



CANADA

Debates of the Senate

2nd SESSION

•

35th PARLIAMENT

•

VOLUME 136

•

NUMBER 78

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Thursday, March 6, 1997

—

THE HONOURABLE WILLIAM J. PETTEN
ACTING SPEAKER

CONTENTS

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

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

Published by the Senate

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

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

THE SENATE

Thursday, March 6, 1997

The Senate met at 2:00 p.m., Senator William J. Petten, the Acting Speaker, in the Chair.

Prayers.

[*Translation*]

SENATORS' STATEMENTS

HEALTH

CLOSING OF MONTFORT HOSPITAL IN OTTAWA

Hon. Normand Grimard: Honourable senators, since Tuesday, we have had the opportunity to listen to statements on the recommendation by the Ontario Health Services Restructuring Commission to close Montfort Hospital in Ottawa.

As a senator familiar with the needs of the communities in the region, I ask the members of the commission to reconsider their decision and not close Ontario's only French-language hospital.

[*English*]

Hon. Colin Kenny: Honourable senators, I will make a short statement of a personal nature. I was born in Montreal at the Royal Victoria Hospital. My mother was treated in English. Subsequently, my father became ill and went to the Royal Victoria Hospital, and he was treated in English. My godmother and my grandmother, who both lived in Montreal, went to the Montreal General Hospital, where they were treated in English.

We here in Ontario have a French-speaking teaching hospital, and the provincial government is considering closing it. My concern is that it not be closed. However, more than that, this is not a fight that our francophone colleagues should have to lead. This is a fight that anglophones in the province should be leading. We should be making the point that we do not accept the idea of closing the Montfort Hospital.

• (1410)

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Hon. Doris M. Anderson: Honourable senators, I rise today to speak on this matter because the Senate will not be sitting on March 8, which has been declared International Women's Day. Therefore, I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to women in Canada and around the world.

Women have made great strides internationally since the first International Women's Day was celebrated by many countries in Europe and North America on March 8, 1911. The United

Nations officially proclaimed March 8 as International Women's Day in 1975.

As I look around this chamber today and see that we have 24 women senators — almost one-quarter of the total number of senators — I am reminded of the struggles women have faced on the long road toward equality. I am reminded of the five courageous women who fought so strongly to convince the Privy Council in England that women were, indeed, persons under the law and, therefore, had the right to be appointed to the Senate. Until that decision in 1929, women were prohibited from being appointed to the Senate.

I am reminded also of the brave women of the suffragette movement who fought so vociferously for the basic right to vote. It was not until 1918 that women in Canada were granted the right to vote at the federal level, although they had been granted the right to vote in some of the provinces much earlier.

Over the years, women also became active in politics, running for office, getting elected to provincial legislatures and to the federal Parliament in greater numbers. We now have 53 women members of Parliament in Canada.

Canada is considered an international leader in terms of women's rights. The increasing number of women in legislative bodies throughout Canada is having an impact on legislation. In the last 25 years alone, there have been many progressive changes in legislation in a number of areas affecting women, the family and the social and economic well-being of our nation generally.

The Canada Labour Code was amended in 1971 to prohibit discrimination in the workplace on the grounds of sex and marital status, and the 17-week maternity leave provision was instituted. A few years later, the Canadian Human Rights Act ensured equal pay for work of equal value. In 1983, the act was amended to prohibit sexual harassment and to ban discrimination on the basis of pregnancy and family or marital status. The following year, the Canadian Constitution was amended to recognize and affirm that aboriginal and treaty rights were guaranteed equally to both male and female persons.

Honourable senators, we have come a long way in the evolution of the rights of women. However, we must remember that we still have a very long way to go.

NATIONAL SOCIAL WORK WEEK

Hon. Landon Pearson: Honourable senators, while we in this chamber are debating the legislative framework within which Canadians live and work, it is vital to remember those who are on the front line; those who are in direct contact with the most vulnerable members of our society. Today, I should like to pay tribute to the more than 14,000 professional social workers across the country during this seventh annual National Social Work Week, March 3 to 7.

Social work is a profession concerned with helping and empowering individuals, families, groups and communities. The profession of social work is founded on humanitarian and egalitarian ideals. Social workers believe in the intrinsic worth and dignity of every human being, and are committed to the values of acceptance and self-determination. They are dedicated to the welfare and self-realization of human beings, the development and disciplined use of scientific knowledge regarding human and societal behaviours, to the development of resources to meet individual, group, national and international needs and aspirations, and to the achievement of social justice for all.

Honourable senators, from the many speeches that I have heard in this chamber, I know we share a concern for those of our fellow Canadians who live in poverty or in other difficult circumstances. However, I also know that very few of us can help them directly. Therefore, social workers become our proxies in many places, such as hospitals, family agencies, correctional centres, treatment homes for children, programs for seniors, day care centres and schools, to name just a few. Their functions range from direct services to advocacy, from ameliorative to preventative services, from teaching to policy analysis, from research to community organization, and from planning to program administration.

Therefore, on the seventh annual National Social Work Week, I salute the 10 provincial associations of professional social workers across Canada, as well as the Canadian Association of Social Workers, the national voice of the profession.

[Translation]

HEALTH

CLOSING OF MONTFORT HOSPITAL IN OTTAWA

Hon. Jean-Maurice Simard: Honourable senators, on June 3, 1985, I received a phone call from the Prime Minister, Brian Mulroney, asking me if I would accept an appointment to the Senate.

Hon. Marcel Prud'homme: You told him no.

Senator Simard: The Prime Minister indicated to me that, if I accepted the Senate appointment, he would like me to look after minorities outside New Brunswick and throughout Canada.

I think I have remained faithful to my commitment. It was what prompted me yesterday during Question Period to ask about the Montfort Hospital, a francophone hospital. My commitment to minorities, to the francophone minority in particular, goes back 25 years.

Similarly, in keeping with the commitment I made on June 3, 1985, I agree that everything possible should be done, every consideration given, to preserve the only francophone hospital in Ontario. I would like to take this opportunity to say, although I know it, as do all our colleagues, that health is a provincial jurisdiction. However, my interpretation of the fundamental law of the land confers responsibilities on the Parliament of Canada.

Certainly, it confers an authority, an obligation on the federal government. This obligation is to protect, to promote minorities when they are threatened.

To conclude, regarding the Montfort Hospital, I would remind the government that it has an obligation under the Charter, under the Constitution of Canada not to wash its hands of this matter, since it comes under provincial jurisdiction.

In the past, when minorities were at risk in certain provinces, successive governments stepped in and created programs to come to their assistance. In the situation before us, I would like the Chrétien government not to wash its hands of the matter and to step in if the provincial government of Ontario were to get ready to close this francophone hospital. I hope the government will live up to its responsibilities.

[English]

The Hon. the Acting Speaker: Honourable senators, I regret having to interrupt the Honourable Senator Simard. However, his time has elapsed. Is leave granted to allow the honourable senator to continue?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

[Translation]

Senator Simard: I would remind the government of the constitutional obligation not to wash its hands of this matter but to shoulder its full responsibility so that members of this minority in the Ottawa area can receive health care in their own language at Montfort or other institutions.

[English]

• (1420)

Senator Prud'homme: Honourable senators, on Tuesday and Wednesday of this week I made known my intention to participate in this debate. Since many senators appear to be getting involved as well, I shall make only two comments today, and I shall speak in English intentionally.

Yesterday, an honourable senator made some comments that I would have happily debated. However, I thought, for the unity of the country, I would abstain and hold my tongue for a while.

I should like to pose the subject of yesterday's discussion to honourable senators in reverse. Some of those senators are present; however, I will not look at them as I do not want to embarrass anyone. I have no reason to say, "Why do you not speak both languages?" That is not my business. I would never dare to say that to an honourable senator. I would just like to say, "How would you feel?"

We are all approaching a time in our lives when we may have urgent need to go to a hospital. How would honourable senators feel if, upon arriving at the hospital and telling the staff, "Oh, it is painful, painful," everyone at the hospital said, "Pardon, je ne comprends pas, je m'excuse, voulez-vous expliquer s'il vous plaît, quel est votre symptôme? Qu'est-ce qui ne marche pas?"

I am of the opinion that — I will choose my words carefully — some of you may get up and say, “What the hell is going on in this country of ours?” Some of us would do that. We are not saying that the Montfort Hospital is unilingual French.

I have given my life to this issue. Senator Fairbairn knows that I changed my opinion. I spoke in her district in Alberta and met some of her friends 30 years ago. I am not asking for unilingualism, either English or French, but for an understanding of both languages. I ask honourable senators to put themselves in the shoes of the people who built this institution in order for people to be more at ease in a hospital. There is only one bilingual hospital in Ontario.

Two senators have pushed me to the wall, so I shall visit the Montfort Hospital next week. I want to see if someone who speaks only English can be served. I have been told that the response will be, “Yes, of course, no nurse will refuse to speak English to someone who speaks only English.” That is the kind of debate that we, in our wisdom in the Senate, could have on this matter.

[Translation]

In my opinion, a senator is a man or woman of wisdom, one who can see not only the solution to a problem but who can also prevent problems from getting worse.

[English]

It is up to each of us to decide. Is that a serious issue and does it deserve our attention? I have come to the conclusion, without pushing my views on anyone, that indeed it is, because of the repercussions, because of the abuse that people will suffer and because many people will use that service. We, as senators, should reflect on this issue, and it does not matter whether we do so individually or collectively as a group, a party or a region. This issue is serious, and it requires our attention.

Hon. Sharon Carstairs: Honourable senators, the closure of the Montfort Hospital will have an impact more far-reaching than this city and this province. I am sure that it will come as a surprise to many of you to know that Manitoba students will be affected by this decision. The Collège universitaire de St-Boniface, the French-speaking —

Hon. Thérèse Lavoie-Roux: When the Collège militaire de Saint-Jean was shut down, you did not defend it. It was the only French military institution in this country. Everyone on the other side kept silent.

Because you are going into an election now, okay, let us —

[Translation]

— make political hay with the Montfort Hospital and jump on the bandwagon.

[English]

For God’s sake, I am fed up with this.

[Senator Prud’homme]

Senator Carstairs: Honourable senators, I was not in this chamber when the Saint-Jean Military College was closed. However, I will put my record on the defence of French-language rights in the Province of Manitoba against anyone’s.

The Collège universitaire de St-Boniface, a French-speaking, four-year liberal arts college in Winnipeg, was in the process of negotiations with the Montfort Hospital. The purpose of these negotiations was to ensure that science students in an internship program at the collège could be trained in the hospital in the French language. Needless to say, those negotiations are now on hold.

There was a time when those students could have been accommodated at the St. Boniface Hospital, in St. Boniface, Manitoba. However, as that hospital expanded to serve the entire city and broadened the range of services that it offered, it became far less a deliverer of French-language services.

That is the concern that I have with respect to the Ottawa General Hospital. It is true that many employees at the Ottawa General speak French, but whether it will be possible for a francophone to access those services at a particular moment in time is much more problematic. That is the question that our colleague Senator Jean-Robert Gauthier has addressed in recent statements.

Certainly there is no opportunity at the present time to access that momentary service at the St. Boniface Hospital in Winnipeg. There is no question that there is a greater luxury of language in Ottawa. It is rare to hear French spoken in Winnipeg. Indeed, francophones are so sensitive in my city they will switch, almost immediately, to English when an anglophone appears on the scene, even though the conversation may not include that anglophone.

It is understandable that with the greater numbers in Ottawa, there is a greater necessity to provide that service. However, how long will this service be provided unless we protect it? Surely the most important services are education, which is guaranteed in our Constitution, and those that protect health care services to citizens when they are most vulnerable.

Those of you who have ever tried to access health centres — and I refer to Senator Prud’homme here — in another language in a foreign country, will know how difficult it can be. When we were newly married, my husband and I visited Mexico City. He developed a high temperature, and when it began to climb above 103 degrees I frantically tried to get someone to speak to me in English so that I could access their hospital service. It was very difficult.

• (1430)

Honourable senators, there is only one hospital which provides for French-speaking patients in Ontario. There is only one teaching hospital with instruction in French west of the Quebec border. Surely we owe that much to francophones outside Quebec to provide this tiny service. I have a home in Ottawa. I pay property taxes in Ottawa. I pay provincial sales taxes in Ontario. I wish that my tax dollars would be used to support this hospital.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

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 Monday next, March 10, 1997, at 8 p.m.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTION PERIOD

JUSTICE

SUPPRESSION BY PRIVY COUNCIL OF DOCUMENT
FILED IN COURT CASE—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Michel Cogger: Honourable senators, my question today has nothing to do with the Honourable Mitchell Sharp. I am in a good mood.

A matter concerning a court case has been brought to my attention, and I should like to bring it to the attention of the Leader of the Government in the Senate because it is getting stranger and stranger.

Honourable senators may recall that an RCMP officer who is a resident of Quebec was recently elected as a mayor of a small municipality. As a result of his election, he incurred a suspension without pay because of some arcane rule of the RCMP. Apparently, one cannot be an officer in the RCMP and a municipal officer at one and the same time.

In any event, this gentleman went to court, and is currently before the Federal Court seeking his own reinstatement. He has filed some documents and some rules and regulations governing the RCMP. So far, so good; the court will eventually rule upon the whole matter.

What is strange is that about a year after this gentleman filed his documents, the Clerk of the Privy Council, Madam Bourgon, filed a petition before the court barring the filing of the documents, or putting under seal the entire file. That is a very strange move indeed, to say the least. However, the Clerk of the Privy Council has the power to do that under the Evidence Act of Canada. Mr. Justice Marc Noël ruled in this case in a judgment

dated last week. In that ruling, he points out to the Clerk of the Privy Council that the documents she seeks to keep from being divulged have been in the public domain for at least a year.

Honourable senators, would the Leader of the Government undertake to raise this matter with Madam Bourgon so that we can shed some light on the situation?

I might point out that, failing a good and valid explanation, this whole thing appears to be nothing more than a move to frustrate a citizen from exercising his rights before a court of law. In other words, it is hard to argue that a document cannot be put into the public domain because it belongs to the Privy Council and is of such importance to the Government of Canada and the Crown that its content cannot be divulged, when the document has already been in court and, therefore, in the public domain for a whole year. Anyone who bothered to consult that file could have seen it.

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I should tell my honourable friend that I spoke with Mitchell Sharp today. He is in fine spirits and health, and sends his regards to all of us. He is a very special man.

On the case that my honourable friend raises, I have to tell him that I am not familiar with that case. However, I will be very pleased to take his question to the Clerk of the Privy Council and attempt to obtain an answer for him.

Senator Cogger: Would it help if I provided the Leader of the Government with a copy of the decision of the court?

Senator Fairbairn: Honourable senators, I would be grateful if my honourable friend would send it over to me.

Senator Cogger: Certainly, and please convey my kind regards to Mr. Sharp.

Senator Fairbairn: I would be glad to do so.

AGRICULTURE

DELAYS IN RAIL SHIPMENT OF GRAIN TO WEST COAST—
REQUEST FOR UPDATE

Hon. Leonard J. Gustafson: Honourable senators, my question is for the Leader of the Government in the Senate. What has been done about the movement of grain to the West Coast? Does she have anything to report as to what the situation is at this time? Is it improving?

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, the situation has been improving since we last exchanged comments, following the meeting of the Minister of Agriculture about three weeks ago with those involved. I believe he will be communicating with the same group tomorrow to go over the progress that has been made.

My honourable friend may know that there have been considerable efforts across the prairies to speed up the movement of grain. The railways have added equipment. There has also been an effort to have the terminals at the port of Vancouver remain open seven days a week so that unloading and loading can take place as quickly as possible, in order to get the railway equipment back into the system. As well, there have been efforts in some cases to truck grain to the south in order to get it to some of our clients in Latin America and elsewhere.

Honourable senators, I spoke yesterday with the Minister of Agriculture about this matter. There is still a lot more to be done. He believes that everyone is putting out a full-court press on this matter, and he will be confirming that with the people he met with three weeks ago. That is what is happening in the short term. However, the minister is intent on making long-term plans, and he anticipates that he will have cooperation from all the others involved.

Honourable senators, the main point is that there have been improvements. They are not enough; however, we are working very hard at the situation.

Senator Gustafson: In speaking with many of the farmers, and more particularly with the Federation of Agriculture, there is a good deal of concern that this situation seems to recur year after year. There is also a concern that the lack of movement on the branch lines is merely a forerunner to closing out those branch lines in such a way that eventually the farmers will have to start trucking to the main lines; they will have no other choice.

• (1440)

Honourable senators, I want you to know that there is a great deal of concern. I also believe that there should be. It is to be hoped that the minister will take some action that will have impact in the years to come.

Senator Fairbairn: Honourable senators, I agree with my honourable friend. I know that the Minister of Agriculture will be pleased to have his comments and any other advice that he has to offer.

HEALTH

INCREASE OF INCIDENCE OF LUNG CANCER IN WOMEN— GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Stanley Haidasz: Honourable senators, no doubt the Leader of the Government in the Senate is aware of the distribution this morning of the annual report from the National Institute of Cancer in Canada informing us of the good news and the bad news as far as updated cancer statistics are concerned.

We heard in the news this morning that, although overall cancer rates have decreased in past year, lung cancer in women has increased four times since 1970. Therefore, we can conclude that the strategy and the measures that have been applied to fighting cancer in the past 10, 20 or 30 years in Canada are

apparently not effective for controlling lung cancer. Yet we know that certain types of lung cancer are caused mainly by smoking cigarettes. Most lung cancer cases are caused by smoking more than 10 to 20 cigarettes daily for a period of two years or more. Inhaling nicotine gives you the addiction. The smoke also contains approximately 3,000 toxic tars, at least 50 of which are carcinogenic.

Unfortunately, Bill C-71, which is the highlight this year, as it was last year, of the government's strategy against cigarette smoking, does not even deal with the cause of lung cancer, directly or explicitly — that is, the smoking of cigarettes, and in particular, the high levels of tar and nicotine in cigarettes.

Could the minister tell this chamber whether we can expect — either in this session or early in the next session after the next election — any other piece of legislation which will attack directly the cause of Canada's greatest preventable disaster, namely, lung cancer from cigarette smoking?

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I thank my honourable friend for his question. I am aware of the report that came out today. However, I have not had an opportunity to read it.

I listened with a feeling of some relief and a bit of irony at the statistics that the report took back to 1970, which was right about the time when I stopped smoking two packs of Buckingham's per day. Had I continued to do that, I doubt very much if I would be standing here today. A number of my friends and colleagues at the time in the parliamentary press gallery who were engaged in similar habits have died, such as Marjory Nichols, and others have suffered tremendously. I am glad that my friend raised this issue today. It is appropriate for him to do so, and underlines, once again, the concern of a tragedy which is preventable.

We are about to receive Bill C-71, relating to the manufacture and sale of tobacco products. We as a Senate will probably have that bill by next Monday night. I cannot tell the honourable senator at this time whether we could anticipate another bill of that specific nature in which my honourable friend is interested during this session. However, I certainly will pass on his concerns directly to the Minister of Health.

TOBACCO PRODUCTS RESTRICTIONS BILL— STATUS OF LEGISLATION—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Stanley Haidasz: Honourable senators, I should also like to bring to your attention that I have been rather impatient with the lack of legislation dealing with the precise cause of cancer, namely, smoking cigarettes, and especially the high levels of nicotine and tar in a burning cigarette. That is why last year, in desperation, I finally brought in a private bill, Bill S-5, which was given approval in principle. That bill received second reading in June of last year, and is now being studied in committee. Could the Leader of the Government in the Senate tell us whether Bill S-5 has any chance of passage through the Senate before this session ends?

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn, (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I regret that I cannot answer my honourable friend's question. In large measure, that will be a decision of the committee which is presently studying that bill. The other thing I cannot tell him is how long this session will continue. Therefore, I am somewhat inhibited in my ability to foresee, in time, the conclusion of that matter.

In any event, the subject-matter of my friend's bill is well known, and I will again pass on his continued and very well-placed and earnest concerns to the Minister of Health.

DELAYED ANSWERS TO ORAL QUESTIONS

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I have answers to questions raised in the Senate on December 16, 1996 by the Honourable Senator Lynch-Staunton, regarding inter-governmental affairs, future labour market availability of service to anglophones in Quebec; and on February 11, 1997 by the Honourable Senator Spivak, regarding the sale of CANDU reactors to China.

I also wish to table responses to several written questions: Number 28 by the Honourable Senator Forrestall, number 144 by the Honourable Senator Comeau, and number 153 by the Honourable Senator Spivak.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

FUTURE LABOUR MARKET DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS— ASSURANCE OF AVAILABILITY OF SERVICE TO ANGLOPHONES IN QUEBEC—GOVERNMENT POSITION

(Response to question raised by Hon. John Lynch-Staunton on December 16, 1996)

Employment Insurance Act states that the active employment measures will be delivered in either official language where there is significant demand for that assistance in that language.

This does not mean that the federal legislation will apply. It means that the government of Canada will:

- negotiate with each province and territory a commitment that respects this guideline
- ensure that services will be provided in both official languages where there is significant demand.

The Government of Canada's position on this issue is quite clear: the integral application of the measure regarding official languages.

The agreements recently reached with Alberta and New-Brunswick fully meet the requirements of the Official Languages Act while reflecting the particular conditions of each province.

We are convinced that this will also be the case with Quebec.

ATOMIC ENERGY OF CANADA

SALE OF CANDU REACTORS TO CHINA—SUBJECT OF FURTHER NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN PARTIES—GOVERNMENT POSITION

(Response to question raised by Hon. Mira Spivak on February 11, 1997)

On November 26, 1996 Prime Minister Jean Chrétien and Premier Li Peng of China witnessed the formal signing of contracts between Atomic Energy of Canada Limited (AECL) and the China National Nuclear Corporation (CNNC) for the supply of two CANDU reactors to China. The contracts were signed by the respective presidents of AECL and CNNC.

It is normal procedure that after a contract is signed, there are some conditions that have to be met in order for the contract to become effective. As an example, the associated loan agreements, which cannot be finalized before the commercial contracts are signed, still had to be negotiated between the Export Development Corporation (the lender) and the State Development Bank of China (the borrower). The terms of the loans are in accordance with OECD consensus rules.

All conditions necessary to make the contracts effective have now been met, and the parties (AECL and CNNC) have exchanged letters declaring the contracts formally effective, and work has started.

Over 100 private sector Canadian companies are expected to receive contracts to provide goods and services for construction of the two units in China. The projects will create or sustain an estimated 27,000 person-years of employment in Canada.

ANSWERS TO ORDER PAPER QUESTIONS TABLED

TRANSPORT CANADA—STATUS REGARDING CIVIL AVIATION MEDICAL EXAMINERS

Hon. B Alasdair Graham (Deputy Leader of the Government) tabled the answer to question No. 28 on the Order Paper—by Senator Forrestall.

COMPOSITION OF YOUTH TASK FORCE

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Deputy Leader of the Government) tabled the answer to question No. 144 on the Order Paper—by Senator Comeau.

CANADA-CHINA AGREEMENT—SALE OF CANDU REACTORS— GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Deputy Leader of the Government) tabled the answer to question No. 153 on the Order Paper—by Senator Spivak.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

CANADIAN FOOD INSPECTION AGENCY BILL

THIRD READING

Hon. Nicholas W. Taylor moved third reading of Bill C-60, to establish the Canadian Food Inspection Agency and to repeal and amend other Acts as a consequence.

Hon. Leonard J. Gustafson: Honourable senators, Bill C-60, to establish the Canadian Food Inspection Agency and to repeal and amend other acts in consequence thereof, was referred to the Standing Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for examination. Yesterday, the committee reported the bill without amendment, but did make a number of observations and recommendations.

In committee, we had an in-depth discussion on this area of recommendations that were made to the minister and the departmental officials who will be in charge of the agency. We also had good discussions covering some of the areas that were of particular concern to the Federation of Agriculture, as well as to others. We also made a number of observations and recommendations in the course of the hearings on the bill.

The committee heard from a variety of witnesses. In particular, representations were made by the departmental officials, by two unions, namely the Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada and the Public Service Alliance of Canada, as well as the Canadian Federation of Agriculture. As is often the case, I and other members of the committee were frustrated by the limited amount of time given for the examination of the bill.

•(1450)

This bill will have an influence on several key issues of critical concern to Canadian agricultural producers and processors. For example, the bill will enable the creation of the Canadian Food Inspection Agency. Certainly, a high level of food safety is important, not only to Canadian consumers but to our international customers. The important contribution made by the agricultural sector to Canada's balance of trade is due in part to our international reputation as a reliable supplier of consistently high-quality agricultural products. While the establishment of a single food inspection agency would seem to be an efficient manner in which to conduct inspections, and while it is likely that the proposed agency would ensure that Canadian agricultural products are of high quality, several concerns exist concerning the proposed agency. Some of these were highlighted in the committee's report yesterday.

For example, the whole issue of cost recovery is of concern to our producers and processors. The user fee that producers and processors will pay to the proposed agency must not be set at a level that will make them less competitive in the global marketplace. Given the importance of ensuring that we remain competitive, it was distressing for the committee to be told that there had been no assessment of total moneys paid by the

agricultural sector for cost recovery. It is for this reason that the committee recommended that such an analysis be undertaken immediately. It is only through such an analysis that we will be able to compare the costs of Canadian producers and processors with those of their international competitors and thereby ensure that we are not being placed at a competitive disadvantage in the global marketplace.

On this point particularly, Senator Kenny suggested that it is important that the committee obtain from the agency an account of what is happening in these areas. All senators should be active in seeing that that happens.

The Agriculture Committee has had excellent cooperation from its members, possibly for many reasons. While we have had many things on our table, as farmers we are down-to-earth and we get down to the facts of the situation. I appreciate that cooperation, as well as the cooperation we experienced on our Washington trip. Some committee members will be reporting on that later.

Another issue of concern to me, some committee members, and some witnesses was the inadequate detail in the bill with respect to the proposed advisory board. As noted in the committee's observations and recommendations, while the bill specifies the maximum size of the proposed board and that it will advise the minister on any matter within the responsibility of the proposed agency, it would appear that there is no requirement for the proposed board to be representative. Further, details are lacking on the specific mandate of the proposed board.

In particular, the Canadian Federation of Agriculture suggested that the proposed advisory board complete an annual performance review of the proposed agency and of its fee schedule and that it play a major role in the drafting of the regulations. The Public Service Alliance of Canada suggested that the proposed advisory board have the authority to review the operations of the proposed agency and to provide advice, whether solicited or not. While information on the representative nature of the proposed board and its specific mandate may be included in the regulations, as is often the case, the draft regulations were not provided to the committee. This information would have been helpful in the committee's examination of the bill.

In any event, it is hoped that any advice given or recommendations made by the proposed advisory board will be given greater consideration than is sometimes the case with the advice and recommendations of the Canadian Wheat Board advisory committee. Many of the recommendations they make are not heard by those in authority making the decisions.

Concerns were also raised by the two unions which appeared before the committee. The Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada expressed a concern about the loss of rights and protections of employees once they are no longer covered by the Public Service Employment Act. The Public Service Alliance of Canada stressed that only employees of the proposed agency should be permitted to carry out inspection activities and perform other functions. These concerns are valid. It is hoped that, as a

separate employer, the proposed agency will abide by the spirit of the rights and protections provided to employees under the Public Service Employment Act. Moreover, it is hoped that any delegation of inspection and other functions to persons other than employees of the proposed agency will mean no reduction in the level of food safety.

We, in Canada, enjoy some of the safest food in the world. We certainly want to continue that pattern in these inspection agencies and ensure that we in no way undermine the importance of providing safe food to our people and our international customers, given that our agricultural exports have been of tremendous benefit.

In conclusion, in this time of change in the agricultural sector, all parties must adapt. The proposed Canadian Food Inspection Agency is only one element of this change. The Standing Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will be monitoring the agency and its operations to ensure that the needs of our agricultural producers and processors, as well as our Canadian and international customers, will be met.

Honourable senators, as the farmer goes, so goes a country's food production. This is probably one of the most important issues that we face. As was once said, "Destroy the farmer and grass will grow in the streets of the city in the nation."

You might say I have a bias. I see Senator Hays smiling; he may have a bias as well. However, the Senate is aware of the importance of agriculture. We are certainly going through many changes, as we heard in Washington, with regard to the Wheat Board, transportation and agencies, and it is most important that we in the Senate pay attention to the issues that exist in agriculture in order to keep agriculture strong in Canada.

Motion agreed to and bill read third time and passed.

• (1500)

CRIMINAL CODE

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

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

Hon. Thérèse Lavoie-Roux: Honourable senators, I rise today to speak to Bill S-13, to amend the Criminal Code regarding protection of health care providers. This bill, I believe, is well intentioned but, unfortunately, it contains very serious flaws.

In June 1995, the Special Senate Committee on Euthanasia and Assisted Suicide tabled its report. For more than a year, that committee carefully examined voluminous documentation and hundreds of letters and briefs. We heard testimony from many

specialists with a wide variety of backgrounds who dealt with the fundamental issues relating to end-of-life decisions in their day-to-day work or in their research. Despite our best intentions and, I might say, hard work, we were not successful in arriving at any unanimous recommendations on euthanasia and assisted suicide. Both were rejected by the majority of the members of the committee.

We were, however, unanimous when we acknowledged the necessity of clearly distinguishing euthanasia and assisted suicide from the provision of treatment to alleviate suffering, or the withholding or withdrawal of life-sustaining treatment. We concluded that there is a fundamental difference between causing death, on the one hand, and not working to uselessly prolong life on the other.

A number of witnesses referred to the widespread confusion in both the medical profession and the general public concerning the withdrawal of life-sustaining treatment, and pain management using sufficient and effective medication. We were told that, at times, health care professionals, out of fear of being charged with euthanasia, and often because of lack of proper training and knowledge, were administering inadequate amounts of medication for pain relief. Many people who expressed concern over the prospect of dying in excruciating pain were in favour of euthanasia, in the belief that this was the only solution to physical suffering. Yet we were informed, time and time again, that good palliative care can overcome pain in 95 per cent of the cases.

As a result of this information the committee, in its chapter on palliative care, recognized its importance and made the development of palliative care the first and most important recommendation of its report. The committee recognized its importance and recommended expanded and improved research into palliative care, especially pain control and symptom relief.

Bill S-13 proposes to establish a legal basis to legitimize medical practices based on the right to refuse treatment. However, it is lacking a key element. When the special committee made its recommendation, it specified that a change to the Criminal Code regarding withdrawing and withholding, and pain control that may result in shortening life, must be complemented by the creation of guidelines. That is totally absent from this bill.

The committee recommended that these guidelines be developed by the division of Health Canada responsible for health protection and promotion in conjunction with the provinces, territories and national associations of health professionals. I find it astonishing that there is no reference made in Bill S-13 to these guidelines, even though they were a crucial element in the committee's unanimous recommendation.

It is interesting that on this matter of withdrawal and withholding, there were three recommendations. The first one was that the Criminal Code be amended to clarify the practice of providing treatment for the purpose of alleviating suffering that may shorten life. However, there were two others. The second one recommended what I have just read — the necessity of

having guidelines that would be defined in consultation with the federal government, the provinces and territories. The third one was that the committee recommended that education and training with respect to pain control be expanded and improved for all health care professionals. We also recommended a public campaign to inform people of their rights regarding the refusal of life-sustaining treatment.

In addition, further study is needed to establish what methods actually shorten life in order to have some standard for health professionals. Bill S-13 ignores all of these recommendations. Without these important elements of professional guidance and enhanced education and training, I do not think we will have clarified anything. I think we will have opened the door to abuses, too.

I should like, moreover, to point out another major omission. The bill makes absolutely no mention of the obligations for health care providers to obtain free and informed consent from the patient, or the person best placed to speak on his behalf, before administering any medication in doses that might shorten the patient's life, though the bill does refer to that informed consent in relation to decisions touching upon withdrawing and withholding. This decision is even more serious if you do not obtain it for pain relief, using medication and with no standards.

When it is impossible to know what decision the patient would have made when fully lucid, the best judgment should be made by a multi-disciplinary team of health care providers. Without guidelines or assurance of consent, we open the door to many abuses. Clearly, the protection of health care providers must not in any way take precedence over protection of the patient's rights.

This bill at present seems only concerned with protecting the health care provider, which is all right because the present situation quite often prevents them from fully accomplishing or adequately fulfilling their responsibilities. Perhaps, when we are making the necessary changes, we should include the protection of patients as well as health care providers in the title of the bill.

Another concern I have is that the French translation of this bill is very poor. I have several suggestions for changes, and would ask that an expert look into the matter as soon as possible so that the bill can be revised accordingly. I am sure that everyone would agree, when dealing with a potentially contentious issue such as this one, that special attention should be given to the wording of the French translation.

[*Translation*]

I will say a few words in French because this concerns everyone. The bill before us today clearly identifies legitimate medical practices based on the right to refuse treatment or to obtain appropriate medication to alleviate suffering. The proposed amendment to the Criminal Code establishes the legal basis, which must be complemented by the implementation of guidelines or standards of practice developed in conjunction with the provinces, territories and the national associations of health

professionals. Without special guidance and enhanced education and training, we will not really improve the situation.

I find it astonishing that there is no reference in this bill to these guidelines and standards, although they were a crucial element in the committee's unanimous recommendation. I am surprised this escaped our colleague Senator Carstairs, because the two are closely linked.

In fact, I would like to point out a major omission. The bill makes absolutely no mention of the obligation for health care providers to obtain free and informed consent from the patient or the person in the best place to speak on his behalf before administering any medication that may shorten the patient's life. When it is impossible to know what decision a patient would have made when fully lucid, the best judgment will be made by a multidisciplinary team of health care providers and not the physician alone, in the best interests of the patient. I think it stands to reason that this bill should aim to protect both the patient and the health care providers.

[*English*]

• (1510)

In conclusion, I am convinced it is worthwhile to amend the Criminal Code in order to clarify the practice of withholding and withdrawing treatment and of providing treatment that, to alleviate suffering, may shorten life. Clarification will help remove the insecurity of health care providers, patients and the general public. I fully subscribe to the objective of the bill as tabled. However, I believe there are serious omissions and ambiguities which ought to be corrected. Thus, I cannot vote in favour of this bill.

When the committee recommended clarification in the Criminal Code, they believed the other recommendations which were overlooked in the drafting of this bill were an integral part of the process to achieve this goal.

It is obvious that, without specified parameters, we open the door to all kinds of abuse. We must be careful not to pass a law which has the potential to allow assisted suicide and euthanasia through the back door. Imagine a person receiving medication, without his consent or the consent of his next of kin, that might accelerate death. Imagine his consent has not been requested, and we have no standards. Should we allow the attitude: "He is suffering, go ahead and end it."? Without safeguards, we are allowing euthanasia through the back door.

It is my intention to propose amendments in the committee hearings. I am sure many people will wish to appear before the committee to express their concerns about the legislation. It will also be important to hear from witnesses who work in the field of palliative care and use medication to relieve pain.

Documentation has shown that lobbying for euthanasia has not ceased. This is dangerous and should make us even more careful of adopting this bill before it has been amended in some very important areas.

[Translation]

Again, I firmly believe that, if passed in its present form, the bill before us is a dangerous bill opening the door to all forms of abuse. We are not saying that there should not be a bill, but that it should be improved in the fairest and most efficient fashion possible, so that there is something in it for all concerned, patients as well as practitioners.

On motion of Senator DeWare, debate adjourned.

[English]

INTERNAL ECONOMY, BUDGETS AND ADMINISTRATION

SIXTEENTH REPORT OF COMMITTEE ADOPTED

The Senate proceeded to consideration of the sixteenth report of the Standing Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration (*budget — Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce*), presented in the Senate on March 5, 1997.

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

Motion agreed to and report adopted.

SEVENTEENTH REPORT OF COMMITTEE ADOPTED

The Senate proceeded to consideration of the seventeenth report of the Standing Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration (*budget — Special Committee of the Senate on the Cape Breton Development Corporation*), presented in the Senate on March 5, 1997.

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

Motion agreed to and report adopted.

[Translation]

THE BUDGET, 1997

STATEMENT OF MINISTER OF FINANCE—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. Roch Bolduc rose pursuant to the notice of inquiry given by Senator Lynch-Staunton on Wednesday, February 19, 1997:

That he will call the attention of the Senate to the budget presented by the Minister of Finance on Tuesday, February 18, 1997.

He said: Honourable senators, I always listen very carefully to the budget speech every year, because that is when the government announces several of its decisions.

Indeed, after publishing in the fall the economic and fiscal update, in which he gives his diagnosis of the situation, the

Minister of Finance announces in February the remedies for our real or alleged ills, using a combination of the economic policy tools available to him: taxes, expenditure programs, new regulations.

I would like to briefly outline and comment on what the minister said, in essence, about the objectives pursued by the government, its fiscal goals, its spending, its strategies to fight the deficit, the debt and the unemployment problem.

The minister said that the government was committed to strengthening the Canadian economy. Who can disagree with that? Nobody, of course, although the ways and means taken to achieve that goal remain to be seen. That is generally where policies are deficient and sometimes counter-productive.

For example, a number of serious studies on economic growth show that the essential areas in which governments can act — and therefore have a positive influence — are the relative levels of taxation, regulations, as well as investment, work and innovation incentives. The economic analyses conducted by professors Krugman, Lipsey, Gwartney and many others all reach the same conclusion. How is Canada doing in these areas, and how does the 1997-98 budget improve the situation? That is how this budget should be assessed, as far as the job strategy is concerned, for instance.

I regret to say, honourable senators, that it scores very poorly. Granted, deficit reduction and the move toward freer trade are positive actions. However, what else is the government doing to create jobs?

[English]

The federal debt continues to rise and now amounts to \$600 billion or three-quarters of Canada's gross domestic product. If we add the over \$225 billion in provincial debt, largely caused by federal decisions affecting health, education and social services, our public debt amounts to 100 per cent of Canada's GDP. That is no cause for self-congratulation.

• (1520)

Our taxes rank us fourth in the OECD championship after Belgium, Sweden and the Netherlands.

It is not surprising that, from the European model, we have also inherited Europe's double-digit unemployment — twice as high as in the United States, by the way — since we tax and regulate as blithely as the Europeans do. Tell that to Canada's business persons who are in full agreement with this policy and who are in a position to know since they are its main victims. I shall return later to the other objectives of the government's economic policy.

The minister's speech is contradictory as well. For example, after indicating ways to achieve economic progress, necessarily including lower taxes, the minister says, "But not this year!" Lowering taxes, of course, is one of the most decisive ways of promoting corporate and individual investment. Furthermore, when the minister boasts that he has managed to lower the deficit, he fails to point out that personal income taxes have increased by \$15 billion since 1993.

Another example, honourable senators, is the minister's statement that tax bites in the form of payroll deductions kill jobs. We were expecting real relief. However, he is content to knock 10 cents off employment insurance contributions. Without affecting the desired results, he could have afforded to provide at least 50 cents in relief to these economic agents. In terms of employment, this difference amounts to hundreds of thousands of jobs. I will come back to employment insurance later.

Another example is the minister's misplaced pride in having cleaned up spending on government programs. It must be noted, however, that reduced spending is mainly due to lower interest rates, cuts in transfer payments to the provinces, reductions to employment insurance, and privatization initiated by the previous government.

[*Translation*]

In addition, as soon as the minister says he has finished with the huge program cuts, he announces new spending, described by some observers as passing out the Smarties. Imagine what he would get into if the deficit had been reduced to zero, because, we must remember, we have not yet reached that point.

As the President of the Treasury Board talks of the end of duplication, the Minister of Finance announces new programs in areas of provincial jurisdiction, such as health. It is almost indecent.

The minister is relying on the recommendations of lobby groups to justify intervention in areas that are none of his business. If they wanted to fuel the sovereignty movement in Quebec, they could not do a better job. The minister's attitude is the same as the one that has prevailed in Ottawa for 40 years: "We know better than the people what is good for them." The minister is saying that one of the objectives of the government in its fight against the deficit is to re-establish the primacy of public policy in Canada. You would think you were listening to the members of the PQ talking about assuming the ability to forge their own destiny.

As if the objective of Canadian economic policy were the primacy of government in policy-making. Given the limited capacity of governments, even with the enlightened opinions of the fine economists in the Department of Finance to correctly assess the situations and the negative effects of the remedies they impose, there is nothing to rejoice over and brag about.

[*English*]

Honourable senators, it seems to me that this government, which was elected on the promise of jobs and which, four years later, is boasting of having lowered the unemployment rate by 1 per cent, is patting itself on the back too soon.

In his speech, the minister draws inspiration from certain leaders in the White House: At times, he has the victorious air of President Clinton, satisfied with the domestic economy and world peace, and starting to talk about education, an area of state jurisdiction; at other times, he resembles President Hoover and

his famous slogan "Prosperity is around the corner." Let us hope this corner does not get farther away as we approach it.

The minister's speech is triumphant in tone but ignores regrettable realities. People realize that the debt is enormous. In the OECD indebtedness championship, again, Canada ranks third. However, the minister fails to mention other, equally large but perversely hidden financial commitments for which no provision has been made, such as the Canada Pension fund, amounting to an additional \$600 billion. The minister mentions the need for reform and, yes, the Canada Pension Plan must be reformed. However, the cost of those reforms will be a sharp increase in contributions. Within the next seven years, payments will skyrocket to 9.9 per cent of incomes from 5.6 per cent last year, with employees and employers each paying half. This is according to a recent agreement between the premiers and the federal government.

Honourable senators, payroll taxes kill job creation. It does not matter whether they are from employment insurance, workers' compensation, the CPP or the QPP, or any other reason that governments choose to tax wages. For example, by the end of the coming fiscal year, the combined surpluses of the EI account from past years will total \$12 billion. By the end of the 1998-99 fiscal year, that cumulative surplus will be in the range of \$17 billion. The average worker has handed over an extra week and a half of wages to help Ottawa build this surplus over the past three years.

Honourable senators, the Liberals have changed their view on payroll taxes. As recently as the fall of 1994, they believed "payroll taxes raise the relative cost of labour, creating a disincentive for firms to create jobs." They said so in "Building a More Innovative Economy" at page 25. They felt that a payroll tax "raises unemployment relative to the situation in which there is no tax or a lower tax." That quotation is from "A New Framework for Economic Policy," page 22.

This fall, the Liberal majority on the Finance Committee sang a different tune in its pre-budget report, and I quote:

The case is not clear that payroll taxes are killers of jobs.

The new line is that current payroll taxes are not killers of jobs, but the rising payroll would be. I quote:

There is no doubt that when payroll taxes rise, that can have an effect on jobs.

That quotation is from a town hall meeting with Paul Martin on the CBC on February 20, 1997. Since the Minister of Finance is at least willing to admit that rising payroll taxes hurt job creation, then perhaps he should spend a few minutes to do a little arithmetic. Their small EI premium cuts are more than offset by rising CPP contributions. Since 1993, the combined cost of EI and CPP to employers has climbed to \$7.12 per \$100 of earnings from \$6.50. On \$30,000 of earnings, that is an extra \$184 a year in payroll taxes. For employees, the combined rate next year will be 6 per cent compared to 5.5 per cent in 1993. That works out to an extra \$150 on \$30,000 of earnings.

Yes, honourable senators, higher CPP premiums are part of the answer to saving the CPP and the QPP, but these must be offset with lower income taxes or lower EI premiums. Unfortunately, these higher CPP premiums will not even show up on the books. The biggest single tax hike in recent memory will remain hidden.

[*Translation*]

When such commitments hang over our heads, not to mention the funding of the health care system, an issue which is far from being settled, even though the federal government tends to wash its hands of it, the minister comes up with \$100 million in conditional assistance here and there for health, for a new type of family allowance — he should think about his father — for innovative technology, and for graduate studies. Therefore, on the one hand, we have the same paternalistic, overbearing and unrepentant federalism of the sixties, seventies and eighties and, on the other hand, the same blissful satisfaction regarding program cuts, which are said to be over. I will get back to this later.

Honourable senators, I say to the Minister of Finance and to his Treasury Board colleague that they still have a lot of work to do.

Instead of telling us what the market cannot do, as the Minister of Finance went to great pains to explain to us, he should respect the Constitution of our land while there is still time to do so, and he should stop encroaching on other jurisdictions by offering the provinces, at his conditions, money that he has, in fact, borrowed.

Second, as a show of goodwill, the government should heed the advice of the C.D. Howe Institute and leave the responsibility for manpower training to those provinces interested in taking it over. Incidentally, what is the government waiting for to sign an agreement with Quebec? This issue has been dragging on for years.

Third, I point out to the President of the Treasury Board that the spending program review is not over yet. I suggest, as examples, that the following activities be reviewed.

Veterans' security: Far be it from me to deprive our brave defenders of the care and assistance they deserve. However, the fact is that since 1953 we have not fought in any war. After 45 years of peace, it would be appropriate to take a look at these growing benefits, which now amount to \$2 billion.

In Canada, the audiovisual sector is subsidized to the tune of \$1.2 billion, while transfers to the provinces for education are being reduced. What are the government's priorities?

The budget for Correctional Services and the RCMP is currently \$2.3 billion, but it keeps increasing. Is technology not supposed to make it possible to save money somewhere? It looks like we are on cruise control.

The number of bureaucrats in the fisheries and agriculture departments is decreasing very slowly, even though there are fewer fishers and farmers. Is this normal?

A total of \$2 billion is spent on public works and government services. Why is it taking so long to privatize services that

compete with the private sector, as we found out last year when we reviewed the budget?

CIDA gets \$2 billion, even though it has been demonstrated that trade liberalization is a more efficient solution than financial assistance to improve the standard of living in countries facing financial difficulties.

Government laboratories have already been scrutinized in terms of their ability to meet the demand in a competitive environment. What is the situation regarding this issue?

Are programs for natives not creating a culture of dependency?

The government claims it wants to stop subsidizing businesses. Yet, the trade minister has a budget of several billions of dollars to provide assistance and loans of all kinds. It is a known fact that governments are bad creditors who do not know when to stop lending money to losers. Still, they continue to believe they can spot winners.

[*English*]

In today's global economy, where new technology is changing the nature of work required in every sector of industry, it is not the government's job to select or support one enterprise over another, and I am tempted to apply the same logic to research centres. The government wants to assist students but does not know how to collect on its loans to those customers. These are some examples of the work that needs to be done before the government can say that there is no more fat in its workforce of 200,000 employees.

Like the President of the Treasury Board in the 1997 document entitled "Getting Government Right," the Minister of Finance in his budget still demonstrates faith in interventionist government. Both should know, however, as Charles Murray says, that politicians are not gods. They have limited knowledge of the real economic situation and the repercussions of the legislation they enact. The only certainty is that interventionist government increases politicians' power at the expense of our freedom.

If the minister wants real challenges, I can suggest two: Lower income taxes by 15 per cent so that Canada is competitive with the United States, and bring the debt down to 50 per cent of the GDP. If the minister can score on those two events, I can accept the complacent tone he used in February.

[*Translation*]

I know that the minister's economic intentions are praiseworthy but, as long as we persist in applying policies that have a dissuasive effect on workers and entrepreneurs, we will be stuck in the trough of the wave as France and Germany are. We cannot ask employers to create jobs and at the same time keep raising the cost of creating jobs for the employer, or encourage employees to pull out of the job market voluntarily by offering them incentives.

Similarly, the minister wants to take a page from the socio-democratic societies and invest more money in human capital. The results of such policies are not all that impressive, however, judging by the examples of France and Germany in particular. Even in Sweden, unemployment has quadrupled since 1990.

The minister has also emphasized the importance of innovation. He is right, except that I would point out that Professor Lichtenberger of Columbia — a good university, Senator Stewart's alma mater — took an inventory of R&D expenditures in 53 countries and concluded that the performance level of government-funded R&D — as is the case in Canada — is lower than in the private sector, and even negative in some cases.

[English]

In closing, honourable senators, you can see that I am more severe than the Minister of Finance in assessing the job the government has done. Where the deficit is concerned, if the minister's efforts have had fortunate results, it is largely because inflation has been under control, thanks to the previous government. Where free trade is concerned, the government has changed horses in midstream and adopted the position that we developed and defended before him. Similarly, his change of opinion concerning transport amounts to an implementation of our government's policies.

[Translation]

As for the rest, there is nothing good to say: His tax policy is unfair, largely because it overtaxes everyone. His industrial strategy takes too much for granted, as I have often said. His manpower policy encourages unemployment, his cultural policy is protectionist, his regulatory policy is headed nowhere; regulations are piling up and the bureaucracy is calling the shots. Finally, his constitutional policy is set in concrete: no agreement has been reached with Quebec on employment, for example, with potentially disastrous consequences in the short term.

On motion of Senator Kinsella, debate adjourned.

[English]

CAPE BRETON DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

SPECIAL COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED
TO EXTEND DATE OF FINAL REPORT

Hon. Lowell Murray, pursuant to notice of March 5, 1997, moved:

That notwithstanding the Order of the Senate adopted on February 11, 1997, the Special Committee of the Senate on the Cape Breton Development Corporation which was authorized to examine and report upon the Annual Report, Corporate Plan and progress reports of the Cape Breton Development Corporation and related matters, be empowered to present its final report no later than April 10, 1997; and

That the Committee retain all powers necessary to publicize the findings of the Committee contained in the final report until April 14, 1997; and

That the Committee be permitted, notwithstanding usual practices, to deposit its report with the Clerk of the Senate, if the Senate is not then sitting; and

That the report be deemed to have been tabled in the Chamber.

He said: Honourable senators may recall that when the Special Committee of the Senate on the Cape Breton Development Corporation was revived several weeks ago a deadline of March 11 was set for the committee to table its final report to the Senate. This motion proposes to extend that deadline until April 10, 1997.

There are three reasons in favour of this extension of the deadline. The first is that a number of our colleagues who are interested in the Special Committee of the Senate on the Cape Breton Development Corporation are almost fully engaged with the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce in its examination of Bill C-70, the HST bill. Honourable senators know that legislation must take priority. Therefore, the Special Committee of the Senate on the Cape Breton Development Corporation would defer to these honourable senators so that they can get their work done. They could not possibly attend or take part in the Cape Breton committee if the deadline of March 11 were to stand.

The second reason for extending the deadline is that the Senate passed Senator Buchanan's motion the other day to permit the committee to travel to Cape Breton. It turns out that the earliest date on which we could travel to Cape Breton is the week beginning Monday, March 17, which is some days following the deadline of March 11.

The third reason is that it has been informally represented to honourable senators on both sides by management of the Cape Breton Development Corporation that they would prefer a date later rather than earlier in March because later in March they would have more complete information as to the financial results of the corporation for the entire fiscal year, which ends on March 31.

Honourable senators, for those three reasons, I ask for your support for this motion to extend the deadline of the committee. I put this forward today on behalf of our chairman, Senator Rompkey.

Motion agreed to.

The Senate adjourned until Monday, March 10, 1997, at 8 p.m.

**THE SENATE OF CANADA
PROGRESS OF LEGISLATION
(2nd Session, 35th Parliament)
Thursday, March 6, 1997**

**GOVERNMENT BILLS
(HOUSE OF COMMONS)**

No.	Title	1st	2nd	Committee	Report	Amend.	3rd	R.A.	Chap.
C-2	An Act to amend the Judges Act	96/03/19	96/03/20	Legal & Constitutional Affairs	96/03/21	none	96/03/26	96/03/28	2/96
C-3	An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code (nuclear undertakings) and to make a related amendment to another Act	96/03/27	96/03/28	Social Affairs, Science & Technology	96/05/01	none	96/05/08 referred back to Committee 96/05/16	95/05/29	12/96
C-4	An Act to amend the Standards Council of Canada Act	96/06/18	96/06/20	Banking, Trade & Commerce	96/09/24	none	96/09/25	96/10/22	24/96
C-5	An Act to amend the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act and the Income Tax Act	96/10/24	96/10/31	Banking, Trade & Commerce	97/02/04	eleven	97/02/13		
C-6	An Act to amend the Yukon Quartz Mining Act and the Yukon Placer Mining Act	96/10/21	96/10/23	Aboriginal Peoples	96/11/05	none	96/11/06	96/11/28	27/96
C-7	An Act to establish the Department of Public Works and to amend and repeal certain Acts	96/03/27	96/03/28	National Finance	96/05/14	none	96/06/12	96/06/20	16/96
C-8	An Act respecting the control of certain drugs, their precursors and other substances and to amend certain other Acts and repeal the Narcotic Control Act in consequence thereof	96/03/19	96/03/21	Legal & Constitutional Affairs	96/06/13	fifteen	96/06/19	96/06/20	19/96
C-9	An Act respecting the Law Commission of Canada	96/03/28	96/04/23	Legal & Constitutional Affairs	96/05/09	none	96/05/14	96/05/29	9/96
C-10	An Act to provide borrowing authority for the fiscal year beginning on April 1, 1996	96/03/26	96/03/27	National Finance	96/03/28	none	96/03/28	96/03/28	3/96
C-11	An Act to establish the Department of Human Resources Development and to amend and repeal certain related Acts	96/04/24	96/04/30	Social Affairs, Science & Technology	96/05/15	none	96/05/16	96/05/29	11/96
C-12	An Act respecting employment insurance in Canada	96/05/14	96/05/30	Social Affairs Science & Technology	96/06/13	none	96/06/20	96/06/20	23/96

No.	Title	1st	2nd	Committee	Report	Amend.	3rd	R.A.	Chap.
C-13	An Act to provide for the establishment and operation of a program to enable certain persons to receive protection in relation to certain inquiries, investigations or prosecutions	96/04/23	96/04/30	Legal & Constitutional Affairs	96/05/28	one	96/05/30	96/06/20	15/96
C-14	An Act to continue the National Transportation Agency as the Canadian Transportation Agency, to consolidate and revise the National Transportation Act, 1987 and the Railway Act and to amend or repeal other Acts as a consequence	96/03/27	96/03/28	Transport & Communications	96/05/08	none	96/05/16	96/05/29	10/96
C-15	An Act to amend, enact and repeal certain laws relating to financial institutions	96/04/24	96/04/30	Banking, Trade & Commerce	96/05/01	none	96/05/02	96/05/29	6/96
C-16	An Act to amend the Contraventions Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts	96/04/23	96/04/25	Legal & Constitutional Affairs	96/05/02	none	96/05/08	96/05/29	7/96
C-18	An Act to establish the Department of Health and to amend and repeal certain Acts	96/04/24	96/04/30	Social Affairs, Science & Technology	96/05/08	none	96/05/09	96/05/29	8/96
C-19	An Act to implement the Agreement on Internal Trade	96/05/14	96/05/30	Banking, Trade & Commerce	96/06/11	none	96/06/12	96/06/20	17/96
C-20	An Act respecting the commercialization of civil air navigation services	96/06/05	96/06/10	Transport & Communications	96/06/19	one	96/06/19	96/06/20	20/96
C-21	An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of Canada for the financial year ending March 31, 1996	96/03/21	96/03/26	—	—	—	96/03/27	96/03/28	4/96
C-22	An Act granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of Canada for the financial year ending March 31, 1997	96/03/21	96/03/26	—	—	—	96/03/27	96/03/28	5/96
C-23	An Act to establish the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission and to make consequential amendments to other Acts	97/02/19	97/03/05	Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources					
C-26	An Act respecting the oceans of Canada	96/10/21	96/10/23	Fisheries	96/12/03	none	96/12/04	96/12/18	31/96
C-28	An Act respecting certain agreements concerning the redevelopment and operation of Terminals 1 and 2 at Lester B. Pearson International Airport	96/04/23	96/05/30	Legal & Constitutional Affairs	96/06/10	seven	defeated 96/06/19		
C-29	An Act to regulate interprovincial trade in and the importation for commercial purposes of certain manganese-based substances	96/12/03	96/12/13	96/12/17 Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources	97/03/04	none			
C-31	An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on March 6, 1996	96/05/28	96/05/30	National Finance	96/06/13	none	96/06/18	96/06/20	18/96
C-33	An Act to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act	96/05/14	96/05/16	Legal & Constitutional Affairs	96/05/28	none	96/06/05	96/06/20	14/96
C-35	An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code (minimum wage)	96/10/31	96/11/07	Social Affairs, Science & Technology	96/12/04	none	96/12/05	96/12/18	32/96
C-36	An Act to amend the Income Tax Act, the Excise Act, the Excise Tax Act, the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions Act, the Old Age Security Act and the Canada Shipping Act	96/06/18	96/06/19	Banking, Trade & Commerce	96/06/20	none	96/06/20	96/06/20	21/96

No.	Title	1st	2nd	Committee	Report	Amend.	3rd	R.A.	Chap.
C-41	An Act to amend the Divorce Act, the Family Orders and Agreements Enforcement Assistance Act, the Garnishment, Attachment and Pension Diversion Act and the Canada Shipping Act	96/11/25	96/11/28	Social Affairs, Science & Technology	97/02/12	two	97/02/13	97/02/19	1/97
C-42	An Act to amend the Judges Act and to make consequential amendments to another Act	96/06/18	96/10/02	Legal & Constitutional Affairs	96/10/21	none	96/11/07 (2 amend.)	96/11/28	30/96
C-45	An Act to amend the Criminal Code (judicial review of parole ineligibility) and another Act	96/10/03	96/10/22	Legal & Constitutional Affairs	96/12/05	none	96/12/18	96/12/18	34/96
C-48	An Act to amend the Federal Court Act, the Judges Act and the Tax Court of Canada Act	96/06/18	96/06/20	—	—	—	96/06/20	96/06/20	22/96
C-53	An Act to amend the Prisons and Reformatories Act	97/02/05	97/02/11	Legal & Constitutional Affairs	97/02/13	none	97/02/17	97/02/19	2/97
C-54	An Act to amend the Foreign Extraterritorial Measures Act	96/10/21	96/10/30	Foreign Affairs	96/11/06	none	96/11/07	96/11/28	28/96
C-56	An Act for granting Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of Canada for the financial year ending March 31, 1997	96/09/24	96/09/26	—	—	—	96/10/01	96/10/22	25/96
C-57	Act to amend the Bell Canada Act	97/02/04	97/02/12	Transport & Communications	97/02/17	none	97/02/18	97/02/19	3/97
C-60	An Act to establish the Canadian Food Inspection Agency and to repeal and amend other Acts as a consequence	97/02/13	97/02/18	Agriculture & Forestry	97/03/05	none	97/03/06		
C-61	An Act to implement the Canada—Israel Free Trade Agreement	96/11/07	96/11/28	Foreign Affairs	96/12/11	none	96/12/12	96/12/18	33/96
C-63	An Act to amend the Canada Elections Act, the Parliament of Canada Act and the Referendum Act	96/11/27	96/12/05	Legal & Constitutional Affairs	96/12/12	none	96/12/18	96/12/18	35/96
C-68	An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of Canada for the financial year ending March 31, 1997	96/11/25	96/11/27	—	—	—	96/11/28	96/11/28	29/96
C-70	An Act to amend the Excise Tax Act, the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act, the Income Tax Act, the Debt Servicing and Reduction Account Act and related Acts	97/02/12	97/02/20	Banking, Trade & Commerce					

COMMONS PUBLIC BILLS

No.	Title	1st	2nd	Committee	Report	Amend.	3rd	R.A.	Chap.
C-202	An Act respecting a National Organ Donor Week in Canada	96/12/13	96/12/18	Social Affairs, Science & Technology	97/02/04	none	97/02/06	97/02/19	4/97
C-216	An Act to amend the Broadcasting Act (broadcasting policy)	96/09/24	96/12/03	Transport & Communications					

C-243	An Act to amend the Canada Elections Act (reimbursement of election expenses)	96/05/16	96/05/28	Legal & Constitutional Affairs	96/09/26	none	96/10/01	96/10/22	26/96
C-270	An Act to amend the Financial Administration Act (session of Parliament)	96/12/03	96/12/11	National Finance	97/02/13	none	97/02/17	97/02/19	5/97
C-275	An Act to establish the Canadian Association of Former Parliamentarians	96/04/30	96/05/14	Legal & Constitutional Affairs	96/05/16	three	96/05/16	95/05/29	13/96
No.	Title	1st	2nd	Committee	Report	Amend.	3rd	R.A.	Chap.
C-347	An Act to change the names of certain electoral districts	96/11/25	96/11/27	Legal & Constitutional Affairs	96/12/12	three	96/12/12	96/12/18	36/96

SENATE PUBLIC BILLS

No.	Title	1st	2nd	Committee	Report	Amend.	3rd	R.A.	Chap.
S-2	An Act to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act (Sexual orientation) (Sen. Kinsella)	96/02/28	96/03/26	Legal & Constitutional Affairs	96/04/23	none	96/04/24		
S-3	An Act to amend the Criminal Code (plea bargaining) (Sen. Cools)	96/02/28	96/05/02	Legal & Constitutional Affairs	96/11/07	Rec.			
S-4	An Act to amend the Criminal Code (abuse of process) (Sen. Cools)	96/02/28	96/10/28	Legal & Constitutional Affairs					
S-5	An Act to restrict the manufacture, sale, importation and labelling of tobacco products (Sen. Haidasz, P.C.)	96/03/19	96/03/21	Social Affairs, Science & Technology					
S-6	An Act to amend the Criminal Code (period of ineligibility for parole) (Sen. Cools)	96/03/26		Dropped from Order Paper re: Rule 27(3)	96/11/07				
S-9	An Act providing for self-government by the first nations of Canada (Sen. Tkachuk)	96/06/13		Dropped from Order Paper re: Rule 27(3)					
S-10	An Act to amend the Criminal Code (criminal organization) (Sen. Roberge)	96/06/18	96/12/10	Legal & Constitutional Affairs					
S-11	An Act to amend the Excise Tax Act (Sen. Di Nino)	96/06/20	97/02/19	Social Affairs, Science & Technology					
S-12	An Act providing for self-government by the first nations of Canada (Sen. Tkachuk)	96/11/25	97/02/18	Aboriginal Peoples					
S-13	An Act to amend the Criminal Code (protection of health care providers) (Sen. Carstairs)	96/11/27							
S-14	An Act to amend the Criminal Code and the Department of Health Act (security of the child) (Sen. Carstairs)	96/12/12							

PRIVATE BILLS

No.	Title	1st	2nd	Committee	Report	Amend.	3rd	R.A.	Chap.
S-7	An Act to dissolve the Nipissing and James Bay Railway Company (Sen. Kelleher, P.C.)	96/05/02	96/05/08	Transport & Communications	96/05/15	none	96/05/16	96/10/22	38/96

S-8	An Act respecting Queen's University at Kingston (Sen. Murray, P.C.)	96/06/06	96/06/10	Legal & Constitutional Affairs	96/06/13	96/06/20	37/96
S-15	An Act to amend An Act to incorporate the Bishop of the Artic of the Church of England in Canada (Sen. Meighen)	97/02/13	97/02/18	Legal & Constitutional Affairs			

CONTENTS

Thursday, March 6, 1997

	PAGE		PAGE
SENATORS' STATEMENTS		Delayed Answers to Oral Questions	
Health		Senator Graham	1665
Closing of Montfort Hospital in Ottawa.		Intergovernmental Affairs	
Senator Grimard	1660	Future Labour Market Development Agreements—Assurance of	
Senator Kenny	1660	Availability of Service to Anglophones in Quebec—	
		Government Position.	
International Women's Day		Question by Senator Lynch-Staunton.	
Senator Anderson	1660	Senator Graham (Delayed Answer)	1665
		Atomic Energy of Canada	
National Social Work Week		Sale of CANDU Reactors to China—Subject of Further	
Senator Pearson	1660	Negotiations Between Parties—Government Position.	
		Question by Senator Spivak.	
Health		Senator Graham (Delayed Answer)	1665
Closing of Montfort Hospital in Ottawa.		Answers to Order Paper Questions Tabled	
Senator Simard	1661	Transport Canada—Status Regarding	
Senator Prud'homme	1661	Civil Aviation Medical Examiners.	
Senator Carstairs	1662	Senator Graham	1665
Senator Lavoie-Roux	1662	Composition of Youth Task Force.	
		Senator Graham	1665
ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS		Canada-China Agreement—Sale of CANDU Reactors—	
Adjournment		Government Position. Senator Graham	1665
Senator Graham	1663	<hr/>	
		ORDERS OF THE DAY	
QUESTION PERIOD		Canadian Food Inspection Agency Bill (Bill C-60)	
Justice		Third Reading. Senator Taylor	1666
Suppression by Privy Council of Document Filed in Court		Senator Gustafson	1666
Case—Government Position.	1663	Criminal Code (Bill S-13)	
Senator Cogger	1663	Bill to Amend—Second Reading—Debate Continued.	
Senator Fairbairn	1663	Senator Lavoie-Roux	1667
Agriculture		Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration	
Delays in Rail Shipment of Grain to West Coast—		Sixteenth Report of Committee Adopted. Senator Kenny	1669
Request for Update. Senator Gustafson	1664	Seventeenth Report of Committee Adopted. Senator Kenny	1669
Senator Fairbairn	1664	The Budget, 1997	
Health		Statement of Minister of Finance—Debate Adjourned.	
Increase of Incidence of Lung Cancer in Women—		Senator Bolduc	1669
Government Position. Senator Haidasz	1664	Cape Breton Development Corporation	
Senator Fairbairn	1664	Special Committee Authorize to Extend Date of Final Report.	
Tobacco Products Restrictions Bill—Status of Legislation—		Senator Murray	1672
Government Position. Senator Haidasz	1664	Progress of Legislation	
Senator Fairbairn	1665		i



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