



CANADA

Debates of the Senate

2nd SESSION

•

35th PARLIAMENT

•

VOLUME 136

•

NUMBER 62

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Friday, December 13, 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

Friday, December 13, 1996

The Senate met at 10:00 a.m., the Speaker in the Chair.

Prayers.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

NATIONAL ORGAN DONOR DAY BILL

FIRST READING

The Hon. the Speaker informed the Senate that a message had been received from the House of Commons with Bill C-202, respecting a National Organ Donor Day in Canada.

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, December 16, 1996.

[Translation]

TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE TO TRAVEL

Hon. Lise Bacon: Honourable senators, I give notice that, at the next sitting of the Senate, I will move:

That the Standing Senate Committee on Transport and Communications be empowered to adjourn from place to place within and outside Canada for the purpose of pursuing its study of Canada's international competitive position in communications generally, including a review of the economic, social and cultural importance of communications for Canada.

[English]

QUESTION PERIOD

JUSTICE

REFUSAL OF MINISTER OF JUSTICE TO PAY LEGAL FEES OF FORMER MINISTER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT—REQUEST FOR ANSWER

Hon. Eric Arthur Berntson (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, I have a brief question which relates to one that I asked on December 4 in this chamber of the

Leader of the Government in the Senate. It deals with the treatment of a Mr. Munro, a former cabinet minister.

I do not know this Mr. Munro. I have never met him and know nothing about him. To give an idea of the flavour of what was thought of him by his colleagues, when I asked the question on that day, the Leader of the Government in the Senate said:

• (1010)

Mr. Munro, as honourable senators will know, has contributed for many years a very valuable service, not just to the people of Hamilton but to the country as a whole, and to the aboriginal people.

I should have thought that a person held in such regard by his colleagues would have received a little better treatment from the Minister of Justice. I raised the question on December 4, at which time I made reference to a quote attributed to a Mr. Nelligan, which appeared in *The Ottawa Citizen*, in which Mr. Nelligan quotes Allan Rock, the Minister of Justice, as telling him that his decision not to compensate Mr. Munro was a political decision. While I do not know this Mr. Munro, I think he deserves far better credit and treatment than that.

Yesterday, in response to a couple of questions during which one or two of my colleagues made reference to something they had read in the newspaper, the Leader of the Government indicated that, while what appears in newspapers might make a good story, it might not be a reliable source, and that she would prefer to get her answers from the horse's mouth, so to speak.

On December 4, I asked the minister if she would do just that. In fact, she agreed to do so. Because I am planning another series of questions on this matter, I asked if it would be possible to have the answers to these questions by the time we reach the Christmas break. In other words, whenever the Christmas break comes, will we have the answer from the horse's mouth as it relates to the quotation attributed to Mr. Rock, relative to this decision being a political decision?

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I am aware of the interest of Senator Berntson in obtaining answers as quickly as possible. I am attempting to do just that. I have conveyed the remarks of the honourable senator to my colleagues.

Hon. Finlay MacDonald: Honourable senators, I do know Mr. Munro. I worked very amiably with him when he was Minister of National Health and Welfare and I was President of the First Canada Games Society.

After he was acquitted of the charges against him, I went to the PMO of the then Conservative government to ask them why it was that legal expenses were paid for some people who had been acquitted and not for others. I received the same blockage from that group as my colleague Senator Berntson is receiving here.

Is there not some code or rule or something that guides a decision to pay or not pay legal expenses? There must be something. Sinclair Stevens had his legal expenses paid, just to give one non-partisan example. There is something really puzzling here. There must be some guidelines. These people cannot just be tossed aside for personal or political reasons, as my friend has said.

Senator Fairbairn: Honourable senators, I hear what my honourable colleague is saying. That is what I am trying to find out.

CANADIAN HERITAGE

REMARKS OF MINISTER ON PREVIOUS CUTBACKS AT CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Donald H. Oliver: Honourable senators, my question is for the Leader of the Government in the Senate. Someone has handed me a quotation from the Minister of Canadian Heritage in relation to funding of the CBC. When Ms Copps was in opposition, she stated the following during a debate in the House of Commons:

...the impact of the CBC cutbacks will be directly felt in terms of lost jobs for artists across Canada. There are 414,000 Canadians — 4 per cent of the Canadian work force — who are directly or indirectly working in arts-related fields. I consider the cutbacks a direct attack on jobs for Canadians.

Does the Leader of the Government agree with this statement by her colleague the Minister of Canadian Heritage while she was in opposition?

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, as a government, we have had to deal with a very difficult financial situation in this country. With considerable regret, we have been forced to undertake a series of spending cuts across all sectors. With great regret, the CBC has had to take a major cut of its own. I take no joy in that. I know my colleague the Minister of Canadian Heritage takes no joy in it either. We have undertaken our responsibilities as a government to try to bring our financial situation to order.

The CBC is going through an agonizing time right now. I believe the people within the CBC are trying to the very best of their ability to carry out the cutbacks in a most responsible way.

[Translation]

EFFECTS OF LAYOFFS ON THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF FRANCOPHONES OUTSIDE QUEBEC

Hon. Pierre Claude Nolin: Honourable senators, on the subject of the CBC cuts, we heard last evening, and read in this morning's papers, that the coalitions and associations of francophones outside Quebec are claiming that their constitutional rights may be affected by the layoffs at the CBC.

What is the government's position on this possible infringement of francophones' constitutional rights?

[English]

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, no, I am not in a position to do that. I would need to familiarize myself to a greater extent on the extent of the cutbacks in francophone broadcasting service within the CBC outside Quebec. I will try to do that for my honourable friend, but I cannot answer his question today.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

HARMONIZATION WITH PROVINCIAL SALES TAXES— RESULTANT INCREASE IN COST OF BASIC NECESSITIES— GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. J. Michael Forrestall: Honourable senators, over the last month or so, there have been a lot of busy answers with respect to what the GST and the blended tax is all about. We have been persuaded and urged to consider it every which way we might, although not to consider it as a tax provision but, rather, to take the more charitable description given to it by government.

A moment or so ago, I had occasion to look up the word "tax" in the Oxford dictionary. It is defined as:

a contribution to state revenue compulsorily levied on individuals, property, or businesses...a strain or heavy demand; an oppressive or burdensome obligation...impose a tax on (persons or goods etc.)

It is quite a lengthy definition, as one might imagine. Before we go home at the end of this year, I wish to ask the Leader of the Government in the Senate how she would describe a 15-per-cent increase in home heating fuels, in domestic electricity? How would she describe that if it is imposed by government or, indeed, by any force? How would she describe that other than as a tax?

• (1020)

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, we have had this discussion before. To the best of my ability, I have tried to indicate to my honourable friend what has occurred in the three provinces in Atlantic Canada. For what they believe to be very valid and positive reasons, they have chosen to harmonize their provincial sales taxes with the federal tax. I have indicated to him that this arrangement will provide benefits — some in the short term and some in the long term — to those provinces and to the people of those provinces.

Obviously, because of the nature of the tax that was brought in — and my honourable friend knows where the GST came from — it did not come from us —

Senator Forrestall: We did not promise to tear it up, though!

Senator Fairbairn: — the tax harmonization will generally reduce tax levels, although in some cases there will be increases. I am not arguing that point with my honourable friend. I regret it. I am sure everyone does. However, through the harmonization system, that is what will take place.

Overall, the benefits to the three provinces — Newfoundland, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia — are considered substantial. They have been negotiated with intense care and consideration by these provinces. The Minister of Finance is still hard at work on this issue — and I see my honourable friend smiling — and it remains his hope and intent that this harmonization will carry across the country to form a national harmonized tax.

Senator Forrestall: Honourable senators, whether or not it will come to fruition across the country remains to be seen. We have all seen what happened to Prince Edward Island. While that province hardly contains half of the Canadian population, nevertheless it is still a source for concern.

The concern goes a bit further. The government's undertaking to the Canadian people, the holding out of the promise that the rate drop as a result of harmonization will be returned to the consumer through the price tags on the goods over the counter, is wearing a little thin now. Canadian businesses are already filing notice with the public, and more important, with their employees, that they may have to close their doors in 1997 because of the burden of the costs of implementing the new regime.

Has the government any new figures that they might leave with us at year's end as to the percentage of revenues that may be returned to the consumer?

Senator Fairbairn: No, I do not have that figure, Senator Forrestall. I know the stories and reports to which the honourable senator refers.

We must remember that implementation is not to take place until next April, and it is difficult to place hard numbers on the situation until it does. However, I think my honourable friend does know that ministers in the three provinces that have come into harmonization have made statements to the effect that they will be working closely with businesses and will endeavour to be as flexible as possible to create a smooth transition that will cause businesses not to close but to continue and to prosper.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

A BILL TO CHANGE THE NAMES OF CERTAIN ELECTORAL DISTRICTS

CONCURRENCE BY COMMONS IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

The Hon. the Speaker, informed the Senate that a message had been received from the House of Commons returning

Bill C-347, to change the names of certain electoral districts, and acquainting the Senate that they have agreed to the amendments made by the Senate to this bill without further amendment.

INTER-PARLIAMENTARY UNION

CONFERENCE ON THE IMPACT OF LAND MINES—CONFERENCE ON UNITED NATIONS REFORMS—WORLD FOOD SUMMIT CONFERENCE—NOTICE OF INQUIRY

Leave having been given to revert to Notices of Inquiries:

Hon. Peter Bosa: Honourable senators, I give notice that at the next sitting of the Senate, I will draw the attention of honourable senators to an IPU conference that took place on October 22 at the United Nations in New York on the impact of land mines, support of the United Nations and United Nations reforms; and to a Parliamentarians Day at the World Food Summit Conference in Rome which took place on November 15, 1996.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

CANADA ELECTIONS ACT PARLIAMENT OF CANADA ACT REFERENDUM ACT

BILL TO AMEND—THIRD READING—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. John G. Bryden moved third reading of Bill C-63, to amend the Canada Elections Act, the Parliament of Canada Act and the Referendum Act.

The Hon. the Speaker: It is moved by the Honourable Senator Bryden, seconded by the Honourable Senator Pearson, that the bill be read the third time now. Is it your pleasure, honourable senators, to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Hon. Lowell Murray: No. Honourable senators, I was given to understand that the Honourable Senator Bryden was to speak to this matter. If he does not do so, I certainly will.

Do I understand correctly that the honourable senator is to speak to his third reading motion?

Sensor Bryden: Yes, Senator Murray. I just needed to change my spectacles.

Honourable senators, in rising to speak on third reading of Bill C-63, I want to acknowledge, first, that there were three very helpful speeches on second reading by Senators Murray, Oliver and Tkachuk. I say that not just to be nice, although at this time of year, that is a consideration too. Their speeches flagged various areas of concern and permitted the witnesses and experts who appeared before the committee the opportunity to address most, if not all, of those concerns, in many instances to everyone's satisfaction.

The importance of the committee deliberations was underscored at the very beginning by the appearance of the Honourable Herb Gray, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Solicitor General of Canada, and one of Canada's most experienced and respected parliamentarians. He did not send the parliamentary secretary or other representative, as he could have done. He spent almost two hours with us and, I believe, addressed all the issues of principle in the bill and, in the process, all the questions of concern to honourable senators.

• (1030)

Indeed, he may have assured Senator Murray his place in the hereafter — only for past political sins and not for the ones he may be about to commit. As a result of Senator Murray's question on the issue first raised by Jan Brown, M.P., the minister's instinctive reaction to the ineligibility of missionaries and others who are absent from Canada for more than five years caused the Chief Electoral Officer of Canada to obtain legal advice that will broaden his interpretation of that section of the Elections Act. Therefore, in the future, the five years will be consecutive, and the time will begin to run each time a person returns and leaves Canada, whether the return to Canada is for one year or merely a two-week vacation.

Next, we had not one but two sessions with the Chief Electoral Officer, Mr. Kingsley, and his officials. They took us step by step through the process that led up to the bill, the extensive planning that has been done, and the procedures that are in place to assure the smooth and timely implementation of the bill if it becomes law.

On that same day, the Broadcasting Arbitrator answered our questions on the application of the Broadcasting Act in the shortened election period contemplated by the bill.

On Wednesday, we heard from two experts: Professor Courtney, who expressed his reservations on whether a continuing electors register would be as accurate and cost effective as the present system, and Mr. Neufeld, who has spent his career dealing with automation and other issues in election situations. Mr. Neufeld expressed complete confidence that what is being contemplated in Bill C-63 is necessary, doable, and very accurate and cost effective.

Yesterday, Mr. Côté, the Chief Electoral Officer of Quebec, at his request, gave us the benefit of the Quebec experience in

building a register of electors, and indicated his willingness to cooperate with Elections Canada to their mutual advantage.

Finally, in this regard, all of the committee members were very astute in their questions and constructive in their criticisms, and everyone benefited from that.

Fundamentally, the bill would do three things: It would set up a permanent register of voters; it would shorten the election period from a minimum of 47 days to a minimum of 36; and it would adopt a staggered voting schedule so that the polls in Western Canada would close more or less at the same time as the polls in the East.

While some people have raised various questions about how the 36-day election period would work, it is fair to say that, overall, that proposition enjoys general support.

With respect to the standard voting schedule, concerns have been expressed by some senators over the late opening of the polls in Quebec and Ontario, and the early closing of polls in the west, likely in British Columbia. Saying that in itself demonstrates the difficulty before us with a country that spans six time zones. We all recognize that every Canadian must have equal access to voting, which means the polls cannot be open longer in some provinces or time zones than in others. From there, we must simply balance fundamentally competing concerns.

The compromise before us is a good one. There is ample time in each time zone, either before work in the morning or after work in the evening, for people to vote. The bill requires employers to give employees three hours off to vote. It is fair to say that, while we certainly discussed this issue in committee, this is a compromise that we can all accept.

Most of our meetings centred on the permanent register of electors and how it will work. The register of electors is to be established by one final door-to-door enumeration in all provinces except Alberta and Prince Edward Island. In those provinces, the register will be established with voters lists from the recent — and by that I mean within the past year — enumerations conducted there. The register will then be updated and maintained by Elections Canada in the ways I will describe.

The concern expressed by Senator Lynch-Staunton yesterday at the end of the hearings was whether we can be confident that, with this new system, we will continue to enjoy our traditional high-participation rate on polling day. He is worried that our list of electors on polling day may not be as complete as the list we currently have through door-to-door enumeration. All of the indications we received in committee were that these concerns are unfounded. In British Columbia, the only province that currently has a permanent voters list, the voter turnout at provincial elections "has consistently been as high as or higher than for federal elections," and this from the testimony of Mr. Neufeld.

Senator Lynch-Staunton was concerned that a permanent register of electors necessarily gets out of date. I believe his concern was that, over time, the register might not be as complete and accurate a picture of the Canadian electorate as we presently obtain from an election period door-to-door enumeration.

However — and I think this is a terribly important point over which it is easy to become confused — the register of electors is not the list of electors for polling day. As the Lortie commission wrote in their report when discussing the feasibility and value of a permanent voters list:

The current approach assumes that an enumeration must be as complete as possible if voter registration is to achieve full coverage. This ignores the fact that revision and election day registration are integral components of a comprehensive process of registration.... Revision and election day registration acknowledge that, inevitably, there are voters who must be added to voters lists following any initial attempt to obtain the names and addresses of most voters.

In fact, while the register of electors, minus certain information — that being the gender and date of birth — becomes the preliminary list of electors during an election period, that list of electors then goes through several successive revisions before the final list of electors voting on polling day is generated. Indeed, the bill contains a number of provisions geared specifically for a comprehensive revision process and full, election day registration.

In his presentation to the committee, Minister Gray assured us that the voters list that results “will be as accurate, and more so, as the lists used in the 1993 election.” In 1993, honourable senators will recall, no door-to-door enumeration was conducted. Instead, the base list was obtained from the 1992 referendum voters list and then updated during the 1993 election. We were told that, in 1993, the revisions brought the final list up to the same quality as that achieved with a door-to-door enumeration process — that is, 95 per cent of qualified voters were on the final list.

I am satisfied that, come the next election day, we will have our customary high percentage of voters entered on the voters list. However, I am also pleased to note that the preliminary list of electors, which will be available within five days of the election call and distributed to candidates and political parties, should also be a powerful tool because of its availability that early in the campaign. That list is what will be, in effect, the register of voters for that election.

The continuing register of electors will be maintained and kept up to date by Elections Canada, even outside of an electoral event. Here is where we will be able to take advantage of the sophistication of modern technology. Elections Canada described

to us the extensive work and studies that went into their decision as to the best databases to use to maintain and update the register. They told us that their four criteria were accuracy, currency, coverage and accessibility. They then ran simulated exercises using lists of electors established for events held after 1993 and compared them to Elections Canada lists updated with various data sources. They conducted surveys in all provinces and territories to determine whether the results from their tests could be replicated across the country. They subsequently corroborated their findings with actual data that they received from other provinces. They assessed the accessibility of the data and confirmed that there were no legislative or administrative impediments to using provincial data.

In the result, they decided to use Revenue Canada data for address changes and new 18-year-olds; data from provincial motor vehicle offices also for address changes and new 18-year-olds; provincial vital statistics offices to record deaths; and Citizenship and Immigration Canada for particulars on new citizens. We learned yesterday that discussions are ongoing to use the Quebec register to retrieve the same information from Quebec.

• (1040)

Senator Oliver raised a number of questions to ensure that all privacy concerns are protected and respected. The committee was satisfied that privacy concerns have been thoroughly and properly addressed in this bill. For example, the bill is very clear that an elector's consent is required before one may access the Revenue Canada information. The bill is also very clear in limiting the purposes for which the information on the register can be used. In this regard, we were told that political parties have been provided regular access to electronic copies of the data held in British Columbia voter registers since 1984.

We were told by Mr. Neufield that, to the best of his knowledge, there has never been a complaint about any misuse of this data. There were also no complaints — of which we were made aware, at least — about misuse of the federal electronic voters lists that were available to political parties following the 1992 referendum and to parties and candidates during the 1993 general election.

An issue that has caused significant concern to some senators is the degree of confidence that Elections Canada would be permitted to gain access to the data needed to maintain the register properly. In particular, Senators Murray and Lynch-Staunton were concerned that Elections Canada might find itself unable to conclude the necessary provincial agreements. They wanted to see concrete proof in the form of signed agreements before supporting passage of the bill. They acknowledged that a number of agreements with provincial departments and offices are formalized and in place, but some remain to be concluded.

Mr. Kingsley told the committee that this is something of a chicken-and-egg situation. Indeed, we saw a concrete demonstration of this when the Quebec chief electoral officer testified yesterday. He told us emphatically of his intention to sign a formal agreement with the Chief Electoral Officer of Canada, agreeing to share the provincial electors list which, in Quebec, will be the very best source of up-to-date information on electors. He is only waiting for this bill to be passed so that the Chief Electoral Officer of Canada, Mr. Kingsley, will have the necessary legislative authority.

All the evidence the committee heard led to the conclusion that the provinces support the idea of a permanent voters' register. They are looking forward to benefiting from it and the substantial cost savings they could enjoy. They are perfectly prepared to participate in maintaining the list. Certainly, we heard no evidence at all to the contrary.

I asked Mr. Kingsley, as an officer of Parliament and the person in the organization responsible for this most central aspect of our democracy, if he is satisfied that he can implement the proposals contained in the bill and keep the list up to date for the purposes of conducting an electoral event if the bill passes within the time frame that he needs to get the system up and running. He assured us — indeed, he assured all parliamentarians in this chamber and in the other place — that:

...if ever there were a government bill that proposed something that I could not implement, I would say so and I would say so publicly at a committee hearing like this.

Senator Lynch-Staunton asked him for clarification, whether he meant he was confident that he would get those agreements that he had not yet reached. Mr. Kingsley emphatically replied, "Yes, sir, I am."

The final issue that appeared to concern some senators was whether the projected cost savings are accurate. Senator Nolin dealt with that at some length in committee. Some wondered if the new system would end up costing significantly more than is now suggested.

On this point, I was particularly impressed by the testimony of Mr. Neufeld. He has been involved in a very hands-on way with the administration of elections and the development of electoral systems since 1982. He also has concrete experience with a permanent voters list in British Columbia. He is very familiar with the capabilities and limitations of existing technologies.

We were told by Elections Canada officials that the annual maintenance of the register will cost 25 cents per elector. Conducting an enumeration for an election, we were told, costs about \$3 per elector.

Of course, there are other factors to look at in assessing the savings of one system over another. There will likely be some costs associated with using provincial lists that update the register, et cetera, but you can see the striking comparison in

these figures. We were so struck by this that we asked Mr. Neufeld his opinion on whether Elections Canada's estimate, that 25-cent figure, was optimistic. His reply was clear. Mr. Neufeld said that Elections Canada: "...may even be able to do it cheaper than that." He added that, in creating the various scenarios of cost savings, Elections Canada consistently erred on the side of caution. He told us:

Where they could not be sure, they would put in what I thought were generous contingency figures. A lot of their figures were based on extremely careful research that they did during the summer of 1995.

Overall, we were told that the government has projected savings to taxpayers of over \$130 million through the next six federal elections. As provinces and territories begin to share the register, the savings to taxpayers will increase.

I am satisfied that this is a good bill. It is the result of many years of study and elaborate feasibility and other testing by Elections Canada. It meets all of the tests set out by the Lortie commission for a voters' register.

Honourable senators, for years the Canadian people have been demanding a shorter and more efficient election program. The Lortie commission recommended it. The Chief Electoral Officer of the Parliament of Canada is committed to bringing the program contained in Bill C-63 in on time and on budget. We will save approximately \$30 million at each election.

Nevertheless, it would appear that those opposite have made a campaign decision to use whatever devices they can to attempt to prevent this from happening and to continue to require the Chief Electoral Officer to spend \$30 million more than necessary to run the next election.

To them it may be only \$30 million, but do they have any idea how much food and clothing \$30 million provides for children; how much shelter \$30 million would provide to the homeless; what a contribution \$30 million would make to providing new search and rescue helicopters? I know as well as anyone in this chamber that an election is coming, but, senators, so is Christmas. Let us take note of that.

• (1050)

I would urge all honourable senators to do the right thing for the Canadian people and not what may be politically expedient for any party.

I ask all honourable senators to support the bill.

Senator Murray: Honourable senators, with regard to the closing remarks of my honourable friend, I agree with the statements made by the Honourable Herb Gray in the committee that the effect of this bill is neutral among political parties. Whatever criticism we on this side may have about this bill, it is not motivated by any sentiment whatsoever that the bill puts our party at a disadvantage or, indeed, any of the political parties.

There have been elections, as we all know, in which the incumbent government might have done better with a longer writ or might have done better with a shorter writ, and there have been many elections in which the length of the writ really did not matter at all; the result was preordained.

The present government may well believe that a 36-day writ is in its interest. Perhaps it will prove to be so. However, if the Prime Minister continues to trip himself up with the assistance of some of his colleagues, as they have been doing lately, they may find that the 36 days is too short to recover in the next election.

Senator Oliver: That is a good point.

Senator Murray: That having been said, honourable senators, I simply wish to make a few remarks now, and then propose the adjournment of the debate so that I can complete my speech on Monday.

The purpose of this bill, as we all know, is to make several significant and quite complex changes to our elections law and, therefore, to the functioning of our electoral democracy. There is a fundamental importance to the subject-matter, which is unique. The Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs has been labouring under some time constraints with regard to this bill. Admittedly, some time constraints have been artificially imposed. The government, instead of awaiting the pleasure of Parliament to determine what date the amendments would come into force, has decided that the amendments should come into force on April 1, 1997. Parliament has been asked to accommodate that schedule by passing this bill before Christmas in order to give the authorities three months' lead time to prepare for the implementation of the bill.

Further to that, they have included a notwithstanding clause in the bill. As we all know, the Elections Act presently provides that no amendment to the act can take effect in any election called less than six months after the passage of the amendment. However, the notwithstanding clause in Bill C-63 provides for the amendments to take effect three months after passage of the bill or, indeed, earlier. That is one of the time constraints, albeit artificially imposed, that we have been labouring under in the chamber and in committee.

There is the added issue to which Senator Bryden has referred, namely, that we are getting close to the Christmas recess and we are all somewhat under the gun.

I will pay a well-deserved compliment to the chairman of the committee, Senator Carstairs. The work she did in organizing the business of the committee, given the time constraints that we were labouring under, has been a little short of miraculous.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

Senator Murray: Senator Carstairs correctly anticipated the wishes of honourable senators, particularly opposition senators, as to witnesses we might want to hear. She scheduled the witnesses into every conceivably available time slot. She arranged for extra meetings of the committee when extra meetings seemed necessary. She obtained documents when we wanted documents. It was a most impressive performance on the part of the chairman of the committee.

Within the committee, it is fair to say that the atmosphere was never tense, highly charged or partisan. This is a subject on which just about everyone wishes to be heard. Given time constraints, this is often the situation, and it is quite a challenge to the skills of the presiding officer. Senator Carstairs rose to that challenge, and I would express our appreciation to her and through her to her staff and the staff of the committee. We have all had experiences on committees that have been less than satisfactory and less than agreeable. This experience has been satisfactory and agreeable in every way.

I will agree with Senator Bryden that we were able to get on the record all the evidence that I think we needed to get on the record with regard to this bill. He interprets that evidence in a way far different from my interpretation and puts a spin on it that can only be regarded as self-serving for the government. However, I will come to that in due course.

Continuing on a positive note, I wish to acknowledge, as Senator Bryden has done, the progress that we made in the committee in resolving the problem to which I referred in the debate on second reading, that is, the problem posed by the disenfranchisement of quite a number of Canadian religious missionaries serving overseas. They were deemed to have been absent from the country for more than five years, even if they returned from time to time to their home congregation.

As Senator Bryden has said, Mr. Gray's response was that perhaps that section of the act was being interpreted in an unduly restrictive way. Later, we had an opportunity to explore that matter with Mr. Kingsley and Mr. Girard, his legal advisor. The outcome was that we obtained a written opinion on the matter which goes a long way to meeting our concerns.

The outcome of those discussions has been entirely satisfactory and reflects well on the Senate, the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs, Mr. Gray and Elections Canada. I thank them for that.

Honourable senators, that is as much as I need or want to say for the moment. Therefore, I would move the adjournment of the debate and resume my speech when the Senate meets on Monday.

On motion of Senator Murray, debate adjourned.

MANGANESE-BASED FUEL ADDITIVES BILL

SECOND READING

On the Order:

Resuming the debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Kenny, seconded by the Honourable Senator Bonnell, for the second reading of Bill C-29, to regulate interprovincial trade in and the importation for commercial purposes of certain manganese-based substances.

Hon. Eric Arthur Berntson (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, yesterday Senator Kinsella asked: What are the public policy principles that underlie this bill? I do not think there is any easy answer to that question.

• (1100)

Last evening, on CBC television, we were reminded of the Rio Conference in 1992. We were shown how the Canadian government is not living up to the agreement made by the previous government. Yesterday, Senator Kinsella quoted from Agenda 21. He piqued my interest, and this morning I found another interesting passage. Section 2.10(b) of Agenda 21 states:

The international community should: Provide for an equitable, secure, non-discriminatory and predictable international trading system.

Bill C-29 and Liberal ministers in charge of this file are again in contravention of an established international norm. Indeed, a NAFTA challenge is sure to be launched should this bill become law.

Section 6.40(d) of Agenda 21 reads:

...objectives are: To identify and compile, as appropriate, the necessary statistical information on health effects to support cost/benefit analysis, including environmental health impact assessment for pollution control, prevention and abatement measures.

This is an important point, honourable senators. It is worth considering the kinds of input that came into the offices of the two successive ministers of the environment. I think we all know the difficulty that Senator MacDonald had, during the Pearson airport inquiry, in getting the government to produce its legal and technical rationale for attempting to deny access to the courts. I hope that sort of thing will not be a problem in this important environmental matter.

It would be instructive for us here to learn of some considerations that convinced both Minister Copps and Minister Marchi to embrace this piece of legislation that would essentially

ban a substance that, presumably, increases fuel efficiency and reduces nitrous oxide emissions coming out of tailpipes of approximately 14 million cars in Canada.

The Senate committee should, at some point in its deliberations, ascertain why the government became willing to go so far as to invoke closure on the debate of this increasingly odd bill, not once but twice.

We were told by the Minister of the Environment in his press release of April 18, 1996:

The bottom line for me, as Minister of the Environment, is the potential negative effect on the health of Canadians...

That is a laudable statement; in fact, a necessary one, but the Senate committee should ensure that there is some merit to the measure that two successive ministers have chosen to improve the health of Canadians. We must raise the questions that, to date, this government has refused to answer. Its response in the other place to some legitimate concerns was to invoke closure on the debate. In an appearance before the House of Commons Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development on May 14, 1996, Minister Marchi said:

I can say that I don't get too many questions in the House on the environment. Thank God, perhaps because otherwise I would be in trouble.

It is high time questions were put and answers given.

It is unclear whether the government is serious about its public health claims. Indeed, a memorandum from the Assistant Deputy Minister of Health Protection Branch at Health Canada to the members of the joint government-industry Committee on Transportation, Fuels and Motor Vehicle Control Technologies casts some reasonable doubt on the government claim that it is pursuing passage of this bill based on real concern about the presumably harmful effects of the manganese-based fuel additive.

There is little doubt that manganese is a dangerous substance. However, all evidence, to my knowledge, suggests that MMT is not the cause of the high and dangerous levels of manganese in such places as Hamilton, Ontario. I am concerned that we do not know enough about the levels of ambient manganese in Ontario. Indeed, when my office commenced an initial examination of this matter, I came to learn that the highest level of manganese in Canada does indeed exist in Hamilton.

A related item, and one I hope the Senate committee will delve into at some point in its necessary studies, is the need for scientific information and up-to-date statistical data on our communities across the country. That should be of concern to everyone.

I was struck by something Senator Kenny said on Tuesday in his opening remarks. With regard to air quality information, he said that 1994 is the last year for which we have reasonable statistics. I stand to be corrected, but there is information of a more recent vintage. It is the statistical information my office received from the head of the Air Toxics Section of the Pollution Measurement Division of the Environment Technology Centre at Environment Canada. The information provides a snapshot of the air quality of the following cities: Halifax, Saint John, Montreal, Ottawa, Toronto, Windsor, Winnipeg, Edmonton, Calgary, Vancouver and Victoria for both summers and winters from 1993 to 1995.

When this data is considered in tandem with the August 15, 1994 memorandum from the Assistant Deputy of Health, Protection Branch of Health Canada to the members of the joint government-industry Committee on Transport Fuels and Motor Vehicle Control Technologies, the health issue which both Minister Copps and Minister Marchi have told us is the bottom line becomes very murky.

The memorandum states:

Data on respirable manganese in individual cities from the NAPS database indicates very stable or decreasing levels of manganese from 1986 to 1992, in spite of substantial increases in sales of MMT in Canada during that time.

I have received as well some data for the city of Hamilton of which senators opposite will be interested to receive copies.

It is striking that, while the information from all the other cities in Canada is quite current, the data for Hamilton is only available for the summer of 1994. From my preliminary examination of this data, it is apparent even to me, someone with no scientific background, that Hamiltonians are at the greatest risk of all Canadians from ambient manganese. In fact, Hamilton's manganese level would appear to be the highest in all of Canada.

It should be of great concern to us all that information on the city with the highest levels — dangerous levels — of manganese concentrations is so difficult to obtain. When our side inquired about the absence of data on Hamilton's air quality, I was informed that, during recent government cutbacks, the processing of manganese data was done on a priority basis for Environment Canada and the manganese levels for Hamilton were not now considered to be of high priority.

• (1110)

One might reasonably assume that the then Minister of the Environment, who happens to represent a Hamilton riding, would have commissioned a special and intensive study on this obvious public health concern. When one considers the health principle of this bill, along with the precautionary principle, one must be struck by the minister's odd selection of air quality priorities.

One is confronted with the possibility that this bill is in fact not about the precautionary principle. The shelving of politically sensitive air quality data appears to have occurred. We should ascertain if that, indeed, is the case.

I must express my grave concern about this discrepancy in the basic air quality data because it has been brought to my attention that the former Minister of the Environment was informed by the Industrial Sector Branch of Environment Canada on October 24, 1994, that:

With respect to health impacts of manganese, there are areas in Canada, for example, near steel making facilities in Hamilton and Sault Ste. Marie, where airborne manganese levels sometimes exceed the concentrations that Health Canada would consider safe. These elevated levels of manganese are not caused by MMT in gasoline but by the industrial steel making sources.

Many might note the apparent coincidence between the timing of the memorandum to the minister regarding dangerous levels of manganese in Hamilton and the lack of public access to pertinent air quality data in Hamilton.

Last month, the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment approved in principle an accord designed to lead to improved and more consistent environmental protection across Canada.

The Hon. the Speaker: I am sorry to interrupt the honourable senator, but the allotted time has expired. Is leave granted for the honourable senator to continue, honourable senators?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Senator Berntson: I thank honourable senators.

The Canada-wide Accord on Environmental Harmonization envisions governments working in partnership to achieve the highest level of environmental quality for all Canadians. Its objectives are to enhance environmental protection, promote sustainable development and achieve greater effectiveness and accountability by governments charged with environmental management.

One of the key principles agreed to last month was that environmental measures should be performance-based, results-oriented and science-based. How well does Bill C-29 adhere to this principle?

Many here will recall the historic Agreement on Internal Trade which was signed by the First Ministers on July 18, 1994. On Canada Day 1995, the agreement came into force. Rule 3 of that agreement states:

No obstacles — require governments to ensure that their policies and practices do not have the effect of creating obstacles to trade.

Does Bill C-29 respects this rule?

Honourable senators, I know there are compelling arguments on both sides of this question. Most of the arguments I have heard are not supported by independent analysis or scientific study. For instance, as we already know, we have "big oil" on one side and "big Ottawa" on the other.

There are many other interested groups. One of them is the Learning Disabilities Association, an organization of which I have the honour to be a life-time member, having done lots of work with them. They have taken a position on this bill. I hope it is a well-informed position. I will be meeting with them soon.

What we are talking about here is health, safety and the environment for our generation and generations to come and, indeed, a healthy global environment. This is an important question. I do not think it is one about which we can afford to guess. We had better be sure.

I look forward to this bill being referred to committee where we will, hopefully, uncover some independent scientific support for one side or the other. That is where the answer lies. It does not lie in aligning oneself with the most successful lobbyists.

Hon. Colin Kenny: Honourable senators —

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

Senator Kenny: Honourable senators, before I move that the bill be referred to committee, I wish to ask a question of my honourable friend opposite.

Does the honourable senator agree that the preliminary purpose of the bill is to ensure that on-board diagnostic equipment will function properly in the future so that vehicles that emit pollution will no longer be produced? If that is the case, is it not worth removing magnesium if it is the cause of the failure of such equipment?

Senator Berntson: Honourable senators, I am told that one of the arguments put forward by the automobile sector is that this does foul their onboard diagnostic equipment. I am told that one small sensor in the tailpipe is the culprit. Perhaps the proper course of action should be to design a sensor that does not get gummed up with MMT. I agree that these on-board systems must work. If we are concerned about the environment perhaps banning MMT is the right way to go in any event. The single, per unit, most offensive greenhouse gas is nitrous oxide. The use of MMT reduces nitrous oxide emissions from automobiles.

Senator Kenny: Would my honourable friend not agree that there are other substitutes for MMT that are equally cost effective and perform the job as well?

Senator Berntson: I know that there are other substitutes.

• (1120)

I do not think we can afford gasohol. The gasohol organizations with which I am familiar must have an 8 cent subsidy per litre to make it work. If gasohol becomes broadly based in the government, I do not know if government will find that 8 cents a litre for a much larger market. I am not sure you will see much growth in gasohol, although I know many farmers who see this as a great opportunity, and I wish them well.

I am not familiar with the other petroleum-based additives with which they are working in Alberta, but I am not convinced that we have the independent, scientific data on them showing that they would meet our concerns any better than MMT.

Motion agreed to and bill read second time.

MOTION TO REFER BILL TO COMMITTEE

Hon. Colin Kenny: Honourable senators, I move that this bill be referred to the Standing Senate Committee on Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources.

MOTION IN AMENDMENT

Hon. Noël A. Kinsella: Honourable senators, on the motion to refer this bill to the Standing Senate Committee on Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources, I have no objection; indeed, I support the principle that we send this bill to that committee. However, as I argued yesterday, it is my view that a preliminary analysis must be conducted in order for honourable senators to be in a position to be able to make an evaluation of the bill.

Therefore, I move, seconded by the Honourable Senator Oliver, that the motion be amended by adding the following thereto:

, and

That notwithstanding Rule 98, the Committee present an interim report, before submitting its final report on the Bill, relating to its findings on the following questions:

1. Is MMT-based petroleum the cause of OBD malfunctioning?
2. Does MMT in gas cause a health hazard to Canadians?
3. Does MMT in gas cause direct damage to the environment?

The Hon. the Speaker: Is it your pleasure, honourable senators, to adopt the motion in amendment?

Hon. Colin Kenny: Honourable senators, this is not, in my view, a reasonable amendment to my motion. I have already had discussions with the honourable senator opposite regarding the study that he wishes to conduct. In fact, I have asked him if he would be kind enough to write the terms of reference for the study he would like to have. I also indicated that we would like to proceed with that study today.

The committee is well equipped to handle all of these matters, and it is within the prerogative of the committee, of which he is not a member, to examine this bill thoroughly and entirely. I do not object to his questions, and am happy to have the committee deal with them. I think that is fair and appropriate. However, I also think the committee should be allowed to do its work in its normal fashion and report back to this chamber. The idea of imposing upon the committee an interim report before it can go ahead with its final report is an unnecessary requirement, and I cannot support this amendment.

I might add that I am surprised, inasmuch as I was speaking with the honourable senator a moment ago about trying to facilitate this very study, that he did not have the courtesy to mention this proposal to me. He is entitled to move anything he wants. In all good faith, I approached him and the office of the chairman of the committee to see if we could get a study on this matter moving forward. As we speak, my staff are meeting with Senator Ghitter's staff to see whether we can deal with Senator Kinsella's concerns.

To come to this house now and mandate an interim report before we can go on with our regular report is irregular and inappropriate and certainly does not have my support. Our committee should be able to deal with this matter fairly and openly and completely, in the normal course of events.

POINT OF ORDER

Hon. Eymard G. Corbin: Honourable senators, I rise on a point of order regarding the amendment presented by Senator Kinsella. I know he would only be too glad if I were wrong one more time, as he usually says, but I do not mind standing up and challenging the rules or their interpretation.

In my opinion, the amendment presented by Senator Kinsella breaches rule 58 of the *Rules of the Senate*. He does, in a certain way, indirectly what should be done properly and formally in another way.

Rule 58(1) reads:

One day's notice shall be given of any of the following motions:

There then follows a list of motions. One of the motions which requires one-day's notice — and notice can only be given at the appropriate time in our proceedings — concerns an instruction to a committee.

The amendment presented by Senator Kinsella is indeed an instruction for the committee to report before it completes its regular and normal examination of the bill.

The argument can be made that an amendment can be presented at any time about anything. However, strictly speaking, one then must ask why we have rule 58(1) requiring one day's notice.

I should like Your Honour to tell us whether Senator Kinsella's motion is indeed in order or does it, in fact, contravene the spirit of rule 58(1) in terms of the requirement of one day's notice and rule 58(1)(f) in respect to an instruction to a committee.

• (1130)

Hon. Noël A. Kinsella: Honourable senators, I would speak to the point of order —

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I did not understand Senator Kenny to be raising a point of order. Rather, he was disagreeing.

Senator Kinsella: Senator Corbin raised a point of order.

Senator Kenny: I was disagreeing.

The Hon. the Speaker: I understand that the point of order is that of Senator Corbin.

Senator Kinsella: To Senator Corbin's point of order, I believe that the motion in amendment which I have proposed is in order, and is consistent with the rules. I would refer His Honour to the *Journals of the Senate* of June 11, 1996, on page 344, where exactly the same procedure unfolded. I will not take the time of the house to read it.

Senator Corbin: That is with respect to what?

Senator Kinsella: It was with reference to the Term 17 resolution which we were debating. There was a motion that the bill be referred to committee, and an amendment was made by Senator Murray, seconded by Senator Robertson, that the motion be amended. That was carried.

Senator Corbin: The motion was to be amended in what way? You are arguing here. Give us the facts.

Senator Kinsella: The motion in amendment by Senator Doody, and seconded by myself, was to the effect that the bill be not now adopted but that the bill be referred to the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs. After debate, in amendment Senator Murray moved, seconded by Senator Robertson, that the motion be further amended to authorize the committee to permit electronic coverage of its public proceedings with the least possible disruption of the hearings; to instruct the committee to travel to Newfoundland and Labrador to hear representations on the proposed constitutional amendment; to instruct the committee to present its report no later than September 30, 1996; and also to authorize the committee to deposit its report with the Clerk of the Senate if the Senate was not then sitting, and to deem the said report as having been tabled in the chamber. Those were the several elements that were added to the motion to refer the matter to the committee.

The Hon. the Speaker: Are there any other honourable senators who wish to speak to the point of order?

If no other honourable senator wishes to speak to the point of order, I will take the matter under advisement.

Hon. Donald H. Oliver: Honourable senators, I wish to speak on the amendment.

The Hon. the Speaker: I am sorry, the matter before us now is the point of order. I cannot entertain speeches on the motion in amendment.

Debate adjourned to await the ruling of the Speaker.

INTERNAL ECONOMY, BUDGETS AND ADMINISTRATION

THIRTEENTH REPORT OF COMMITTEE ADOPTED

The Senate proceeded to consideration of the thirteenth report of the Standing Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration (*budget—Transport and Communications Committee*) presented in the Senate on December 12, 1996.

Hon. Colin Kenny, Chairman of the Standing Senate Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration, moved the adoption of the report.

Motion agreed to and report adopted.

ADJUDICATION OF VETERANS' PENSIONS

REPORT OF SOCIAL AFFAIRS, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE REQUESTING AUTHORIZATION TO ENGAGE SERVICES AND TRAVEL ADOPTED

The Senate proceeded to consideration of the eleventh report of the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology (*budget—study on adjudication of pensions by the Department of Veterans Affairs*), presented in the Senate on December 12, 1996.

Hon. Mabel M. DeWare, Chair of the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology, moved the adoption of the report.

Motion agreed to and report adopted.

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. Noël A. Kinsella: Honourable senators, I do wish to speak to this matter, but I have lost my notes. I would ask leave to revert a little later.

Hon. Gérald-A. Beaudoin: I have them.

Senator Kinsella: Honourable senators, we recognize that there is a long tradition of plagiarism being frowned upon by any academic of any worth at all. However, that having been noted and duly cited at the outset, I do wish to say that this important matter that Senator Beaudoin has brought to our attention should receive full consideration. There is a question of time affecting the matter. We are reminded of the great dictum from Cicero that one needs to time one's time in a timely fashion: *Tempera tempore tempora*.

MOTION IN AMENDMENT

Hon. Noel A. Kinsella: I propose then to delete that paragraph in the motion of Senator Beaudoin dated May 9, 1996, which reads as follows:

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

I propose that it be replaced by the following paragraph:

That the committee submit its final report no later than June 17, 1997; and

Hon. Donald H. Oliver: I second that motion.

The Hon. the Speaker: Is it your pleasure, honourable senators, to adopt the motion in amendment?

Some Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Senator Corbin: Explain. Why the change?

Senator Kinsella: Honourable senators, I think the motion is self-explanatory. The original motion would compel the committee, when formed, to present its report by December 15 next. It would appear that much more debate will surround the issue.

• (1140)

Effectively, we are asking for an extension of time so that when the committee is formed, it will be able to complete its work and submit a report to the Senate.

The Hon. the Speaker: It is it your pleasure, honourable senators, to adopt the motion in amendment?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

On motion of Senator Bacon, debate adjourned.

BUSINESS OF THE SENATE

TIMING OF SPEAKER'S RULING

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I have taken a point of order under advisement. If it is the wish of the Senate, we could adjourn for half an hour and then return on this point of order. My main problem is with the kind of instruction that can be given to a committee. Otherwise, if it is agreeable with the Senate, I will hand down my ruling Monday evening.

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Deputy Leader of the Government): You can do it Monday afternoon, if you wish, Your Honour.

The Hon. the Speaker: If it is agreeable, I will give my ruling the next time the Senate meets.

Senator Graham: Honourable senators, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The Senate adjourned until Monday, December 16, 1996, at 2 p.m.

THE SENATE OF CANADA
PROGRESS OF LEGISLATION
(2nd Session, 35th Parliament)
Friday, December 13, 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

No.	Title	1st	2nd	Committee	Report	Amend.	3rd	R.A.	Chap.
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
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	96/12/13						
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

No.	Title	1st	2nd	Committee	Report	Amend.	3rd	R.A.	Chap.
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
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	96/12/11	none	96/12/12		
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	96/12/12	none			
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-202	An Act respecting a National Organ Donor Week in Canada	96/12/13							
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	96/12/11	National Finance					
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	96/12/12	three	96/12/12		

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					

No.	Title	1st	2nd	Committee	Report	Amend.	3rd	R.A.	Chap.
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)					
S-10	An Act to amend the Criminal Code (criminal organization) (Sen. Roberge)	96/06/18	96/12/10	Legal & Constitutional Affairs					
S-11	An Act to amend the Excise Tax Act (Sen. Di Nino)	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							
S-14	An Act to amend the Criminal Code and the Department of Health Act (security of the child) (Sen. Carstairs)	96/12/12							

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

Friday, December 13, 1996

PAGE

PAGE

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

National Organ Donor Day Bill (Bill C-202)

First Reading. 1365

Transport and Communications

Notice of Motion to Authorize Subcommittee
on Transportation Safety to Travel. Senator Bacon 1365

QUESTION PERIOD

Justice

Refusal of Minister of Justice to Pay Legal Fees of Former Minister
of Indian Affairs and Northern Development—Request for
Answer. Senator Berntson 1365
Senator Fairbairn 1365
Senator MacDonald 1365

Canadian Heritage

Remarks of Minister on Previous Cutbacks at Canadian
Broadcasting Corporation—Government Position.
Senator Oliver 1366
Senator Fairbairn 1366
Effects of Layoffs on the Constitutional Rights of Francophones
outside of Quebec. Senator Nolin 1366
Senator Fairbairn 1366

Goods and Services Tax

Harmonization with Provincial Sales Taxes—Resultant Increase
in Cost of Basic Necessities—Government Position.
Senator Forrestall 1366
Senator Fairbairn 1366

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

A Bill to Change the Names of Certain Electoral Districts (Bill C-347)

Message from Commons. The Hon. the Speaker 1367

Inter-Parliamentary Union

Conference on the Impact of Land Mines—Conference
on United Nations Reforms—World Food Summit
Conference—Notice of Inquiry. Senator Bosa 1367

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Canada Elections Act Parliament of Canada Act Referendum Act (Bill C-63)

Bill to Amend—Third Reading—Debate Adjourned.
Senator Bryden 1367
Senator Murray 1367
Senator Oliver 1371

Manganese-based Fuel Additives Bill (Bill C-29)

Second Reading. Senator Berntson 1372
Senator Kenny 1374
Motion to Refer to Committee. Senator Kenny 1374
Motion in Amendment. Senator Kinsella 1374
Senator Kenny 1375
Point of Order. Senator Corbin 1375
Senator Kinsella 1375
Senator Oliver 1376

Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration

Thirteenth Report of Committee Adopted. Senator Kenny 1376

Adjudication of Veterans' Pensions

Report of Social Affairs, Science and Technology Committee
Requesting Authorization to Engage Services and Travel
Adopted. Senator DeWare 1376

National Unity

Motion to Appoint Special Committee—Debate Continued.
Senator Kinsella 1376
Senator Beaudoin 1376
Motion in Amendment. Senator Kinsella 1377
Senator Oliver 1377

Business of the Senate

Timing of Speaker's Ruling. The Hon. the Speaker 1377
Senator Graham 1377

Progress of Legislation i



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