



CANADA

Debates of the Senate

2nd SESSION

•

35th PARLIAMENT

•

VOLUME 136

•

NUMBER 76

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Tuesday, March 4, 1997

**THE HONOURABLE GILDAS L. MOLGAT
SPEAKER**

This issue contains the latest listing of Officers of the Senate, the Ministry,
Senators and Members of the Senate and Joint Committees.

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

Tuesday, March 4, 1997

The Senate met at 2 p.m., the Speaker in the chair.

Prayers.

[Translation]

SENATORS' STATEMENTS

HEALTH

CLOSING OF MONTFORT HOSPITAL IN OTTAWA

Hon. Marie-P. Poulin: Honourable senators, today we resume our work in the Senate. Like many of you, I just came back from my designated region, in my case Northern Ontario. I would like to share with you what I have heard from Franco-Ontarians. There is general consternation throughout the province.

Last week, honourable senators, we heard about the proposal by the Health Services Restructuring Commission of Ontario to close Montfort Hospital in Ottawa.

At first, one might think this: "When there is less public funding to go around, cuts are the next step. All public services in every part of this country are feeling the effects of these cuts. It is a fact of life today."

Why then, the surprise, the commotion following the announcement that Montfort Hospital will be closed? Franco-Ontarians, the medical community, teachers, the clergy, bankers, young people, the not-so-young, the business community, the unions, and politicians at all levels of government are all up in arms!

How did our colleague Senator Jean-Robert Gauthier manage to summon up the energy to tell reporters and friends from his hospital bed that closing the Montfort Hospital was unacceptable? *The Ottawa Citizen* said on March 2, and I quote:

[English]

Few have earned a greater right to speak on this issue than Gauthier, who now has extensive first-hand experience in Ottawa's hospitals.

[Translation]

This English-speaking newspaper is not the only newspaper that published articles expressing strong reactions against the proposal to close Montfort Hospital.

Chantal Hébert wrote the following in *La Presse* on March 1, and I quote:

It has always been easier for a unilingual anglo to be treated in his own language at Montfort than for a francophone to be treated in his, at the so-called bilingual Ottawa General, designated by the commission to take up the slack. Amazingly, Queen's Park's attitude was such that at last Monday's press conference, none of the commission's spokespersons was able to say a single word in French to explain the decision to close the hospital which, according to a recent government report, was said to have the best cost-benefit ratio in Ontario.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, the three minutes allocated to the honourable senator are up. Do you wish to ask for leave to continue?

Senator Poulin: Yes.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Senator Poulin: On March 2, Gilles Lesage wrote the following in *Le Devoir*, and I quote:

And so we see Montfort Hospital — established in Ottawa in 1953 by the Filles de la Sagesse — which serves half of Ontario's francophones in their own language, being shut down by the bureaucracy for the benefit of a large bilingual hospital. Incredibly, the bureaucrats failed to realize that francophones are entitled to at least one hospital where they can be admitted in French and receive specialized secondary care — in psychiatry, for instance — from and among people who speak their language. Even in 1997, so-called rationalization is often carried to absurd lengths.

• (1410)

How could anyone show so little respect for the French fact in Ontario by announcing this recommendation? How could anyone fail to recognize the excellent administration of Montfort Hospital? To quote Chantal Hébert, the hospital ranks third among the most efficient hospitals of Ontario, third out of 144. How could anyone fail to appreciate the past and present involvement of the surrounding community, both Franco-Ontarian and anglophone, and this includes personal, social, financial and professional involvement? How could anyone put the very existence of the only French-language teaching hospital of Ontario on the same notice as your last credit card bill: 30 days?

Thank you, honourable senators, for your interest in respecting the rights of our country's minorities in all of our regions.

Hon. Marcel Prud'homme: Honourable senators, out of respect for our colleague Senator Poulin and her eloquent testimony on the very important issue of the Montfort Hospital, I would prefer not to dilute her remarks. However, I would like to immediately join forces with her and with all those who consider the issue a very important one. I do not want to make it a political one.

Tomorrow I would like to speak. I do not want to take away from what Senator Poulin has just said. She has done a very good job of delineating the issue. Tomorrow, however, I will speak on another topic, so as to complement the statement she made today.

[English]

HUMAN RIGHTS

NATIONAL FILM BOARD DOCUMENTARY ON PLIGHT OF ITALIAN-CANADIAN INTERNEES DURING WORLD WAR II

Hon. Consiglio Di Nino: Honourable senators, I wish to draw your attention to a National Film Board documentary which will be aired tonight on the CBC at 9:00 p.m. *Barbed Wire and Mandolins* is a film depicting the internment of Canadian citizens of Italian heritage in 1940 at the beginning of the Second World War when 700 Canadians of Italian background were suddenly declared to be enemy aliens.

Within days of the declaration of war, the RCMP detained some 17,000 Italian-Canadians, many of them women and children. Some 6,000 were arrested, fingerprinted, and then released with orders to report regularly to the police, with the exception of 700 who were interned as enemy aliens.

In the heat, emotions and madness which always accompany war, actions are often taken which, in the calm light of peace, are recognized as wrong, or at least unnecessary. This was one such action.

Nicola Zavaglia, the film's director, has said:

What shocks me about these incidents is that they reveal the fragility of the democratic system, in the sense that one day you're considered okay and the next day you're seen as a danger.

I urge my honourable colleagues to watch this documentary. It will reveal the pain, the shame and the indignities suffered by those who were the victims of this action and their families.

In 1990, Prime Minister Brian Mulroney had the courage to apologize to those aggrieved, and this is what he said:

Sending civilians to internment camps without trial simply because of their ethnic origin was not then, and is not now,

and never will be, accepted in a civilized nation that purports to respect the rule of law.

Let us hope his words will be heard by future generations.

VISITOR IN GALLERY

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I should like to draw your attention to a distinguished visitor in our gallery, one of our past colleagues, the Honourable Lorna Marsden.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

The Hon. the Speaker: Welcome again to the Senate.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

REPORT ON UNIVERSITY TUITION FEES FOR FULL-TIME STUDENTS TABLED

On Tabling of Documents:

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, following a request by Senator Prud'homme late in the past year, I wish to table a bilingual copy of a report on university tuition fees for full-time students.

THE ESTIMATES, 1997-98

TABLED

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Deputy Leader of the Government) tabled the Main Estimates for the fiscal year 1997-98.

THE ESTIMATES, 1996-97

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (B) TABLED

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

MANGANESE-BASED FUEL ADDITIVES BILL

INTERIM REPORT OF ENERGY, THE ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE ON QUESTIONS PRESENTED

Hon. Ron Gitter, Chairman of the Standing Senate Committee on Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources, presented the following report:

Tuesday, March 4, 1997

The Standing Senate Committee on Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources has the honour to present its

SIXTH REPORT

Your Committee, which was requested to present an interim report, before submitting its final report on Bill C-29, An Act to regulate interprovincial trade in and the importation for commercial purposes of certain manganese-based substances, 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? has, in obedience to the Order of Reference of Tuesday, February 4, 1997, examined the said questions and now presents the interim report.

Respectfully submitted,

RON GHITTER
Chairman

(For text of Interim 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 Ghitter, reported placed on the Orders of the Day for consideration on Tuesday, March 11, 1997.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE

Hon. Ron Ghitter, Chairman of the Standing Senate Committee on Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources, presented the following report:

Tuesday, March 4, 1997

The Standing Senate Committee on Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources has the honour to present its

SEVENTH REPORT

Your Committee, to which was referred the Bill C-29, An Act to regulate interprovincial trade in and the importation for commercial purposes of certain manganese-based substances, has, in obedience to the Order of Reference of Tuesday, December 17, 1996, examined the said Bill and now reports the same without amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

RON GHITTER
Chairman

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

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

THE ESTIMATES, 1997-98 THE ESTIMATES, 1996-97

NATIONAL FINANCE COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO STUDY MAIN ESTIMATES 1997-98, AND SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (B), 1996-97

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Deputy Leader of the Government), with leave of the Senate and notwithstanding rule 58(1)(f), moved:

That the Standing Senate Committee on National Finance be authorized to examine and report upon:

the expenditures set out in the Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1998, with the exception of Parliament Vote 10 and Privy Council Vote 25; and

the expenditures set out in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1997.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

• (1420)

THE ESTIMATES, 1997-98

VOTE 10 REFERRED TO THE STANDING JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Deputy Leader of the Government), with leave of the Senate and notwithstanding rule 58(1)(f), moved:

That the Standing Joint Committee on the Library of Parliament be authorized to examine the expenditures set out in Parliament Vote 10 of the Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1998; and

That a Message be sent to the House of Commons to acquaint that House accordingly.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

VOTE 25 REFERRED TO THE STANDING JOINT COMMITTEE
ON OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Deputy Leader of the Government), with leave of the Senate and notwithstanding rule 58(1)(f), moved:

That the Standing Joint Committee on Official Languages be authorized to examine the expenditures set out in Privy Council Vote 25 of the Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1998; and

That a Message be sent to the House of Commons to acquaint that House accordingly.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

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 tomorrow, March 5, 1997, at one-thirty o'clock in the afternoon.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTION PERIOD

TRANSPORT

PEARSON AIRPORT AGREEMENTS—MOTION BY CROWN
TO RESCIND PRIOR AGREEMENTS BETWEEN PARTIES—
GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. John Lynch-Staunton (Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, last Wednesday, in a case between the Pearson airport group and the government, which has been before the Ontario Courts in Toronto now for over a year, government lawyers moved to rescind all settlement agreements already made between the two parties and confirmed by the presiding judge. These settlement agreements were entered into voluntarily by the two parties, so that a motion by one of them to rescind is most extraordinary and unusual, to say the least.

As the lawyers acting for the government in this matter are senior officials of the Department of Justice, can the Leader of

the Government give us the reasons which led the Minister of Justice to authorize this procedure?

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, as my honourable friend will appreciate, these complex matters are before the courts, and I am not in a position to comment in detail on them.

As I understand the situation, some agreements had been reached by both sides over a period of time with a view to expediting the process. However, there were areas, particularly an area involving the discussion of risk and discounts, where there was no agreement. That was the reason the Crown lawyers in the case took the action that they did last week. It certainly was not in any way an effort to slow down the case, but there were important points on which they wished to have further opportunity before the court. That is my understanding of the activity that took place last week.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: Honourable senators, that is a very unsatisfactory answer because, as I understand it, these agreements were signed by both parties voluntarily, and accepted by the presiding judge who was to take them into consideration when making her final determination of the validity of the claims. These are not the result of any coercion or anything else other than an open agreement following expert testimony by both sides that certain areas could be determined to be the responsibility of the government in terms of assessing the claims.

Now, suddenly — but perhaps not surprisingly — this action is taken on the eve of the testimony of two expert witnesses who have already made public their independent assessment to the effect that the consortium would have lost \$180 million during the term of the lease. On the eve of the appearance of these two witnesses, the government throws a spanner in the works which, if the motion is accepted, will delay indefinitely not only the case but, more important, the appearance of these two witnesses at least until the election is over.

The lawyers are going back on agreements which they signed on behalf of the Government of Canada, and to my mind and to the minds of many others, their timing is politically motivated. It has nothing to do with the case taking its proper course. It has everything to do with this government not wanting to face up to its responsibilities.

Senator Fairbairn: Honourable senators, I have listened to the comments of my honourable friend with interest. I will not deal with his assumptions. The proceedings are ongoing before the Ontario Court, and it is not appropriate for me to comment on positions advanced by either side in the matter. The government has no interest in delaying the case, any more than the plaintiffs do. However, they do have a point to make, which is why they put forward their motion.

I am not in a position to get into the details, but my honourable friend's description of the situation clearly is not in accord with what the lawyers for the Crown believe is their position in the case. Both positions will be heard by the court. This is not an attempt by the government to delay the matter; let me leave it at that.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: I will, too, but only with the following comment: I cannot understand how the leader can say, with a straight face, that the government has no intention of delaying the case when, for two years, it had before Parliament a bill which would not even allow a law suit to be started. Once the plaintiffs were allowed at least to go to court, the government did all it could to stop the case from proceeding. This is only another attempt to delay.

Would the minister please ask her colleague the Minister of Justice not to attempt, once again, to exculpate himself from what is going on within his department? According to *The Toronto Star* of February 28, he has said that he really does not know what is going on in the Pearson case. If he does not know, who does? Who speaks for the Government of Canada as to exactly what its position is in this matter?

Senator Fairbairn: Honourable senators, my colleague the Minister of Justice knows very well what is going on in relation to the Pearson case. As far as the motion itself was concerned, he was certainly aware that counsel intended to file that at some point. At the moment he received the phone call, he may not have realized the precise timing, but he is very much involved in the case. Let us leave it at that.

• (1430)

This government has tried repeatedly to achieve a settlement in the Pearson case. When my honourable friend talks about legislation and timing, I would remind him of the months and years that some legislation languished because of the desire on the side of my honourable friend not to allow it to be brought to the floor of the Senate.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

Hon. David Tkachuk: Honourable senators, I have a supplementary to Senator Lynch-Staunton's question. It is an unusual procedure that the Government of Canada has initiated in court. I did not get much from the answer, and I would like some clarification.

Is the Leader of the Government saying that counsel for the government made a grievous error in signing the agreements?

Senator Fairbairn: Honourable senators, that is not what I am saying. I am saying that a process has been followed in this court case. The case is in progress. I am unable to speak on the positions of either side in this court case but I can say that clearly the government lawyers felt that the disagreement was significant and therefore moved to have the agreements rescinded.

Senator Tkachuk: Honourable senators, I do not understand. If the government signed all five agreements with the plaintiffs' lawyers before January of 1997, then either they were being deceptive to delay this thing from the beginning or they made a mistake in law, a grievous error.

Previous questions have focused on issues of government responsibility. Nobody in this government takes responsibility for

anything; things just seem to happen. The government must have changed its mind for some reason. Perhaps the government's counsel was too hasty, in which case the government should dismiss that counsel and get someone who will protect the interests of the Government of Canada, or they made an error in law.

Senator Fairbairn: Honourable senators, I have listened with interest to my honourable friend's speech, as I always do. However, the answer I have given stands, that the counsel for the government is engaged in a case of enormous interest to the Canadian public. This case is worth \$600 million to the people of Canada. The government takes its responsibilities in this matter seriously and will proceed carefully. The issue is before a court of law, and that is where the debate should remain. I cannot resolve it here in the Senate.

THE ECONOMY

INFLUENCE OF LEVEL OF PAYROLL TAXES ON JOB CREATION—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Consiglio Di Nino: Honourable senators, this Liberal government was elected on a platform of job creation. Today Canada suffers from a 9.7-per-cent unemployment rate, which is almost double the 5.4-per-cent rate of the United States. The number of unemployed people in Canada stands at 1.5 million, and that is only those who will admit they are unemployed. The figure is probably much higher than that. The youth unemployment rate is now at 17 per cent or more.

Honourable senators, the recent budget offers nothing that will make a dent in these high levels of unemployment. If Mr. Martin were serious about creating jobs, he would have substantially cut Employment Insurance premiums. In 1997, the government will collect \$5.6 billion more than they need from the EI payroll tax. Why is the Liberal government continuing to maintain such high premiums when thousands and thousands of jobs could be created by returning those benefits to the people of this country?

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I point out to the honourable senator, as we have discussed many times in this house, that in the last three and a half years, one of the most significant efforts the federal government has undertaken is to stabilize the country's finances so that Canada can have a climate conducive to job creation, and everyone in this house knows that that groundwork is necessary.

This government came to power with unemployment standing at 11.2 per cent. It is now down to 9.7, but it is still too high.

Perhaps my honourable friend would take a moment to read the government's job strategy announced with the budget. It outlines the actions this government has taken for short-term and long-term job creation, and proposes considerable investment in our post-secondary education system and in a new innovations fund which will help our research facilities, universities, colleges and training hospitals.

My honourable friend should not forget either that in the course of its mandate, although it is far from enough jobs, this government has provided a climate in which over 700,000 jobs have been created, most of them full-time. The projections of experts in the private sector are that up to 350,000 jobs will be created in the year ahead. We have a long way to go, but we are working hard at what is the top priority in this country.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAMS—REQUEST FOR STATISTICAL INFORMATION ON JOBS CREATED

Hon. Consiglio Di Nino: Honourable senators, if I were not used to the utterances of Liberal spin doctors, I would probably vote for my honourable colleague Senator Fairbairn if she were running for election. She has made a wonderful speech, except that it is the same one she and her colleagues have given for the past three years.

One of the things the Liberals did after the last election is introduce an infrastructure program, and it was supposed to create jobs in this country. The fact is that 32,000 less construction jobs exist today than when the Liberals took power. The book to which the Leader of Government has referred — which put me to sleep — contains the same distortions that were expressed the last time a similar program was presented to Canadians. How many jobs will be created from this new infrastructure program and how long will those jobs last?

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I do not expect anyone on the other side to concede it; however, I certainly do believe that senators on our side would concede that the infrastructure program has been significant for this country. The program has created jobs, particularly in the construction sector. Communities in every corner of this land have had their infrastructures — and, as a result, their quality of life — improved by the program. It is the provinces that have asked for an extension, and we have given it to them. In the year ahead, \$600 million will be spent. I cannot give the honourable senator a picture of how many jobs will be created at this time. However, my honourable friend must know, particularly coming from the city in which he lives, that it was never the intention that the infrastructure program would create long-term jobs. The intention was to create short-term jobs to trigger activity in the construction industry and also to give Canadians a solid infrastructure for the future.

There is no spinning, Senator Di Nino; those are facts.

• (1440)

Senator Di Nino: Honourable senators, could the minister tell the Senate what the numbers show with respect to how much it cost the government for each job they created through the last infrastructure program?

Senator Fairbairn: Honourable senators, I cannot provide that information off the top of my head. As the honourable senator will know, there was an evaluation of the infrastructure program, and if he has not seen it, I would be pleased to get him a copy.

Senator Di Nino: Honourable senators, I ask that the minister include the comments of the Auditor General as well.

HEALTH

SAFETY OF BLOOD SUPPLY—CARE FOR VICTIMS OF ALLEGEDLY TAINTED BLOOD SUPPLIED BY RED CROSS—INFLUENCE OF LEGAL TACTICS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Richard J. Doyle: Honourable senators, my question is directed to the Leader of the Government in the Senate. It has to do with an eight-year-old boy. His name is Jarad Gibbenhuck, and, though he lives in Vancouver, his future and, to a large extent, his life may depend on what we in this place and our friends in the other place do on his behalf and on behalf of the 12,000 other Canadians who contracted hepatitis C from blood transfusions in the 1980s.

The facts are these: In the 1980s the Red Cross decided not to use a surrogate test that could have screened out the tainted blood. That test was used for four years in the United States before it was introduced here.

Honourable senators, I am sure the minister is aware that the key players in our blood system are the Canadian Red Cross, which collects and distributes the blood and blood products; the provinces, which fund the system; and the federal government, which approves the products and is responsible for regulating the area. In short, the federal government has a direct and undeniable responsibility to young Mr. Gibbenhuck.

Jarad, at 35 pounds, is only half the weight of his uninfected buddies. He vomits a lot, he has abdominal pain, and he can attend school only one day out of five.

However, Canada's health ministers refused to compensate the families of those who were infected with hepatitis C, and advised the Gibbenhucks and others to seek relief through the courts.

Last week, Mrs. Gibbenhuck told the CBC:

We tried to talk to the Red Cross; we tried to talk to our doctor — we were in shock. We'd just found out our child had a potentially fatal illness.... Realizing that there was a lot of people in the same boat as us, what collectively could we do? It wasn't until September, 1996 that we even discussed class action.

Last December, the Gibbenhuck's doctor told them that he could no longer treat Jarad. He had received a third party notice from the Canadian Red Cross and was advised by his lawyers that they would have to cancel his malpractice insurance. He would no longer be insured. The story was on the front page of *The Globe and Mail*. The Gibbenhucks had dropped out of the lawsuit rather than lose the physician they depended on.

Mrs. Gibbenhuck told the CBC the same night:

The Red Cross should actually be out of the blood industry.

We are all aware that the Canada Health Act assures universal and accessible care for all Canadians. Does the minister not consider that she and her government have a responsibility in ensuring that this overriding right of all Canadians not be undermined by legal tactics seemingly designed for the sole purpose of discouraging the victims of this tragedy from pursuing their legitimate claims?

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I thank my honourable friend for his question. I could not agree with him more that this is an incredible tragedy for this young boy and his family, and for many others in the country. Indeed, it is the responsibility of the federal government to ensure that the principles of the Canada Health Act are met, and it takes that responsibility seriously.

On the precise question my honourable friend has asked about the legal implications and, indeed, anything further I might be able to learn on this particular case, I shall seek some help and get him a response.

SAFETY OF BLOOD SUPPLY—LEGAL FUNDING FOR VICTIMS OF
ALLEGEDLY TAINTED BLOOD SUPPLIED BY RED CROSS—
GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Richard J. Doyle: Honourable senators and the minister will have seen *The Globe and Mail* reports of February 28 stating that the Canadian Red Cross Society, along with the federal and provincial governments, will be using taxpayers' money to pay for the legal costs involved in the upcoming class action suit in British Columbia initiated by this group of victims of the blood tragedy. By contrast, the victims are bearing the burden of having to pay their own legal fees, despite the clear responsibility of the federal and provincial governments in that matter. The victims are paying for both sides of the dispute.

Is it fair that one of the two parties in this dispute carries a blank cheque supplied by the Canadian taxpayer while the other party is overwhelmingly disadvantaged financially? Does the minister not agree that fairness and justice would dictate that the victims be at least assisted in covering legal costs, or will the government wash its hands of this matter as it has done to date? Have these people not been denied justice long enough?

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I agree with my honourable friend that it is a question of justice being served. Again, I will seek better answers for him than I could provide today.

• (1450)

CODE OF CONDUCT

INCREASED WORKLOAD FOR PERSONAL ADVISOR
TO PRIME MINISTER—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Michel Cogger: Honourable senators, I was sorry to see the Leader of the Government labour in her attempt to make the government look good on its employment and job creation record. Therefore, I will try to ask a simple question which will merit only a simple answer. I want to know, honourable senators,

if anyone has seen Mitchell Sharp recently. If he has been seen, was he alive?

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I have not had the pleasure myself recently, but I can assure my honourable friend that Mr. Sharp is alive and well and, as he has always done, providing a tremendous service for his country.

Senator Cogger: I am pleased to hear that. I realize the poor gentleman is only being paid \$1 a year. Perhaps, considering that salary, one cannot expect him to do too much work. On the other hand, in light of the goings on in the House of Commons and the goings on of various members of cabinet, would the Leader of the Government consider recommending to Mr. Chrétien that Mr. Sharp's salary be increased? Then, perhaps, the Prime Minister could ask him to do a little more. It seems that he is sorely needed to keep the Minister of Justice, the Minister of National Defence and a few other of their colleagues on a straight and narrow path.

Senator Fairbairn: Honourable senators, I completely agree with my honourable friend's evaluation of the worth of the comments of Mr. Sharp, who, the Deputy Leader tells me, was sitting in the gallery taking in the budget speech when it was brought forward a couple of weeks ago.

Knowing Mr. Sharp, he would give 100 per cent of his effort for this country, with or without remuneration. I would say that a \$1 investment each year in the talents of Mr. Sharp is a tremendous bonus for the Canadian people.

Senator Cogger: Honourable senators, can the minister tell us whether Mr. Sharp was at all consulted? If so, did he have anything to say, in writing or otherwise, about the whole mess surrounding the Airbus settlement and the apology by Mr. Rock and Mr. Grey? Was he around? Was he in the loop?

Senator Fairbairn: I cannot answer my honourable friend's question.

CHILD POVERTY

INITIATIVE ANNOUNCED IN RECENT BUDGET—
REQUEST FOR TIMETABLE FOR COMMENCEMENT

Hon. Mabel M. DeWare: Honourable senators, as you are all aware, child poverty was in the forefront of the government's budget. It has also been the subject of discussions in the Senate and of Senator Cohen's report which was tabled last week.

The recent federal budget announced the Child Poverty Initiative — a very welcome step. The Liberals are finally discovering that child poverty is a serious problem. With over 1.5 million children living below the poverty line in 1995, the number of children now living in poverty has risen by 110,000.

The budget announced \$600 million in new funds to enrich the Child Tax Benefit. Increased payments are expected to come in two stages, the first this July, and the second next July.

My question to the Leader of the Government in the Senate is: If the government is committed to solving child poverty, why are we doing this in two stages instead of one?

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, of course it would be preferable to do it in one stage and do it as quickly as possible. However, given that these are agreements we have entered into with the provinces, it will take some time to turn over the administration of the program, which is why a portion of what was the Working Income Supplement increase will be brought forward and paid out this July instead of when it would normally have been paid out in the following year.

If the provinces and the federal government are able to put the plan together more quickly, I would hope the moneys will be in the hands of Canadians for the benefit of the children for whom my honourable friend speaks so eloquently, as did her colleague Senator Cohen a couple of weeks ago when she tabled her most worthwhile and interesting report.

Senator DeWare: Honourable senators, over the next two years, the provinces will have to absorb \$3 billion of an almost \$8 billion cut in transfer payments. With this in mind, the budget document indicates, with respect to the child support document, that enriched federal benefits will enable provinces and territories to redirect some of their social assistance resources towards improving children's services and income support for low-income working families.

What assurance does the federal government have from the provinces that these savings will be passed on to programs for children?

Senator Fairbairn: Honourable senators, the Minister for Human Resources Development, Mr. Pettigrew, has indicated publicly — and he certainly indicated to me — that there is agreement among the provinces and a commitment among the provinces that this will be done. This is the result of a considerable effort over the last year, and especially the last eight months, at the federal-provincial level. This very important area has been a showcase of goodwill and common purpose. Mr. Pettigrew has no doubt that, as the program takes its final form, the provinces will, indeed, live up to their commitments. As the federal government moves in with its contribution of funds, they will increase their concentration of special services in this same area, particularly as it relates to the working poor.

The Hon. the Speaker: I regret to inform honourable senators that, although I have other senators on the list, the time for Question Period has expired.

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 September 26, 1996, by the Honourable Senator Simard regarding Employment Insurance, cost of campaign by the Minister of Human Resources to promote changes to the legislation. I also have a response to a

question raised in the Senate on November 7 and November 26, 1996, by the Honourable Senator Andreychuk regarding the sale of CANDU reactors to China. As well, I have a response to a question raised in the Senate on February 4, 1997, by the Honourable Senator Lynch-Staunton regarding the investigation into the sale of Airbus aircraft to Air Canada.

I also have a response to a written question by the Honourable Senator Spivak, number 152.

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

COST OF CAMPAIGN BY MINISTER OF HUMAN RESOURCES TO PROMOTE CHANGES TO LEGISLATION— REQUEST FOR PARTICULARS

(Response to question raised by Hon. Jean-Maurice Simard on September 26, 1996)

The Government has a responsibility to inform Canadians of changes to social programs and explain how the changes could affect them.

The EI legislation, which was tabled in the House of Commons in December 1995, contained major changes to the Unemployment Insurance Program and Canadians have the right to be informed of the main elements of the proposed legislation.

Two information campaigns in daily and weekly newspapers took place from December 1995 to September 1996: the first one in December 1995 and January 1996 to explain the overall new Employment Insurance Program; the second in July 1996 to explain the changes that were coming into force on July 1, 1996.

The information inserts described the main elements of the proposed legislation and referred people to a 1-800 toll free line where they could order publications explaining the proposed legislation in detail. Callers received, within one week, the publications they had ordered. More than 70,000 people called the toll free line from January 1996 to September 1996 to order publications on the EI Legislation.

The Canadian public was well informed and was able to participate in the debate.

INFORMATION COSTS

Insert One	
December 1995/January 1996	\$1,733,190
Insert Two	
July 1996	<u>\$1,135,000</u>
Total	\$2,868,190

ATOMIC ENERGY OF CANADA

SALE OF CANDU REACTORS TO CHINA—REQUEST FOR DETAILS OF APPLICATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL AND SAFETY STANDARDS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

*(Response to questions raised by Hon. A. Raynell Andreychuk
on November 7 and 26, 1996)*

The Sierra Club of Canada has initiated an Application for Judicial Review before the Federal Court of Canada, in connection with the sale of CANDU nuclear reactors to China. The matter is now before the Court and, therefore, any comment would be inappropriate at this time.

JUSTICE

INVESTIGATION INTO SALE OF AIRBUS AIRCRAFT TO AIR CANADA—NOTIFICATION TO SWISS AUTHORITIES OF LATEST DEVELOPMENTS—DISCIPLINARY SANCTIONS TAKEN AGAINST OFFICIALS INVOLVED—GOVERNMENT POSITION

*(Response to question raised by Hon. John Lynch-Staunton on
February 4, 1997)*

On November 14, 1995, prior to the lawsuit, in response to concerns raised by Mr. Mulroney's lawyers, the Department of Justice wrote to the Swiss authorities, reaffirming that the request was based on allegations, and stressing that it should be dealt with in confidence.

The Government of Canada sent a copy of the Settlement Agreement to the Swiss on January 28, 1997. The Settlement Agreement, accepted by all parties, states that "the parties have always acknowledged that the RCMP must continue investigating any allegations of illegality or wrongdoing brought to its attention." (Paragraph 6).

As the Justice Minister has already stated, the problem was one of process, not of people. The process followed in the drafting and sending of the Letter of Request was one that was in place for a long time. Mr. Mulroney has acknowledged this in the Settlement Agreement.

Paragraph 8 states, "the parties acknowledge that the procedure used in sending the Request for Assistance to Switzerland in this case was the same as that followed in numerous previous requests for mutual assistance under both the current and previous administration where such requests have always remained confidential. Because of this, the Government of Canada did not foresee that the Request for Assistance would become public. Since it did, the government of Canada has reviewed its procedure to ensure that the risk of this happening again is minimized" (paragraph 8).

The government response is the responsible one in the circumstances. The process has been changed.

New measures will provide more assurance of confidentiality and the avoidance of a conclusion, and approval by senior officials. There will also be a review of the overall application of this policy every 6-12 months by the Deputy Minister, and then discussion with the Minister.

In addition, Minister Rock has announced the appointment of former Justice Allan Goodman to review the policy and procedures in relation to international mutual legal assistance, including the recent changes to these procedures. Mr. Goodman will provide comments on the process. He is to report to the Deputy Minister at the end of March.

ANSWER TO ORDER PAPER QUESTION TABLED

THE ENVIRONMENT—AIR AND WATER QUALITY STANDARDS— FINANCIAL COMMITMENT TO PROGRAMS— GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Deputy Leader of the Government) tabled the answer to Question No. 152 on the Order Paper—by Senator Spivak.

MANGANESE-BASED FUEL ADDITIVES BILL

INTERIM REPORT OF ENERGY, THE ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE ON QUESTIONS— POINT OF ORDER—SPEAKER'S RULING RESERVED

Hon. Noël A. Kinsella: Honourable senators, I rise on a point of order. Earlier in the proceedings this afternoon, during Presentation of Reports from Standing or Special Committees, the Chairman of the Standing Senate Committee on Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources presented the interim report of the committee respecting Bill C-29. The question was then put: "When shall this report be taken into consideration?" If my memory serves me correctly, it was decided that the report would be taken into consideration next Tuesday.

Subsequently, the chairman of the same committee rose and presented another report on Bill C-29, reporting the bill without amendment. The question was put by the Speaker as to when the bill would be read the third time. The majority in the chamber agreed that it would be placed on the Orders of the Day for third reading at the next sitting of the Senate.

Senator Berntson: I said, "Never."

• (1500)

Senator Kinsella: Some honourable senators said, "Never," and I said, "No," to the question.

Honourable senators, the point of order that I am raising touches on a number of issues. The first issue is that we had a house order dated February 4, 1997, which provided:

That, notwithstanding Rule 98, the Standing Senate Committee on Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources present an interim report, before submitting its final report on Bill C-29, to regulate interprovincial trade in and the importation for commercial purposes of certain manganese-based substances, 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?

Honourable senators, we have had the report tabled before us today. Therefore, honourable senators have probably not had a chance to read that report. However, upon examination of that report, you will find that there is a majority opinion, which reflects the views of the majority of members on the committee, and there is a minority opinion. Should the Senate adopt the majority opinion — that is, the report — then we will not have a problem with respect to the report on the bill itself. However, should this chamber adopt the report and embrace the minority opinion, then the chamber will be facing a paradox.

In light of the science and the evidence gathered by the Energy Committee concerning the question, “Is MMT-based petroleum the cause of OBD malfunctioning,” the minority report recommends that that specific question be referred to an independent third party for evaluation and report back to the Energy Committee.

What is being recommended in the interim report — which I believe has a good chance of being embraced by this chamber — is that the Royal Society of Canada assess the situation. That is the society upon which the Prime Minister of Canada recently relied in his dealings with the Government of France relating to the matter of asbestos. In that matter, a study was conducted by this independent group of scientists whose objectivity and neutrality is well known around the world. It is that same body which the interim report minority view is recommending should assess the science underlying the question of whether or not MMT-based petroleum causes OBD malfunctioning.

Unfortunately, in the committee meeting this morning, the majority, operating on the principle that might, rather than reasoned analysis, makes right, decided to force the chairman of the committee to present this report on the bill itself, in disobedience of the order of this house rendered on February 4, 1997, which was to the effect that the Energy Committee must submit an interim report that responded to three very important, very clear and specific questions.

Honourable senators, it is not without precedent that this kind of situation has presented itself in this chamber. It is common practice, for example, that the National Finance Committee will present reports on the Main Estimates. It is on the basis of the report of the National Finance Committee on the Main Estimates that the house then examines the bills of supply. The supply bills are then dealt with expeditiously because the analysis that is required, in a generic way, has been done by the National Finance Committee. It has never been the custom or tradition of this house for a supply bill to be adopted prior to the National Finance Committee presenting its report on the Main Estimates.

Unfortunately, that is the best analogy that I could find as I looked at the procedural literature. Not having much success in finding other similar parallels to this situation, I then turned my mind to the logic of what we are dealing with. That logic is simply that this house made a simple request to the Energy Committee, namely, “Answer these three questions.” If you read the report, including both the majority and the minority opinion, you will discover that, from a scientific standpoint, the word is not yet in on the key question of whether or not OBDs are caused to malfunction because of the presence of MMT in petroleum products.

Procedurally, what should now occur is that this house should examine the interim report, which the Senate had determined it wanted to have prepared, and to examine. The Senate did not wish to receive a report of a bill without amendment, notwithstanding the evidence that was presented. That is simply one of those perfunctory moves that a majority often makes, unfortunately, in our committees, namely, to report a bill without amendment, irrespective of the knowledge base that surrounds the matter.

Honourable senators, as a result of the presentation of the two reports today, what we now have on our Order Paper is a situation of contradiction. In my view, the seventh report of the Energy Committee, presented today by the chairman, is out of order and should not have been proceeded with, unless we are to rescind the order made by this house on February 4, 1997. In my view, we must first proceed with an examination of the interim report, and then with an examination of the report of the committee on the bill itself.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I did not wish to interrupt the Honourable Senator Kinsella but, unfortunately, I find myself in a position in which I cannot entertain points of order at this point. I can only do so when the order is called. I refer you to rule 23(1), which states, in part:

...Any question of privilege or point of order to be raised in relation to any notice given during this time can only be raised at the time the Order is first called for consideration by the Senate.

The order has not yet been called. Therefore, I cannot entertain a point of order on an order that has not been called, according to the *Rules of the Senate*.

Senator Kinsella: With respect, perhaps His Honour will permit a reflection on rule 23. I looked at rule 23(1) as well, and that is not what we are dealing with here. This point of order is not with respect to notices that were given; it is with respect to the procedure that has been used, which is faulty.

• 11510

Rule 23(1) deals with the proper placing of items to be dealt with on the Order Paper. It is the assumption that what is on the Order Paper is properly on the Order Paper. I am arguing that the attempt to place these two items on the Order Paper for tomorrow is out of order. Therefore, rule 23(1) is not applicable in that sense.

The Hon. the Speaker: I am prepared to entertain other views on this point of order.

Senator Berntson: It is indispensable.

Senator Doody: It speaks for itself. Case closed.

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I would refer you to rule 23(1), which states:

During the time provided for the consideration of the daily Routine of Business and the daily Question Period, it shall not be in order to raise any question of privilege or point of order. Any question of privilege or point of order to be raised in relation to any notice given during this time can only be raised at the time the Order is first called for consideration by the Senate.

According to rule 23(1), Senator Kinsella can only raise his point of order when the item comes before the Senate for debate.

This is part of the new rules upon which the members opposite insisted when they were introduced and passed in 1991.

Senator Doody: And which our friends opposite are so anxious to revoke.

Senator Graham: Reference was made by Senator Kinsella to the motion of February 4. I do not intend to go over that motion again. I would, however, indicate that this is a very specific motion which requires that an interim report be presented prior to the presentation of the committee's final report on Bill C-29. However, it does not require that this interim report be debated or adopted prior to the Senate dealing with the remaining stages of Bill C-29.

Senator Berntson: It is illogical.

Senator Graham: Apart from the requirement that it be presented at any time prior to the presentation of the final report, there is no procedural linkage between the interim report and the bill.

Today, Senator Ghitter, who unfortunately is not present with us at the moment, presented the final report of the committee on Bill C-29. Before he did so, he first presented the interim report, as he was required to do pursuant to the February 4 resolution of the Senate. That having been done, the requirements of that resolution have now been met in full.

It may very well be, in the opinion of some of our honourable colleagues, that the interim report should be considered before we proceed to the consideration of the bill itself. However, that is not a view shared by all honourable senators in this chamber. More important, it is not a procedure under our rules or mandated by our resolution of February 4.

There is a fundamental difference between a course of action that some may wish to follow and a course of action that must be followed. In this instance, our rules of procedure are crystal clear about the proper course of action. First, the terms of the February 4, 1997 resolution have been met in full with the presentation of the interim report. Second, pursuant to rule 97(4), the final report of the committee presented by Senator Ghitter is deemed to have been adopted. The bill was reported without amendment, so the report stands adopted.

The only question now before the Senate is when Bill C-29 shall be read the third time. To suggest or argue otherwise is to deny the clear wording of the February 4 resolution, and that would set us on a course of action that would be in direct contravention of rule 97(4).

Rule 97(4) provides that, when a committee reports a bill without amendment, such report shall stand adopted without any motion, and the senator in charge of the bill — in this case, Senator Kenny — shall move that it be read the third time on a future day. We all clearly heard Senator Kenny say, "Next sitting." Today, Senator Ghitter, as we mentioned, reported Bill C-29 back to the Senate without amendment, so that report stands adopted.

As I just mentioned, Senator Kenny moved that the bill be read the third time on Wednesday. As the sponsor of the bill on behalf of the government, he obviously falls into the category of, to use the words of rule 97(4), "the Senator in charge of the bill." That motion was his to make.

Senator Kinsella is overlooking the clear wording of rule 62. Rule 62(1) provides a list of motions that are debatable. The list includes, of course, a motion for the third reading of the bill, but it does not include a motion that a bill be placed on the Orders of the Day for third reading.

Rule 62(2) reads:

All other motions, unless elsewhere provided in these rules or otherwise ordered, shall be decided immediately upon being put to the Senate, without any debate or amendment.

Senator Kenny's motion falls into this category. It is a motion that is neither debatable nor amendable.

A relatively recent precedent lends strong support to this position. On April 8, 1992, Senator Nathan Nurgitz, the former Chairman of the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs, presented to the Senate the committee's report on the Young Offenders Act, then known as Bill C-12. As with Bill C-29 currently before us, that report contained observations but no amendments. When the Speaker asked, "When shall this bill be read the third time?", the sponsor of the bill, Senator Di Nino, moved that it be read the third time at the next sitting of the Senate. When the Speaker put the question, Senator Bonnell rose to make some remarks. His right to speak at that time was challenged. Following a lengthy procedural debate, the Speaker reserved his decision.

The following day, Speaker Charbonneau ruled that, because of the clear wording of rule 63, which is now rule 62 —

...the motion proposed yesterday by Senator Di Nino regarding Bill C-12 cannot be subject to debate.

Senator Berntson: What is your point?

Senator Graham: Now, almost five years later, we are in an almost identical situation.

Rule 62 was adopted by the Senate on June 18, 1991. Until then, very few motions were non-debatable. I quote from the 1994 *Companion to the Rules of the Senate of Canada* which states:

The 1991 change specified that all motions were to be decided immediately without debate, ...

— and I would add in parenthesis "without amendment" —

... unless they were specifically recognized as debatable under the terms of Rule 63(1).

That is now rule 62(1).

Honourable senators, rule 62 was put into place at the insistence of the members opposite. It was the subject of a ruling by Speaker Charbonneau in 1992. If colleagues believe it is now wanting, there is a process available under rule 57(1) to change it. However, until it is changed, it should be respected.

• (1520)

I submit that Senator Kenny's motion is properly before us. It should be disposed of in the normal course without debate and without amendment.

Hon. John Lynch-Staunton (Leader of the Opposition): I am sure all honourable senators are very impressed by Senator Graham's impromptu learned discourse. It is remarkable how he can invoke rules with which he disagrees to make a point. Unfortunately, however, he misses the real point which is not whether we should entertain third reading; the point is: What is the status of the interim report, and what was the purpose of the interim report?

I would refer to Senator Kinsella's remarks on December 18, 1996, when he moved that the three questions be studied by the committee. Honourable senators will remember that his motion was seconded by the Deputy Chairman of the Standing Senate

Committee on Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources and given unanimous approval.

When one is somewhat unclear on a legislative text, one is urged to consider the intent of the legislator. This happens many times in court cases involving the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. One must ask oneself: What was the intent of the legislator at the time those words were included? If we do not find in Senator Kinsella's motion the same general interpretation, we must look at the intent.

Honourable senators, his intent, supported by all members here, is found in his remarks of December 18 when he said:

Honourable senators, that is the motivation behind having this committee make an interim report on the questions set out in my motion. In this way, we will have this data...

— and these are the key words —

... before the committee brings back to us its report on the bill, with or without amendments.

The intent of the interim report is clear. It was to give this chamber guidance on three key questions relating to the subject-matter of the bill in order to help the Senate, in debating the interim report, to have a better understanding of the issues involved. Now, suddenly, this intent has been put aside, not only by bringing in a final report before an interim report has been debated, but by allowing the interim report to be debated after the final report has been approved.

I say that we should not have approved the final report at the time we did. It was highly irregular to do so because it contravenes the intent of the legislator. Further, we could not raise a point of order at the time because points of order during Routine Proceedings are not allowed. This is the first opportunity at which to challenge the validity of the vote allowing the bill to go to third reading.

The Speaker and the chamber must respect the intent of the legislator, which is to deal with the interim report first. This report was prepared by an order of this house. There was agreement that this should be done. As Senator Kinsella said, we all agreed to have data before — not at the same time, and certainly not after — the committee presented its report on the bill, with or without amendments. The purpose of that is clear. I will not repeat what I have just said, because it seems very clear to us on this side.

It is not a question of unduly delaying a decision on Bill C-29; it is a question of honouring and respecting the unanimous wish of this chamber. Therefore, the procedure, I say with all due respect, should be to debate the interim report at the time decided next week. Let us dispose of it. Let us advise the committee, if need be, of suggestions or amendments, and let it proceed, after that, to a final report. However, to do that in reverse contravenes procedure and certainly contravenes the wishes of the Senate.

Hon. Colin Kenny: Honourable senators, the procedure which has been followed has adhered precisely to the order of this house which called for the presentation of an interim report before the presentation of the final report. The interim report was, in fact, presented before the final report.

[Senator Graham]

Senator Kinsella is an experienced legislator. He has been a member of this chamber for some time. Had he moved a motion that the report be presented to and considered by the chamber, or had he moved that the chamber review the interim report and give the committee further instructions, or had his motion been worded in some other way, then perhaps we would be proceeding differently. However, we are following precisely the motion proposed by the honourable senator, which I seconded. That is to say, we did present the interim report which was followed by the presentation of the final report. That is exactly what was asked for on February 4.

[Translation]

Hon. Pierre Claude Nolin: Honourable senators, this Senate resolution requests answers from the Energy, Environment and Natural Resources Committee to three basic questions concerning the examination of the implications of MMT. If we follow to the letter the terms used in the motion which the Senate approved unanimously, not only is the motion of Senator Kinsella involved but so is the one from the House, and we end up with nonsense.

You will have to decide. It will not be easy. Should a preliminary or an interim report be not only tabled but studied and approved before a final one is tabled and studied? Otherwise, the motion unanimously approved in this house is meaningless. You will have to decide on this, which seems to me fairly easily resolved.

The interim report can certainly not be studied, approved and adopted after the final report has been studied. It must be done first.

It is therefore not enough for the interim report to be tabled; it must also be fully reviewed before the final report is considered.

You will have to make this decision. I do not think we can examine the final report so long as we have not exhausted the question of the interim report.

[English]

The Hon. the Speaker: If no other honourable senators wishes to speak on the point of order, I will take the question under advisement.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

NUCLEAR SAFETY AND CONTROL BILL

SECOND READING—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. Nicholas W. Taylor moved second reading of Bill C-23, to establish the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission and to make consequential amendments to other Acts.

He said: Honourable senators, although I have only been in the Senate a short while, I thought there must be an easier way to put on the record speeches prepared by one's researcher than to stand in the chamber and read them. I thought we should be allowed to

ask that they be taken as read and thereby included in Hansard. I did some research on that and made some rather intriguing findings. Beauchesne says that you are not allowed to read a speech and, in another part, that you are not allowed to file a written speech in Hansard.

When the fountain of truth is squirting like that, saying on the one hand, that you cannot use notes and, on the other, that you cannot file the printed speech to be taken as read, I guess we have to use the old system of reading the speech into the record. I will try to make it as painless as possible, honourable senators.

• (1530)

The proposed legislation is designed to meet commitments made by the government in the Throne Speech to promote the sustainable development of our economy and create a nuclear regulatory regime appropriate to the 21st century.

In 1946, when the Canadian nuclear industry was in its infancy — and while I was out prospecting for uranium and becoming familiar with this industry — Parliament passed the Atomic Energy Control Act which gave the federal government jurisdiction over the development, application and use of nuclear energy. Of course, in those days, it was all done more for political purposes, and there was little worry about an element that could be used to make atom bombs.

Since then, the industry has developed a wide range of applications dependent upon nuclear science and nuclear energy. All Canadians benefit from them. At the same time, though, Canada's nuclear regulatory agency, the Atomic Energy Control Board, the AECB, has established a comprehensive regulatory program to go along with it. The AECB has been effective in minimizing the risk associated with nuclear technologies yet still allowing Canada's nuclear industry to grow.

Some significant changes, though, are required. For instance, the Atomic Energy Control Act concentrates on nuclear security as a primary application of nuclear energy. Now, the AECB devotes most of its efforts to protecting the health and safety of workers, the public and the environment from any undue risk due to civilian application of nuclear energy.

Honourable senators, the changed mandate of the AECB is not the only aspect of existing legislation that must be corrected. The courts, the Auditor General and others have identified a number of deficiencies in the existing legislation. Its regulatory powers and the powers of the inspectors need to be put on a sound legal basis to avoid legal challenge to its regulation of the industry. Also, the AECB needs to have a structure and the administrative powers necessary to conduct its affairs efficiently and effectively.

I would like to explain how this bill addresses the deficiencies of the Atomic Energy Control Act and responds to Canadians' expectations of the nuclear regulator. To reflect its revised mandate, the Atomic Energy Control Board will be renamed the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission, the CNSC. In addition to clarifying its new mandate, the name change will eliminate the long-standing confusion between the AECB and the AECL, Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, which develops and markets CANDU nuclear reactors. More important, it will also prevent any association of the regulator with the promotional activities for nuclear energy.

Bill C-23 clearly identifies the powers needed by the commission's inspectors to protect the health and safety of workers, the public and the environment. I want to emphasize, however, that those powers, while extensive, have been very carefully constrained to safeguard the rights of Canadians and licensees.

The bill also provides explicitly for appeal mechanisms, and it protects the interests of licensees by requiring the commission to conduct its proceedings, including appeal hearings, as efficiently and speedily as possible. Bill C-23 empowers the commission to require financial guarantees of licensees to ensure that the costs of shutting down and decommissioning nuclear facilities or of dealing with contamination are borne by the licensees and not by the Canadian taxpayers. Furthermore, Bill C-23 makes explicit provisions for the recovery of costs and regulation reflecting government policy in this area.

This bill has other important features. For example, the commission will have the power to order remedial action in hazardous situations and to allow those who do the remedial work to recover their costs. Bill C-23 will enable the courts to impose fines of up to \$1 million for regulatory infractions. In the old act, fines were often in the nature of \$5,000. That is hardly adequate in these days.

The new legislation contains provisions for public hearings, reviews and appeals to address concerns about efficiency of board operations. The legislation increases the number of commission members to help achieve more balanced, broad-based decision-making. The bill also allows the commission to sit in panels which will often be more efficient than plenary decision-making. In addition, the new legislation explicitly binds federal and provincial Crown corporations, ensuring that all licensees are fully bound by law.

Honourable senators, I would also emphasize that this bill will ensure the continued independence of the federal nuclear regulator. It does so by stipulating that members of the commission can be removed only for cause. Also, the government direction to the commission on broad policy matters must be made public.

When the legislation establishing federal involvement in the nuclear industry came into force, Canadians could only imagine the benefits of nuclear technology. Today, many of us have experienced those benefits firsthand. Those benefits include safe and reliable supply of electricity, medical treatment, quality jobs and export opportunities. Canadians deserve to continue to realize these benefits.

Further development of the nuclear option in Canada will depend on public confidence in the industry's ability to protect public health, safety and the environment. Bill C-23 will do much to strengthen public trust in the industry by establishing a modern regulatory regime. The Nuclear Safety and Control Act will guide Canada's nuclear sector into the next century under a regime that will give the regulatory body the authority it needs to remain effective, responsive and accountable. With that in mind, I urge honourable senators to vote in favour of this bill.

[Senator Taylor]

On motion of Senator Kinsella, for Senator Spivak, debate adjourned.

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL UNITY

CREATION OF SPECIAL SENATE COMMITTEE—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion as amended 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 June 17, 1997; 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 Bacon*)

Hon. Lise Bacon: Honourable senators, the subject to be addressed today is Canadian unity, a word fraught with meaning, yet representing the bringing together of diversity, and oh so positive in nature when it is defended by consensual agreement.

The unity of a people is the force that moves it toward other horizons. This is why unity needs to be seen as the expression of our openness to the world.

Canadian unity must become our mantra if we are to move ahead and to maximize our success on the eve of the 21st century. Easy to say, but not so easy to do! Experience in recent years has shown us how far from easy it is to get that reality across to people.

Why? Because today the art of explaining the importance of our national unity or, put still more simply, our pride in being Canadian, is not always totally orthodox.

The theme is sometimes gussied up with all manner of details, all manner of hypotheses and presented to the population from one side of the country to the other.

Some refer to a unity that curtails their ambitions; I refer to a unity that makes it possible to face up to major challenges, that enables us to see further ahead, to move further ahead.

Today, the peoples of the world are uniting. As Canadians, we wish to take part in the world's changing face. Most people ought to understand that clearly, for we, by virtue of being Canadians, are playing in the big leagues.

We live in the best country in the world. However, for the past year and a half, the Parti Québécois government, with no respect for facts or history, and especially not for the right of individuals to be properly informed, has concocted some very pessimistic scenarios.

According to them, the results would be almost catastrophic if Quebec were to remain in Canada, a country that is strong, known throughout the world and capable of taking on great challenges and facing the demands of globalization.

My purpose is not to criticize anyone but to take this opportunity to consider with you what Canada's history has to say to us, what the present challenges are and what the future holds in store for future generations.

If we work together to keep this country strong and united, in keeping with our ambitions, we are on the road to success.

This country, this land of ours is proof positive that conviction and willpower can build a country. This country of ours is also proof that for more than three centuries, our ancestors have had this desire to be builders, and we continue that tradition today.

We have come through the best of times and the worst of times. We have had to face tremendous changes, and we have persevered. We believed, and we still believe, that our country is ready for the next chapter in its history.

This history also reminds us that, as Canadians, we have every reason to be proud. Too often, important facts tend to be left out when we try to explain and talk about our country. These facts give us a better understanding of our complex situation and would avoid many misunderstandings.

I have certainly no intention of teaching a history class, but I would like to remind you of the following:

Let us go back to the middle of the 18th century, when the English had extended their colonies from Georgia to Nova Scotia. The French settled in the St. Lawrence and Mississippi valleys. The French colony in the St. Lawrence valley was called Canada and its people were called Canadians.

Normally, these two colonies should have given birth to two great nation states: the English nation of America and the French nation of America. But history decided otherwise, and when George III signed the Treaty of Paris, Canada disappeared with one stroke of the pen. That was a harsh blow.

Because of the circumstances, the people of Canada had to wait much longer before they could become a nation. The people of Canada had to fight to keep what they had acquired.

Canadians knew that, sooner or later, they would take control of the political and economic situation of a country they still considered their own. They knew that someday they would be masters of their own destiny. Their perseverance was rewarded, and they left us this magnificent country, which for more than three centuries has been at peace.

We should have the integrity to remind all Canadians of what unites us: our political tradition, our unique geography, and the values of mutual support that exist within our huge territory, thanks to our federative structure. We must not break up this country on a passing whim, based on the outlandish assumptions of a few.

Under our democratic political system, we can reflect on the strategies for the development of our country, our ideals and the drawbacks — and there are some — of living in a federation.

The advantages are tremendous. The results are impressive. Understanding the host of challenges that every individual, every province, the whole country must face: that is unity! Confrontation and dismantling is typical of individuals who have given up, who no longer believe in our ideal and have lost sight of their history. Obsessed as they are with building their own country, they have forgotten the Canadian sentiments of the majority.

[English]

Are we fully aware, in 1997, that we are the first human beings to live in a world where globalization of the economy, finance, unemployment, information and violence, is an everyday affair? We are the first to have to think about how the planet is to be inhabited and governed, to have to take into account collectively such concerns as nuclear security, degradation of the environment and healthier public finances, among many others things. Those are the real problems, and our country will not escape them. The decision-makers of today and tomorrow will have to face the music as a unit. Whatever the future holds, we will succeed only by united action.

Most of the experts who analyze the current global situation agree that, by the year 2020, or in the space of one more generation, the total world population will be in the neighbourhood of 8 billion. Going by current statistics, 3 billion of those will be poor, more than 2.35 billion will be homeless and still more will have no access to clean drinking water. That is a reality.

As Canadians, we share this planet with our fellow human beings. We are committed to globalization. We are allies in other countries' development and security. Every day we have to cope with new trends emerging from our neighbour to the south and our partners overseas. Frequently, we have to take up the cause of peace somewhere in the world. We do business everywhere. We are innovators in a host of sectors.

We want to go further and continue to be the best country in which to live. That being so, we have responsibilities and obligations to meet as a people. We have to see to Canada's development, we have to preserve Canada's social profile and we have to keep Canada united.

People who want to swim against the modern tide and break our country into pieces have understood nothing. The Quebec sovereigntist obsession with a dream country has produced nothing tangible in the entire 20 years that they have been going on about it. What has been achieved toward making the dream a reality? Words, reports, court cases, problems unloaded on to others, closures, company departures, job losses and everybody vying to be the one who criticizes the federal government the most. Has any of this helped Quebec make progress? Do Quebec governments that refuse to participate in the ongoing dialogue with the federal government take Quebecers' concerns into consideration? No.

For those obsessed with separation, the federalists are nothing but opportunists. They will level almost any charge at the federal government, but when a chance comes to go along on a trade mission abroad, there they are, lining up for the plane. How nice and cosy.

These actions do suggest that their partnership with the rest of Canada is not as thorny as it may appear. If the will is present, the partnership works well. For once, the separatists displayed that will and, disgracefully enough, they are more than pleased with the results of the trade mission. United action leads to concrete results, and it produces solutions to the problems of our age by and for all Canadians. Together they decided to take on the world; together they succeeded. Is it so difficult? We will be tackling only one aspect of everything that cries out to be done, while remaining aware that other problems will soon be demanding our attention.

• (1550)

Will we find solutions by closing the gate, putting on blinkers and refusing to come out? The path we chose as a society must emerge from individual decisions.

As Quebecers we must each ask ourselves the question: Do we want to stay in Canada?

[*Translation*]

A poll taken between September 20 and 24, 1996, for the Council for Canadian Unity, clearly shows that the people of Quebec generally remain committed to Canada; 61 per cent of the respondents were in favour of Quebec remaining within Canada and 62 per cent were against Quebec being fully and completely independent.

Of course, a poll is just a poll. The only conclusion that can be drawn from it is that at least 61 per cent of respondents indicated they wanted to remain a part of Canada. These people deserve respect. The voice of those whose constructive opinions differ from the separatist line should not be silenced.

Many members of our society have realized that all the quarrelling over Quebec's sovereignty is not getting us anywhere. In fact, 49 per cent of those questioned agree that the economy and the political instability in Quebec have a negative impact on job opportunities.

That is what things are really like in Quebec and across the country. For Canadians, wherever they live, feeding their families comes first; they want to regain the dignity associated with working. Knowing the challenges that lay ahead, we are working our way up the ladder of success one step at a time. We will look for solutions together and benefit from them together.

Here are a few examples: an employment insurance system that promotes returning to work instead of living off society; the creation of 622,000 jobs between January 1994 and October 1996; the renewal of federalism; getting our fiscal house in order; all the work done to open up new opportunities for our young people; the emphasis on science, technology and research; guaranteed pension plans that are fair; the maintenance of our health care system, and the funds allocated to promoting Canadian culture.

These are some of the actions taken in response to current problems on behalf of all Canadians. The fact that our two cultures, however different they may be, met and went through three centuries together is proof positive that federalism works.

We can also say that, for a long time, unity has been a sign of this country's stability, of our much envied social peace. This stability confirms the need for unity while showing respect for diversity.

It is essential to keep building a strong and united Canada at a time when the threat of break-up is lurking. We must never stop showing that all Canadians are protected by socio-economic guarantees commensurate with the challenges that lie ahead. Unity and economic health are no doubt a country's ticket to the 21st century.

Unity, union, cooperation, understanding, peace, success, the solutions to the problems of our times, the renewal of some of our institutions, all these expressions will be meaningless if we do not decide to work together and, more specifically, to remain together. We must let the world see how proud we are to be Canadians, to live in a country that history made strong, united and, above all, unique.

The whole issue of unity, of being proud of the links that exist between Canada's individuals, communities and provinces, must mature within each individual, so that we can find innovative solutions that have nothing to do with sovereigntist and federalist stereotypes.

I do not believe that a Senate committee, in spite of all its qualifications and goodwill, could, at this particular time, find a magic, concerted solution.

Our concern, honourable senators, must be the immediate and long-term improvement of the world's social, economic and environmental climate, so as to leave a positive legacy to those who will follow us. This should include concrete actions on Canada's part. Our country can play a leadership role at the international level.

To that end, we must focus on all the positive aspects in our country and promote Canada's image as a nation that is aware of the existing challenges but also understanding of the differences. We must become an example and share our knowledge, so that the prophets of doom and gloom will be proven wrong.

Together, we can make the 21st century Canada's century. Let us show our country in all its greatness and strength. Our openness to the world and our understanding of the differences will be our greatest strengths in the pursuit of a common goal. If there is a country that can adapt and prosper in this era of globalization, it is definitely Canada. All Canadians will be part of the evolution of our country and of its institutions, and all will reap the benefits.

On motion of Senator Kinsella, debate adjourned.

[English]

LIBERAL PARTY RED BOOK

GOVERNMENT'S ELECTION PROMISES—INQUIRY

Hon. Consiglio Di Nino rose pursuant to notice of December 12, 1996:

That he will call the attention of the Senate to the Liberal Government's Red Book promises.

He said: Honourable senators, what has been causing the Liberals to stumble so decisively in the past weeks? It will be my pleasure to enlighten you in the next few minutes.

What has brought down their support in just a few months in Ontario alone? Is it the fearsome opposition in the house? Hardly. Is it the attacks of the antagonistic media? Absolutely

not. Is it the howls of special interest groups whose causes are being ignored? No. It is none of these. What has officially ended the longest honeymoon of any democratically elected government in the world are the people of Canada, the millions of voters who are mad as hell and, from the way the tide is turning, it appears they will not take it any more. I think it is instructive for us to understand why.

Disenchantment with politics is nothing new. When voters walk into the voting booth today and pull the lever, the machine yawns. What has set the voters — even loyal Liberal ones — into such a purposeful rage is the total betrayal they feel. The source of their betrayal is the Liberals' Red Book, a document that would have lesser mortals red-faced with embarrassment but has Mr. Chrétien and his ministers wondering in wide-eyed innocence what all the fuss is about.

The fuss is all about the fact that Canadians have been completely fooled by a party that promised one thing and did at least 60 other things instead. The sheer number of broken promises is surely worthy of inclusion in the *Guinness Book of World Records*.

However, making so many political promises and packaging them for easy reference so that you can be easily caught when you break them, is surely a political first in any arena.

These are not my partisan thoughts. Even though Mr. Martin was the Red Book's co-author, he has refused repeatedly to defer to its commitments. Edward Greenspon of *The Globe and Mail*, in his book *Double Vision* quotes Mr. Martin as saying to his Finance officials:

Don't tell me what is in the Red Book, I wrote the goddamn thing. And I know that a lot of it is crap.... So screw the Red Book.

Mr. Martin is not the Liberal leader — at least not yet. I would suggest that he speak with his Prime Minister about the cynicism and frustration Canadians feel when confronted with blatant disregard for promises made, because it was Mr. Chrétien, of course, who told *The Globe and Mail* three years ago:

There will not be one promise there that you will not be able to come to me after two years and say to me, "You've not done it." I will do it unless there is an Act of God.

All religious questions aside, let me paraphrase Winston Churchill and say: Some act; some God.

• (1600)

Mr. Chrétien has a habit, after he puts his foot in his mouth the first time, of claiming that it was a once-in-a-lifetime experience. Unfortunately, the Prime Minister has become the Energizer Bunny of the big untruths. Listen to what he said in Victoria on September 2, 1993.

When you're Prime Minister and you make a decision as a Prime Minister — you can't say I'll do that and if it's wrong, I'll change my mind. We're not electing somebody to play Russian roulette.

Three weeks later back in the national capital, he told the *Ottawa Sun*:

I'm sure that it will be done because we will do what we're telling you that we will do.

Just to make sure we got the message that integrity was back in government, three weeks later Mr. Chrétien told *The Financial Post*:

There will not be a promise in this campaign that I will not keep.

Honourable senators, this afternoon I am tabling my whole presentation entitled "A Beginner's Guide to the Broken Liberal Promises." It spells out for Canadians how, sea unto sea, the gap really is between the Liberal's promise and their performance, and details exactly how the Liberals have not acted upon promises made in the Red Book, in the accompanying platform documents, or by Mr. Chrétien himself, verbally or in writing. It is by no means an exhaustive inventory.

Take a closer look at the Red Book on truths, honourable senators, and you will have no trouble finding which of the many promises the Liberals have simply not acted upon and which have been turned on their heads. It would be unfair to fellow senators if I were to chronicle each and every one of these broken promises. You would not give me the time. I am afraid the numbing effect of repetition would soon take hold. Let me give you a condensed version, if I may, of the most calamitous and consequential broken promises.

During the last campaign, they were treated as if they were the Ten Commandments. Today they are sounding as if they belong on David Letterman's Top 10 list. I will start with number 10 — the broken promise of Canada's health care system. The Red Book says:

A Liberal Government will not withdraw from or abandon the health care field.

This commitment was backed up by Mr. Chrétien telling *The Toronto Star*:

I don't want the systems we built up in this country to be destroyed.

What have the Liberals done? Rather than acting to protect Medicare, they are tying the federal government's hands by slashing its funding for health, education and social assistance by some \$8 billion. Obviously, as federal funds for health care dry up, Ottawa is being forced to abandon its protection of Medicare and leave the provinces to sort out the mess it has created. Jean Chrétien and the Liberal government have cut health care funding by billions of dollars.

An editorial cartoon by Bruce McKinnon in *The Chronicle-Herald* best depicts what the Liberals have done. It shows Minister Dingwall as a caveman on Medicare.

Broken promise number 9: the Liberals are concerned about human rights. The Liberal Foreign Policy Handbook promises to

"speed up the process of ratifying and signing the Organization of American States Convention on Human Rights." Canada, along with Cuba, has not yet signed this convention.

Then of course there is the issue of sacrificing human rights in order to win contracts or, as you have heard me state before, what I call state prostitution — an issue that saw *The Ottawa Citizen* cartoonist Allan King show a Chinese leader meeting with Jean Chrétien. Says the Chinese leader: "We crush any kind of dissent, use slave labour, have the world's highest rate of capital punishment, sell sophisticated weapons to renegade states.... Think you could turn a blind eye?" Our Prime Minister says "CANDU!"

Broken promise number 8: the Liberals will invest in people. Under the section of the Red Book headed "Workplace Training," the Liberals promise that:

...the private sector will be encouraged to provide more training for its workers. We will work with business, labour, and the provinces to develop incentives that will lead to a significant increase in workplace training.

The Liberals said they would spend an additional \$228 million by the year 1997-98 to establish new apprenticeship programs. No such programs have been established. Instead, the government is in the process of getting out of training and vacating the field of worker training to the provinces. Allan King's cartoon shows the difficulties Canadians are facing in adapting to the new economy without the assistance of the federal government. It is Minister Manley talking to some of his constituents which is called "the virtual unreality."

One of the most harmful broken promises is Broken Promise Number 7, child care, because it hurts our children and grandchildren in a way that can never be righted, no matter what party comes to power. According to the Red Book:

A Liberal government, if it can obtain the agreement of the provinces, will be committed to its expanding child care in Canada by 50,000 new quality child care spaces in each year that follows a year of 3 per cent economic growth, up to a total of 150,000 new spaces.

What a mouthful. Obviously, with these two built-in escape hatches, this promise was made in bad faith. What is more, the government's having reduced payments to the provinces under the Canada Health and Social Transfer, it should come as no surprise that most of the provinces cannot afford to take part in this Liberal scheme. As Human Resources Minister Pierre Pettigrew privately told day-care advocates in Toronto last November, "Child care is a provincial responsibility." A political cartoon by Ian Smith captures the flippant attitude of the Prime Minister and his cabinet on the promise of child care.

Broken promise number 6, the CBC, — brings me close to the peak of doublespeak, for on the one hand, the Liberals were very clear in the Red Book. I quote:

A Liberal government will be committed to stable, multi-year financing for national cultural institutions to plan effectively.

I repeat, “stable, multi-year funding.” What do the Liberals do? They cut the CBC budget by \$450 million between 1994 and 1997. That is one-third of all the money it received from Ottawa. With that multi-year cut, some 4,000 jobs are slashed, taking staff levels back to about one-half the 1984 levels.

You might say, “Look, all government agencies have to endure cuts.” I agree. However, between 1994 and last year, cuts to the CBC were made like a flick of a switch, and were twice as deep as reductions in overall spending by the federal government, as shown in the political cartoon in *Le Quotidien*, which is rather interesting. It is entitled “Zappé!”

Canada now has, among countries with public broadcasting systems, the lowest level of per capita support. In the words of the Toronto businessman Jack Rabinovitch:

It beats me why Ottawa is emasculating the CBC, especially when it is the most effective agent for a sharpened sense of cultural identity that Canadians have.

Broken promise number 5 is immigration. The Red Book promised that Canada “would set an immigration target of one per cent of the population each year”. An immigration level of 1 per cent of the population would amount to 300,000 immigrants a year. Speaking as an immigrant myself, and despite the overwhelming evidence that immigrants improve the economic well-being of all Canadians, not only have the Liberals refused to raise immigration levels, they have actually cut them. At 200,000, they are now equal to only two-thirds of 1 per cent of Canada’s population. Perhaps, as the political cartoon suggests in *The Toronto Sun*, the Prime Minister does not really want any more immigrants because he no longer needs the votes.

With broken promise number 4, jobs, I come to the big league lies. Honourable senators, this sentence has been quoted time and time again, but for the record, what the Red Book says on the Liberal commitment to jobs is this:

A Liberal government will put jobs and economic growth at the forefront of its objectives.

As the Liberal leader later amplified:

The most important issue in the election is jobs.

The reality is that more Canadians were out of work in 1996 than in 1995, and more in 1995 than in 1994, the first full year of the Liberal regime. We have had the highest rate of unemployment for the longest period of time since the Great Depression. To defend their record, the Liberals have pointed to their infrastructure program. In fact, there were 32,000 fewer people working in the construction industry in 1996 than there were in 1994, the year the program was announced. Mr. Martin, author of the Red Book, should be called Pinocchio for his broken promises, as suggested by the political cartoon in *Le Quotidien*.

• (1610)

The Liberals counter by claiming that the combined infrastructure spending of \$6.4 billion by the three levels of government will translate into 80,000 to 100,000 jobs. What they fail to mention is that it costs government an average of \$64,000 to \$84,000 to create each job. They also fail to mention the fact

that the Auditor General has repeatedly questioned those job creation claims.

The Liberals have suddenly discovered that youth unemployment is a problem. The minister took his oath of office in November of 1993. Net job losses among Canadians aged 15 to 24 total 45,000 to date.

Even more blatant than the betrayal over jobs is the fudging over the GST — Broken promise number 3.

Let me repeat the words that have caused one Liberal member to cross the floor in protest, a Liberal minister to resign and resurrect herself, another minister to attempt a limited apology, and the Prime Minister to stammer out his own highly conditional, commitment-proof and painfully disingenuous apology. The Red Book claims the following:

A Liberal government will replace the GST with a system that generates equivalent revenue, is fairer to consumers, and to small business, minimizes disruption to small business, and promotes federal-provincial fiscal cooperation and harmonization.

The Minister of Finance should admit that he has made a mistake, as reflected in a cartoon by the *Chronicle Herald*, which says —

The Hon. the Speaker: I regret to have to interrupt Senator Di Nino, but his 15-minute period is up. Is the honourable senator requesting leave to continue?

Senator Di Nino: Yes.

Hon. Philippe Deane Gigantès: Before I agree to the honourable senator’s request, I would ask him to produce enlargements of the pages he is holding up. Although he holds them up, I cannot read them.

Senator Di Nino: I will send them all to my honourable colleague.

Senator Corbin: He is not supposed to hold them up!

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

The Hon. the Speaker: Leave is granted. Please proceed.

Senator Di Nino: Thank you, honourable senators.

The cartoon reads: “It was an honest mistake. We didn’t say we were going to scrap the tax for you. We said we were going to tax the crap out of you.”

Lack of integrity not only nullifies every single promise in the Red Book, it infects the very heart of the government’s integrity.

Broken promise number 2 relates to the appointment of an independent Ethics Counsellor. The Red Book states:

A Liberal government will appoint an independent Ethics Counsellor to advise both public officials and lobbyists in the day-to-day application of the Code of Conduct for Public Officials.

The Ethics Counsellor will be appointed after consultation with the leaders of all parties in the House of Commons and will report directly to Parliament.

In reality, the Ethics Counsellor is not independent; he does not report to Parliament, he reports to the Prime Minister. Of course, the party leaders were not consulted in the appointment. The Liberals simply made minor changes to the job description of the Deputy Registrar General. In the words of *Democracy Watch*, "The Ethics Counsellor has proven time and time again that he is a lapdog, not a watchdog."

Little wonder *The Toronto Star* called this "the most blatant betrayal of the Red Book... an ethics watchdog loyal to his political master, not the public." But the Liberals believe, as shown by the cartoon by Sue Dewar, that they can do anything, including lie, and that Canadians will get over it.

I wish to tell my friend Senator Gigantès that it is Sheila Coppins who says, "So what? I can lie all I want. You'll get over it."

As I said a moment ago, at the heart of all these broken promises, and ensuring that their number rises with each passing day of the Liberal regime, is the issue of integrity. I remind you, honourable senators, that it was integrity itself — not examples of integrity but a rolling wave of honesty, a tsunami of transparency — that would sweep over and cleanse the political landscape once the Liberals were swept into power.

Mr. Chrétien's most memorable promise of all was:

I want to tell you that honesty and integrity will be back in public life.

At the very least, I know that all members of this house will agree that time has proven Mr. Chrétien wrong. The editorial cartoon by Peter Pickersgill shows how the Prime Minister has backtracked on all of his promises.

If anything, honesty and integrity appear to have fled from public life — at least that part of it populated by Liberal members of the House of Commons.

Honourable senators, I like Liberals. I have grown up with many of them and would trust them with anything in the world, except public life. Where I part ways is where millions of non-partisan Canadians are parting from their government.

The real crime of the Liberals' shameful record of broken promises is that it leaves the promise of our nation unfulfilled.

Canadians are more cynical and mistrustful of the political process than ever. From that ground of mistrust, precious little good can grow, and that at the very time in our nation's history when our citizens must join with their political leaders in order to save all that continues to make Canada the most attractive country on earth in which to live.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, if no other honourable senator wishes to speak, this inquiry will be considered debated.

CAPE BRETON DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

SPECIAL COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO TRAVEL

Hon. Noel A. Kinsella, for Honourable John Buchanan, pursuant to notice of February 20, 1997, moved:

That the Special Committee of the Senate on the Cape Breton Development Corporation be authorized to hold hearings in Cape Breton, Nova Scotia.

Motion agreed to.

CAPE BRETON DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

SPECIAL COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO ENGAGE SERVICES AND TO PERMIT COVERAGE OF MEETINGS BY ELECTRONIC MEDIA

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Deputy Leader of the Government), for Honourable Bill Rompkey, pursuant to notice of February 20, 1997, moved:

That, notwithstanding the *Procedural Guidelines for the Financial Operation of Senate Committees*, the Special Senate Committee on the Cape Breton Development Corporation be authorized to engage the services of such counsel and technical, clerical and other personnel as may be necessary for the purpose of its examination and consideration of this study; and

That the Committee be authorized to permit coverage by electronic media of its public proceedings with the least possible disruption to its proceedings.

Motion agreed to.

The Senate adjourned until Wednesday, March 5, 1997, at 1:30 p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 4, 1997

	PAGE		PAGE
SENATORS' STATEMENTS			
Health			
Closing of Montfort Hospital in Ottawa. Senator Poulin	1625		
Senator Prud'homme	1626		
Human Rights			
National Film Board Documentary on Plight of Italian-Canadian Internees During World War II. Senator Di Nino	1626		
Visitor in Gallery			
The Hon. the Speaker	1626		
<hr/>			
ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS			
Post-Secondary Education			
Report on University Tuition Fees for Full-Time Students Tabled. Senator Fairbairn	1626		
The Estimates, 1997-98			
Tabled. Senator Graham	1626		
The Estimates, 1996-97			
Supplementary Estimates (B) Tabled. Senator Graham	1626		
Manganese-based Fuel Additives Bill (Bill C-29)			
Interim Report of Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources Committee on Questions Presented. Senator Ghitter	1626		
Report of Committee.	1627		
Senator Ghitter	1627		
The Estimates, 1997-98			
The Estimates, 1996-97			
National Finance Committee Authorized to Study Main Estimates 1997-98, and Supplementary Estimates (B), 1996-97. Senator Graham	1627		
The Estimates, 1997-98			
Vote 10 Referred to the Standing Joint Committee on The Library of Parliament. Senator Graham	1627		
Vote 25 Referred to the Standing Joint Committee on Official Languages. Senator Graham	1628		
Adjournment			
Senator Graham	1628		
<hr/>			
QUESTION PERIOD			
Transport			
Pearson Airport Agreements—Motion by Crown to Rescind Prior Agreements Between Parties—Government Position. Senator Lynch-Staunton	1628		
Senator Fairbairn	1628		
Senator Tkachuk	1629		
The Economy			
Influence of Level of Payroll Taxes on Job Creation— Government Position. Senator Di Nino	1629		
Senator Fairbairn	1629		
Infrastructure Programs—Request for Statistical Information on Jobs Created. Senator Di Nino	1630		
Senator Fairbairn	1630		
Health			
Safety of Blood Supply—Care for Victims of Allegedly Tainted Blood Supplied by Red Cross—Influence of Legal Tactics— Government Position. Senator Doyle	1630		
Senator Fairbairn	1631		
Safety of Blood Supply—Legal Funding for Victims of Allegedly Tainted Blood Supplied by Red Cross—Government Position. Senator Doyle	1631		
Senator Fairbairn	1631		
Code of Conduct			
Increased Workload for Personal Advisor to Prime Minister— Government Position. Senator Cogger	1631		
Senator Fairbairn	1631		
Child Poverty			
Initiative Announced in Recent Budget—Request for Timetable for Commencement. Senator Fairbairn	1632		
Senator DeWare	1632		
Delayed Answers to Oral Questions			
Senator Graham	1632		
Employment Insurance			
Cost of Campaign by Minister of Human Resources to Promote Changes to Legislation—Request for Particulars. Question by Senator Simard. Senator Graham (Delayed Answer)	1632		
Atomic Energy of Canada			
Sale of CANDU Reactors to China—Request for Details of Application of Environmental and Safety Standards— Government Position. Question by Senator Andreychuk. Senator Graham (Delayed Answer)	1633		
Justice			
Investigation into Sale of Airbus Aircraft to Air Canada— Notification to Swiss Authorities of Latest Developments— Disciplinary Sanctions Taken Against Officials Involved— Government Position. Question by Senator Lynch-Staunton. Senator Graham (Delayed Answer)	1633		
Answer to Order Paper Question Tabled			
The Environment—Air and Water Quality Standards— Financial Commitment to Programs—Government Position. Senator Graham	1633		
Manganese-Based Fuel Additives Bill (Bill C-29)			
Interim Report of Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources Committee on Questions—Point of Order.			

	PAGE
Senator Kinsella	1633
Senator Graham	1635
Senator Lynch-Staunton	1636
Senator Kenny	1636
Senator Nolin	1637

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Nuclear Safety and Control Bill

Second Reading—Debate Adjourned. Senator Taylor	1637
---	------

National Unity

Creation of Special Senate Committee—Debate Continued	1638
---	------

PAGE

Liberal Party Red Book

Government's Election Promises—Inquiry.	
Senator Di Nino	1641
Senator Gigantès	1643

Cape Breton Development Corporation

Special Committee Authorized to Travel. Senator Kinsella	1644
--	------

Cape Breton Development Corporation

Special Committee Authorized to Engage Services and to Permit Coverage of Meetings by Electronic Media.	
Senator Graham	1644

Appendix	i
-----------------------	---



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