal Code be amended to clarify the circumstances wherein the withholding and withdrawal of life-sustaining treatment is legally acceptable.

The general philosophy of the proposed amendment to section 45 of the Criminal Code seems well accepted by society, the profession and the courts. While the provisions contained in the current code have provided physicians with some protections from criminal responsibility, the provisions as they currently stand are too narrow in scope to clearly apply to medical practice today. Section 45 of the code has been found by the courts to apply only to surgery. However, there are many practices other than surgery that may result in death or bodily harm. There are other practices today that are accepted as legitimate even though they do not benefit the person who is the subject of the practice. Though the issue has been on the books for years, the rise of advanced medical technology, especially life-sustaining ones, has brought to centre stage the various moral issues involved in euthanasia. Advances in the science of medicine have been dramatic in the past 100 years. Invasive surgery, transplantation, transfusion, systemic research and mechanisms to save, sustain or prolong life are some of the practices that were not contemplated when the original code was drafted.

Since 1992, the Canadian Medical Association has advocated clarification in the Criminal Code of the legality of the cessation of treatment in order to protect health care providers from liability. The issue itself has been on the books for decades. In fact, in 1969, the Canadian Medical Association General Council approved the following statement:

An ethical physician will allow death to occur with dignity and comfort when death of the body appears inevitable. He will support the body when clinical death of the mind has occurred but need not prolong life by unusual or heroic means.

Honourable senators, Canadian society has also changed since the code's inception. One significant change is the emphasis on the predominance of individual rights and freedoms. This is reflected in the Canadian Constitution by the recent edition of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, through federal and provincial human rights legislation and court decisions. It is also reflected in the changed nature of the physician-patient relationship where decisions are now made jointly between physician and patient rather than by physician alone.

Honourable senators, all of these changes have contributed to a tension between the apparent requirements of the criminal law and medical practices that are considered appropriate and desirable. They have also raised difficult questions as to what constitutes appropriate conduct in a particular medical context.

• (1510)

Recommendations concerning these issues are also contained in a number of documents of the Law Reform Commission of Canada. The main theme of the commission's recommendations on this topic is that a statement should be added to the Criminal Code that would make it clear that a patient has the right to reject treatment and require that it cease and that the Criminal Code's provisions should not require a physician to violate this right. The proposed amendment to section 45 supports these recommendations.

In addition, there is some doubt as to the scope of the defence contained in section 45. It has been suggested by the Law Reform Commission that the defence may be available only in situations of necessity or emergency. The definition of medical treatment needs to be broadened to incorporate what is generally accepted as the scope of practice of qualified physicians engaged in promoting the well-being of their patients, particularly in the case of physicians practising in the public health field of society.

Physicians work to preserve and promote health and prevent death. The criminal law, too, seeks to protect health and life. Difficulties arise when the law appears to require a physician to act to preserve and promote health or prevent death in circumstances where such actions may be inappropriate. The law should recognize a competent patient's wishes and respect them as regards the cessation or non-initiation of treatment.

It is clear that the Criminal Code should be amended to ensure that this right is recognized and respected. It is because of my overriding belief in the patient's right to choose that I stand before you today, honourable senators, and call on you to support moving Bill S-13 forward.

I congratulate Senator Carstairs for her careful work on this subject. Her speech was excellent, and I will retain it as a reference document on this subject for some time.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, it is agreed that the motion will remain standing in the name of the Honourable Senator Lavoie-Roux.

On motion of Senator Lavoie-Roux, debate adjourned.

CRIMINAL CODE

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Roberge, seconded by the Honourable Senator Cohen, for the second reading of Bill S-10, to amend the Criminal Code (criminal organization).—(*Honourable Senator Losier-Cool*).

Hon. Rose-Marie Losier-Cool: I yield to Senator Carstairs.

Hon. Sharon Carstairs: Honourable senators, I thank Senator Roberge for his bill. I have been ready to speak on it for some time and was only hoping that I could do so when he was in the chamber. However, because I do not want it to die on the Order Paper, I am speaking today.

The issue of organized crime in Canada and how we deal with it is an important one and worthy of our detailed study. In essence, as I read the bill, the primary purpose of it is to make it an indictable offence liable on conviction to a term of imprisonment of from one to ten years for anyone to accept in

whole or in part any property, benefit, or advantage from a criminal organization.

The bill defines a "criminal organization" as a group of at least five members who have committed one or more crimes. Could youth gangs be interpreted, therefore, as an example of organized crime? Would members of a youth gang who are over the age of 18, be subject to this act? Should they be?

In another section, the presumption exists that if a person lives with or is in the company of a member of a criminal organization it is proof that the person is a member of that criminal organization. Is this too broad a sweep? What impact would this have on spouses, children, or extended family members? What impact does this bill have, if any, on the Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the freedom of association?

Senator Roberge has correctly made reference to Italy and France, both of which have constitutional guarantees for their citizens, and yet were able to pass acts similar to the one that he has proposed.

I have no answers on this bill. However, honourable senators, I do have a great number of questions. I look forward to the review of this bill when it comes before the committee.

Hon. Eric Arthur Berntson (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, this is again one of those fuzzy areas of the rules. My colleague Senator Roberge is quite prepared to see this bill go to committee; however, there is some reluctance to send it to committee without him being in the chamber. Until he returns, I would be very happy to have it stand my name.

On motion of Senator Berntson, debate adjourned.

BUSINESS OF THE SENATE

FIRST NATIONS GOVERNMENT BILL—REQUEST FOR DATE OF SPEAKER'S RULING ON POINT OF ORDER

Hon. David Tkachuk: Your Honour, we have been waiting a while for the ruling on Bill S-12. Would you have any indication as to when this may take place?

The Hon. the Speaker: It is my hope to make the ruling next week.

Senator Tkachuk: Is it possible to be a little more precise than that?

The Hon. the Speaker: No, as a matter of fact, at the moment, it is not. It is a very complicated ruling on which we have already spent a good deal of time, and I am meeting with my staff again tomorrow morning. I am hoping that it will be early in the week, but I cannot guarantee it at the moment.

Senator Tkachuk: It is getting close to Christmas. I do not want to have to have the staff work overtime, but time is running.

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 do stand adjourned until Tuesday next, December 10, 1996, at 2 p.m.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, is leave granted?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

The Senate adjourned until Tuesday, December 10, 1996, at 2 p.m.

THE SENATE OF CANADA
PROGRESS OF LEGISLATION
(2nd Session, 35th Parliament)
Thursday, December 5, 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	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	96/10/31	Banking, Trade & Commerce					
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	96/11/05	none	96/11/06	96/11/28	27/96
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	96/12/03	none	96/12/04		
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	seven	defeated 96/06/19		
C-29	An Act to regulate interprovincial trade in and the importation for commercial purposes of certain manganese-based substances	96/12/03			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-35	An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code (minimum wage)	96/10/31	96/11/07	Social Affairs, Science & Technology	96/12/04	none	96/12/05		
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-41	An Act to amend the Divorce Act, the Family Orders and Agreements Enforcement Assistance Act, the Garnishment, Attachment and Pension Diversion Act and the Canada Shipping Act	96/11/25	96/11/28	Social Affairs, Science & Technology					
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	none	96/11/07 (2 amend.)	96/11/28	30/96

No.	Title	1st	2nd	Committee	Report	Amend.	3rd	R.A.	Chap.
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	96/12/05	none			
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	96/10/30	Foreign Affairs	96/11/06	none	96/11/07	96/11/28	28/96
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
C-61	An Act to implement the Canada—Israel Free Trade Agreement	96/11/07	96/11/28	Foreign Affairs					
C-63	An Act to amend the Canada Elections Act, the Parliament of Canada Act and the Referendum Act	96/11/27	96/12/05	Legal & Constitutional Affairs					
C-68	An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of Canada for the financial year ending March 31, 1997	96/11/25	96/11/27	—	—	—	96/11/28	96/11/28	29/96

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	96/12/03	Transport & Communications					
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-270	An Act to amend the Financial Administration Act (session of Parliament)	96/12/03							
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
C-347	An Act to change the names of certain electoral districts	96/11/25	96/11/27	Legal & Constitutional Affairs					

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	96/11/07	Rec.			
S-4	An Act to amend the Criminal Code (abuse of process) (Sen. Cools)	96/02/28	96/10/28	Legal & Constitutional Affairs					
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		Dropped from Order Paper re: Rule 27(3)					
S-9	An Act providing for self-government by the first nations of Canada (Sen. Tkachuk)	96/06/13		Dropped from Order Paper re: Rule 27(3)					

No.	Title	1st	2nd	Committee	Report	Amend.	3rd	R.A.	Chap.
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 Niro)	96/06/20							
S-12	An Act providing for self-government by the first nations of Canada (Sen. Tkachuk)	96/11/25							
S-13	An Act to amend the Criminal Code (protection of health care providers) (Sen. Carstairs)	96/11/27							

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, December 5, 1996

	PAGE		PAGE
SENATORS' STATEMENTS		Delayed Answers to Oral Questions	
National Day of Remembrance		Senator Graham	1272
Seventh Anniversary of Tragedy at L'École polytechnique. Senator Fairbairn	1268	World Expositions	
Post-Secondary Education		Participation of Canada in Expositions in Lisbon and Hanover. Question by Senator Atkins. Senator Graham (Delayed Answer)	1272
Particulars of Tuition Fees Charged at Various Universities. Senator Cochrane	1268	Answers to Order Paper Questions Tabled	
Senator Prud'homme	1269	Transport—Details of Agreement Reached Between Government and Greater Toronto Airports Authority Concerning Operation of Pearson International Airport. Senator Graham	1273
The Senate		Transport—Costs Involved Regarding Pearson Airport Inquiry Documentation. Senator Graham	1273
Comments by Senator Criticizing Prime Minister. Senator Maheu	1269	Pearson Airport Inquiry—Information on Computers and Indexing. Senator Graham	1273
<hr/>		<hr/>	
ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS		ORDERS OF THE DAY	
Post-Secondary Education		Canada Labour Code (Bill C-35)	
Report of Social Affairs, Science and Technology Committee Requesting Authorization to Travel Presented and Printed as Appendix. Senator DeWare	1269	Bill to Amend—Third Reading. Senator Bosa	1273
Criminal Code (Bill C-45)		Canada Elections Act	
Bill to Amend—Report of Committee. Senator Carstairs	1269	Parliament of Canada Act	
Foreign Affairs		Referendum Act (Bill C-63)	
Committee Authorized to Meet During Sitting of the Senate. Senator Stewart	1270	Bill to Amend—Second Reading. Senator Tkachuk	1273
Legal and Constitutional Affairs		Senator Bryden	1274
Notice of Motion to Authorize Committee to Meet During Sitting of the Senate. Senator Carstairs	1270	Senator Berntson	1275
<hr/>		Referred to Committee.	1275
QUESTION PERIOD		Criminal Code (Bill S-13)	
Transport		Bill to Amend—Second Reading—Debate Continued. Senator Keon	1275
Pearson International Airport—Lease to Greater Toronto Airports Authority—Accuracy of News Release Regarding Previous Agreements with Private Consortium—Government Position. Senator Lynch-Staunton	1270	Senator Lynch-Staunton	1275
Senator Fairbairn	1270	Criminal Code (Bill S-10)	
Prime Minister		Bill to Amend—Second Reading—Debate Continued. Senator Losier-Cool	1277
Veracity of Comments to Students in Manitoba—Government Position. Senator Tkachuk	1271	Senator Carstairs	1277
Senator Fairbairn	1271	Senator Berntson	1277
		Business of the Senate	
		First Nations Government Bill—Request for Date of Speaker's Ruling on Point of Order. Senator Tkachuk	1277
		The Hon. the Speaker	1277
		Adjournment	
		Senator Graham	1278
		Progress of Legislation	i



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