



CANADA

Debates of the Senate

2nd SESSION

•

35th PARLIAMENT

•

VOLUME 136

•

NUMBER 85

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Thursday, March 20, 1997

—

THE HONOURABLE GILDAS L. MOLGAT
SPEAKER

CONTENTS

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

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

Published by the Senate

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

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

THE SENATE

Thursday, March 20, 1997

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

Prayers.

SENATORS' STATEMENTS

LITERACY ACTION DAY

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I wish to take a moment today to congratulate all of the literacy advocates and volunteers who organized the most successful Literacy Action Day on Parliament Hill yesterday. Throughout the day, representatives from ABC Canada, Frontier College, la Fédération canadienne pour l'alphabétisation en français, the Movement for Canadian Literacy, Adult Learners and Laubach Literacy of Canada met with members of all parties in the House of Commons and the Senate. In fact, by the end of this month they will have met with 60 parliamentarians. I cannot tell honourable senators what a contrast that is to what has occurred in past years.

The purpose of Literacy Action Day, quite simply, is to raise awareness and understanding of this particular challenge we in this country face. Where better to start than here, on Parliament Hill, where reading, writing, speaking and communicating are absolutely basic to the work we do?

Honourable senators have heard me often, as have others, mention the fact that more than 40 per cent of our adult citizens have varying degrees of difficulty with the basics. Without the ability to read and write and to communicate at the levels demanded by today's society, these Canadians face a life of limited opportunities and unachieved goals. Canada suffers because of their inability to fully participate in, and contribute to, our national life. We need all of our citizens, and no one in this country should have to sit on the sidelines for lack of learning opportunities.

Solutions are possible with patience, understanding, determination, and a lot of will.

•(1410)

I wish to thank again all of those who made yesterday possible, as well as the army of volunteers who, every day in this

country, work on this issue in every town and village across Canada.

FISHERIES

REPORTS AND INFORMATION OF SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERNET

Hon. Gerald J. Comeau: Honourable senators, as Chairman of the Standing Senate Committee on Fisheries, I am pleased to announce that the Fisheries Committee is breaking new ground in making the work of Parliament available to the Canadian public. Today, the Fisheries Committee began publishing the major reports of the committee on the Internet, in addition to background material related to the committee's current study on the privatization of fish quotas.

The Internet is becoming more and more available to Canadians. To many, it has become an essential and important tool to use in their workplace and classrooms.

That part of the Internet called the Worldwide Web has become such a widespread technology that Her Majesty the Queen announced two weeks ago that Buckingham Palace is now on the Worldwide Web with information about the monarchy. Indeed, Senator Prud'homme, the Senate Fisheries Committee is in good company.

In any event, the Fisheries Committee report from 1995 on the Atlantic groundfish industry, the 1993 report on the Atlantic inshore fishery, and the 1991 report on the lobster fishery are now available and can be seen by anyone on the Parliamentary Internet. I invite fellow senators to view our site for themselves. The reports, transcripts and background information are attractively and colourfully displayed. Other Senate committees may wish to follow our example and publish their reports and other information on the Worldwide Web. To that end, I am happy to make available material on how the reports of the Fisheries Committee were prepared for display on the Internet, which should make it that much easier for other committees to profit from our experience.

I invite senators to visit our site on the web at <http://www.parl.gc.ca/english/Senate/com-e/fish-e.htm>. By the time you get through the address, you may have worn out your stay. Nevertheless, I invite all honourable senators to visit the site.

CANADA COUCIL FOR THE ARTS

FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY

Hon. Philippe Deane Gigantès: Honourable senators, March 19, 1997, is a day we must not forget. We were honoured by the presence in our chamber of men and women who constitute the soul of our nation far more than we do: Our artists and intellectuals. Without the work of artists, writers and thinkers, a nation does not have much of a soul. In future centuries, nations that did not nurture their writers and artists will not be remembered very well, if at all.

Those who wielded power in the past are remembered in most cases not by their deeds but by the masterpiece of some artist they sponsored. Who among us knows much about Giulano de la Rovere, who became Pope Julius the Second? Which of his military or ecclesiastical deeds made a difference to the world? If he matters in history, it is because he was the patron of Michelangelo and Raphael, before whose work we stand awed and delighted. Julius also was the patron of Bramante, the architect who first planned Saint Peter's Basilica in Rome.

Who among us remembers the patrons of Johann Sebastian Bach or the names of the hierarchs of the Lutheran Church which employed him? Their only claim to lasting fame is that they enabled him to live in straitened circumstances while he gave the world the Passacaglia, the Brandenburg Concertos, the Saint Matthew Passion, and the rest of his constellation of musical beauty.

Fewer and fewer people know or care about Ancient Greek history. Napoleon said that Greek history was about wars among villages but recorded by great historians such as Herodotus and Thucydides, who are still read by our contemporary historians. Bertrand Russell wrote that the whole of western philosophy is a footnote to Plato. For millions of our contemporaries who read neither Plato nor Thucydides, the glory that was Greece can be seen and felt today in its immortal art.

If we do not nurture our creative artists and intellectuals, we shall lose our soul. If, as some fear, we lose our country, it might not matter, because there will be nothing lasting by which to remember us.

LITERACY

REMOVAL OF GOODS AND SERVICES TAX FROM READING MATERIALS

Hon. Consiglio Di Nino: Honourable senators, I wish to associate myself with the comments made by the Leader of the Government in the Senate. Literacy is an issue very dear to her heart.

However, while recognizing her commitment to the cause of literacy, I am truly disturbed by the lack of courage shown by the

Leader of the Government and her colleagues in keeping the promise made by numerous Liberals during the last election campaign, including many of the present cabinet ministers and the current Prime Minister.

On May 4, 1990, Mr. Art Eggleton, now Minister of International Trade, stated that:

Today, the case against the taxing of reading is stronger than ever. On behalf of those in our community striving to attain literacy, I urge your government to include reading material in the GST's zero-rate exemptions.

The Don't Tax Reading Coalition, made up of 24 Canadian organizations, including the Association of Canadian Publishers, the Canadian Federation of Students, the Canadian School Boards Association, the Canadian Council of Teachers of English, the Canadian Library Association, and many more, has stated over and over again that the elimination of the GST on reading material would help literacy immensely.

Yesterday, March 19, Literacy Action Day, reminds us that almost 50 per cent of Canadians lack adequate literacy skills. Honourable senators, we can help them. One of the best things we can do is listen to the coalition and remove the GST on reading material.

[*Translation*]

INTERNATIONAL FRANCOPHONIE DAY

Hon. Marie-P. Poulin: Honourable senators, today we are celebrating the Journée internationale de la Francophonie. This era of enhanced communications and trade is propitious for the enhancement of international ties, as we all know.

Let us recall that the concept of the Francophonie as an entity took root in 1986, with the first francophone summit. The Francophonie refers to the 49 countries and governments with people who speak French, who now have an organized framework of functional structures for cooperation and exchange. The leaders of these 49 countries and governments meet every two years in order to mobilize their resources and their energies. The creation of these francophone summits has ushered in a new era by focusing on the promotion of the French language throughout the planet.

In addition, Canada now has a minister responsible for the Francophonie, whom you know: Don Boudria, Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie, a Franco-Ontarian from the Prescott-Russell area. As well, the Francophonie has five major operations which arose out of the summits, including TV5, the international French-language television service which you receive on cable.

Honourable senators, let us all celebrate this Journée internationale de la Francophonie together.

**INTERNATIONAL ASSEMBLY OF
FRENCH-SPEAKING PARLIAMENTARIANS**

L'ORDRE DE LA PLÉIADE—
DECORATION AWARDED TO CLERK OF THE SENATE

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I am pleased to inform you that Paul Bélisle has been awarded the decoration of officier de la Pléiade by l'Association internationale des parlementaires de langue française.

•(1420)

I would also like to point out that we have his wife and two young daughters in the gallery on this occasion.

[English]

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

REPORT OF STANDING JOINT COMMITTEE TABLED

Hon. P. Derek Lewis: Honourable senators, I have the honour to table the fourth report of the Standing Joint Committee for the Scrutiny of Regulations, which deals with the Notice of Application for Treatment Regulations made by the Governor in Council pursuant to sections 672.6(1) and 672.95 of the Criminal Code on November 19, 1992 and registered as SOR/92-665.

CODE OF CONDUCT

FINAL REPORT OF SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE PRESENTED

Hon. Consiglio Di Nino, for Senator Oliver, Co-chairman of the Special Joint Committee on the Code of Conduct, presented the following report:

Thursday, March 20, 1997

The Special Joint Committee on a Code of Conduct has the honour to present its

FINAL REPORT

Your Committee has examined its Order of Reference adopted by the Senate on Thursday, March 21, 1996, Wednesday, June 19, 1996, Tuesday, November 26, 1996 and Thursday, December 12, 1996 and now presents its final report entitled *Code of Official Conduct*.

Respectfully submitted,

DONALD H. OLIVER, Q.C.
Co-Chair

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

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

NATIONAL DEFENCE

DEPLOYMENT OF CANADIAN AIRBORNE REGIMENT IN SOMALIA—
ADEQUACY OF RESPONSE OF CHAIN OF COMMAND—
MOTION TO REFER QUESTION TO
FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE WITHDRAWN

Leave having been given to proceed with Order No. 88:

Resuming the debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Murray, P.C., seconded by the Honourable Senator Robertson:

That the question of the adequacy of the response of the chain of command of the Canadian Forces — ministerial, civilian, and military — to the operational, disciplinary, and administrative problems relating to the deployment of the Canadian Airborne Regiment in Somalia be referred to the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs.—(*Honourable Senator Kinsella*).

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, with respect to the motion under the name of Senator Murray relating to the Somalia affair, the Leader of the Government has a motion for which she will ask leave to move today. Indeed, she will be speaking to that motion. In order to do that and proceed properly, there has been some discussion on both sides, and Senator Murray has agreed that, if this were the case, he would withdraw his motion. Perhaps he could confirm that. If we have leave, notwithstanding rule 57(1)(d), then the government leader could proceed with her motion at the present time.

Hon. Lowell Murray: Honourable senators, I can confirm that there have been discussions. On the basis of those discussions and after consultation on this side of the house, in particular with the Leader of the Opposition, I have undertaken to withdraw my motion to leave the way clear for the Leader of the Government to introduce another motion in its stead.

The Hon. the Speaker: Is leave granted, honourable senators, for Honourable Senator Murray to withdraw his motion?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion withdrawn.

ESTABLISHMENT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO EXAMINE
ACTIVITIES OF CANADIAN AIRBORNE REGIMENT IN SOMALIA

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government), moved:

That a special committee of the Senate be appointed to examine and report upon the adequacy of the response of the chain of command of the Canadian Forces to the problems relating to the deployment of the Canadian Airborne Regiment in Somalia, in particular the torture and beating death of Shidane Arone, to the extent that these matters will not have been examined by the Commission of Inquiry appointed March 20, 1995.

That the Committee in examining the management of the issues arising from these matters call the following witnesses, among others:

- 1) the then Minister of National Defence;
- 2) the then Deputy Minister of National Defence;
- 3) the then Acting Chief of Staff of the Minister of National Defence;
- 4) the then special advisor to the Minister of National Defence (M. Campbell);
- 5) the then special advisor to the Minister of National Defence (J. Dixon);
- 6) the persons occupying the position of Judge Advocate General during the relevant period;
- 7) the then Deputy Judge Advocate General (litigation);
and
- 8) the then Chief of Defence Staff.

That seven senators, nominated by the Committee of Selection, act as members of the special committee, and that three members constitute a quorum;

That the committee have power to send for persons, papers and records, to examine witnesses under oath, 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 committee have power to retain the services of professional, clerical, stenographic and such other staff as deemed advisable by the committee;

That the committee have power to authorize television and radio broadcasting, as it deems appropriate, of any or all of its proceedings; and

That the committee have the power to engage the services of such counsel and technical, clerical and other personnel as may be necessary for the purposes of its examination;

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

She said: Honourable senators, the intention to hold an inquiry into the tragic events in Somalia was announced by the Minister of National Defence in November of 1994. We knew we had an institution in difficulty, with events that had shocked all Canadians. In March of 1995, the terms and the mandate were approved by order in council and the commissioners were appointed. The original reporting date was December 22, 1995. The government has adjusted the reporting date of the inquiry three times: to June 1996, again to March 1997, and finally to June 1997.

With each passing day, there is a more urgent need for the report, as it is considered essential that the Canadian Forces be revitalized with the benefits of the lessons learned from Somalia. After three extensions, the government concluded that the Minister of National Defence had to pursue the development of proposals for the renewal of the Canadian Forces, and that the advice of the inquiry should be submitted as soon as reasonable, which brought forward the date of June 30, 1997.

Honourable senators, the renewal of the Canadian Armed Forces is the primary defence concern of the government. The current work of the Minister of National Defence will be submitted to the Prime Minister and made public on Tuesday, March 25. The Somalia inquiry has heard its last witness. After 183 days of televised hearings, 121 witnesses, thousands of pages of transcripts, and after receiving over 150,000 documents, the government wishes to receive the advice and the counsel of the commissioners.

Without commenting in any way upon the work of the commission of inquiry, it is clear that some issues of particular interest to many Canadians will not be addressed by the commission. Some of those who have not publicly presented their side of the story have asked for an opportunity to do so. We believe that people do want to hear from those named in this motion, and I believe that we will be able to move forward in a constructive way.

•(1430)

Senator Murray made his motion proposing that the house organize such an examination. The government welcomed his initiative, and discussions have taken place over the past weeks to work together in order to see if we could come to an agreement on terms of reference on how to proceed.

Honourable senators, it is time now, I believe, to start healing the wounds that have become synonymous with the events in Somalia. I believe that, by working together, we in this chamber can assist this process through a balanced and meaningful examination of the issues placed before us.

Hon. Lowell Murray: Honourable senators, I thank the Honourable Leader of the Government in the Senate for her comments, and for the spirit in which they were uttered. I subscribe fully to her implicit view that this is not a partisan matter or a partisan initiative but one on which we can work together in the interests of the country.

I also wish to thank the Leader of the Government and the Deputy Leader of the Government, with whom I worked closely in the last while on these matters, for their cooperation. I know that in the Senate we are masters of our own procedures, but on an initiative such as this, undertaken in these circumstances, I quite understand that the leadership in the Senate would need to consult with others in the government on this matter. If I may say so, I also understand some of the complexities that enter into those consultations. Therefore, I am grateful to Senator Fairbairn and Senator Graham for undertaking that on behalf of the Senate.

The motion put forward by the Leader of the Government makes a particular reference to the torture and beating death of Shidane Arone. Indeed, that horrible incident stands out in our memory from the deployment of Canadian troops in Somalia, and it is one into which we will want to inquire very closely, especially the response of the chain of command. However, in making particular reference to the death of Shidane Arone, we are not restricting the generality of the mandate being given to the committee, which is, in general, to look into those matters related to the deployment of troops in Somalia that the Létourneau commission will not have had an opportunity to examine.

In the motion put forward by the Leader of the Government — and I have agreed to this — there is also a list of witnesses that the committee should call upon, among others. The reason for having those names on the list is obvious enough. However, I draw to the attention of honourable senators the fact that we say “among others” because I have no doubt that there are others whom we may want to call. Indeed, there are others whom we may want to call before we call upon any of the people whose names are on the list we have just agreed to.

Let me say finally, honourable senators, that I do hope the Committee of Selection will be able to meet very soon, immediately after we return from the Easter break, so that the committee may have an organizational meeting, elect its chairman, and get on with preparations.

Quite frankly, if Parliament is dissolved this spring, as many people expect, I doubt it will be possible for us to get very far with hearings before dissolution. Nevertheless, I think it is important, as an earnest indicator of the Senate’s intentions on this matter, that we organize the committee, elect our chairman and, if at all possible, have some meetings before the end of April or early May.

Finally, on the subject of a possible spring dissolution, I hope we all understand that, while this committee, like all committees, would cease to exist with dissolution, I hope and believe that there is a disposition on all sides to reconstitute it upon a new

Parliament being assembled. As I say, in that respect we are indeed masters of our own procedures.

I thank all honourable senators for their forbearance and cooperation on this matter. It is not one that we embark upon with much joy, frankly. However, I think it is something that has to be done in the public interest.

Hon. Consiglio Di Nino: Honourable senators, I have a question with a view to clarification. Can we give this committee any authority to continue even after the writ has been issued? This is the kind of committee that can do its work because it is non-political and non-partisan. In my opinion, it would be worthwhile to continue the committee, rather than leave it until the house reconvenes after a potential election. Can someone enlighten me on that point?

Senator Murray: Honourable senators, I am not aware of any precedent for that. However, if one of my colleagues has one, I would be glad to hear about it.

At a very minimum, I would hope that informally we could do a lot of work to prepare ourselves for resuming the committee after an election, but that would be up to the chairman and the steering committee.

Hon. Finlay MacDonald: Could the Honourable Senator Murray give us some indication as to the disposition on the other side to reconstitute the committee?

Senator Murray: Honourable senators, I must say I did not ask for — and did not receive — any undertaking of that kind from my friends opposite. However, I think we all are aware of the possible political timetable that we are working against at the moment. I would not put words in anyone else’s mouth, but if I could put thoughts in their minds, I really do not believe they would have agreed to this motion if it was their intention to kill the committee once an election was over.

Hon. Michel Cogger: Honourable senators, I should like to direct a question to the Honourable Senator Murray, who put forward a motion more or less to the same effect a while back. When was that done?

Senator Murray: February 12.

Senator Cogger: Perhaps I could be allowed to ask a question of the Leader of the Government in the Senate.

Senator Murray’s motion has been sitting on the Order Paper since February 12. It is now March 20, the eve of a two-week adjournment. The government is purporting to bring in its motion superseding Senator Murray’s motion. Is this a cruel joke? We shut down one inquiry and purport to open another one, having wasted, at the very least, a whole month since Senator Murray’s motion.

Senator Corbin: The commission is still sitting!

Senator Lynch-Staunton: Speak from your chair!

Senator Cogger: I am not finished. If the honourable senator wishes to speak to me, let me finish and then he can ask his question.

•(1440)

Senator Corbin: Have respect for the rules!

Senator Cogger: Quiet down! I am not finished.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: Back to your chair if you want to speak!

Senator Cogger: Yes, speak only from your chair! Good point.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: It was your rule.

Senator Cogger: Honourable senators, here we are, on the eve of a two-week adjournment, purporting to create a special committee of this house. Evidently, the committee will not be created until after we get back. We all know that we are on the eve of an election.

Senator Corbin: Who says so?

Senator Cogger: Honourable senators, this is nonsense. After spending all this time to set up a special committee and creating some hope for potential witnesses, we are being told, "Go home. We will see you in the next Parliament." Can the Leader of the Government explain that to me?

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, a question can only be asked of the last speaker. The last speaker on this subject was Honourable Senator Murray. The honourable senator is entitled to ask a question of Honourable Senator Murray, but not of someone else.

You are entitled to make a speech, Honourable Senator Cogger, and I accept your statements as being a speech.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: Wait for Question Period.

Senator Cogger: Honourable senators, I will ask my question of Senator Murray. Senator Murray, is this, in your view, a cruel joke that we are playing on the Canadian public, or are we really trying to set up a committee?

Some Hon. Senators: Yes or no.

Senator Murray: Honourable senators will recall that I expressed some concerns a week or two ago and offered some admonitions to the government on this matter, that they should really get on with it. My admonitions were really not directed to the Leader and the Deputy Leader of the Government, who are doing their best, but rather to the government as a whole.

Some years of experience have made me aware of the difficulties that arise when one engages the entire government.

While I should have liked to see this matter resolved long before now and to have had the hearings begin by now, I am inclined to be happy with the outcome. The outcome is that, if this motion goes through today, with leave, the Selection Committee will meet, the committee will have an organizational meeting, and we will be on the road.

I do not know whether my friend Senator Cogger has any alternative to that, but I think we should take the offer and run.

Senator Cogger: Honourable senators, I have a further question for Senator Murray. Perhaps I do have an alternative. Is it not an alternative to simply vote down this motion and not have a phoney commission at all? Is that not better than this commission that will have an aborted life of a couple of weeks before this Parliament is prorogued?

Senator Corbin: I have a better solution. Have a caucus.

Senator Cogger: Read the rules, senator.

Senator Murray: Honourable senators, on this, as on other matters, I am relying on the good faith of all honourable senators.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, with leave of the Senate and notwithstanding rule 57(1)(d), it was moved by the Honourable Senator Fairbairn, seconded by the Honourable Senator Stanbury:

That a special committee of the Senate be appointed to examine and report upon the adequacy of the response of the chain of command of the Canadian Forces to the problems relating to the deployment —

Hon. Senators: Dispense.

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

Some Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Senator Cogger: With one abstention.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN VOLUNTEER SERVICE MEDAL FOR UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING BILL

FIRST READING

The Hon. the Speaker informed the Senate that a message had been received from the House of Commons with Bill C-300, respecting the establishment and award of a Canadian peacekeeping service medal for Canadians who have served within international peacekeeping missions.

Bill read the first time.

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

On motion of Senator Rompkey, bill placed on Orders of the Day for second reading on Tuesday, April 8, 1997.

QUESTION PERIOD

THE BUDGET

C.D. HOWE INSTITUTE—REPORT INDICATING MORE TAX PAID BY TAXPAYERS THAN REVEALED—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Terry Stratton: Honourable senators, my question is addressed to the Leader of the Government in the Senate. This has nothing to do with the unemployment rate, by the way. I thought I would change topics and give her a break.

My question deals with the report from an analyst at the C.D. Howe Institute stating that the federal government is trying to hide the increasing tax burden on Canadian families through accounting practices that are reflected in last month's budget. The report says that the budget hides the real amount of revenue that Ottawa collects. This is from *The Globe and Mail* of March 14, 1997.

The article states that the federal coffers will receive \$8.5 billion more in revenue from the GST and from personal income tax than the budget indicates. According to the C.D. Howe Institute report, this means that the average family of four would pay \$1,700 more in taxes than might be expected by someone who has read the budget.

How does the government respond to these allegations? Is the Minister of Finance cooking the books, as it were?

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, first, the Minister of Finance does not cook the books.

Senator Doody: No, he just taxes them.

Senator Fairbairn: With all due respect to the C.D. Howe Institute, I would put my faith in the Minister of Finance and his performance of the last several years, rather than in that particular report. I will certainly take Senator Stratton's question to the Minister of Finance and have an answer for him after we return.

Senator Stratton: Honourable senators, I would appreciate that, and hope that it will be before we go into an election.

Senator Doody: You live in hope.

Senator Stratton: This report is a backgrounder from the C.D. Howe Institute prepared by William Robson. What he is saying is curious. He indicates that the missing money is tucked away in a variety of files. The bulk of it, however, can be found in two rather unpopular ones. The budget projects personal

income tax revenues of \$66.5 billion in the upcoming fiscal year and the GST bringing in \$17.5 billion. Yet the actual amounts of income tax and GST may be somewhat above the \$72 billion and \$20.5 billion. The difference is close to \$9 billion, or around \$1,700 per family.

It appears that, before reporting the GST income and the personal tax income, they are taking off the rebates. I guess that is my fundamental question. Is that indeed what the Minister of Finance is doing?

Senator Lynch-Staunton: It is called cooking the books.

•(1450)

Senator Fairbairn: Honourable senators, I have listened with interest to the reports of the C.D. Howe Institute, and I undertake to get the honourable senator a report from the Minister of Finance after we come back.

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE FUND

CURRENT PREMIUMS ACTING AS DISINCENTIVE TO JOB CREATION—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Pierre Claude Nolin: Honourable senators, I have a question for the Leader of the Government in the Senate regarding the continued growth of the paper surplus in the Employment Insurance Fund. Since the growth in that paper surplus is created by forcing Canadian employees and employers to pay a much higher payroll tax than is necessary, this is a policy that is creating a disincentive for firms to create jobs.

When does the Minister of Finance plan to reduce the premium rate to balance expenditures against revenues in the Employment Insurance Fund? To put it another way, how many additional billions of dollars does the Minister of Finance plan to accumulate in that fund?

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, since he was given the portfolio, the Minister of Finance has set goals to steadily reduce the premiums, which had been rising just as steadily prior to the election of 1993. I know the Minister of Finance is not moving as quickly as my honourable friend would wish, but he has established a pattern of steady reduction.

I cannot tell the honourable senator when the Minister of Finance will move further in that direction. It would depend upon economic circumstances. I will take my honourable friend's question and see if I can glean further information.

APPLICATION OF SURPLUS FUNDS TO JOB TRAINING—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Terry Stratton: Honourable senators, as a supplementary question, yesterday, Senator Simard asked the Leader of the Government in the Senate about the Liberals' plans for the enormous and growing paper surplus — in other words \$12 billion, and \$17 billion in fiscal 1998-99 — in the Employment Insurance Fund.

During the last election, the Red Book indicated that a Liberal government would ensure that the funds paid out as unemployment benefits would be better spent helping the unemployed acquire the skills necessary for work. I refer to page 37 of the Red Book, which is headed "Investing in People." There, the Liberals state that they will ensure that funds paid out as unemployment benefits are better spent to help the unemployed acquire the skills necessary to find work.

The question becomes: Is the position of the Liberal government that its current policy of keeping the money that is paid into the fund is better than putting it to work to help the unemployed learn new skills?

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, in response to my colleague, no, not at all. In fact, the government has engaged in a policy of reinvestment of the savings and, as my honourable friend may know, that is done through a series of five active measures that include targeted wage subsidies to enable people to remain in the workforce, self-employment assistance, job creation partnership, targeted earning supplements, and skills, loans and grants. A combination of those five active measures is now in place in Canada, and is doing exactly the kind of work that my honourable friend suggests is a good idea: that is, to enable Canadians who have been in difficulty in the workplace to stay in the workplace and earn money, and also to add skills and assistance to those who must seek other kinds of employment.

Senator Stratton: I agree with the Honourable Leader of the Government that that is all very nice. However, it ties into the unemployment situation, and many economists are now saying that the unemployment rate will not drop below 9 per cent before 1997, but it will stay above that figure. Despite the moneys being spent, we are not creating the jobs that we should be creating, and this leads back to my original question that the leader is researching.

When we have a \$5.6 billion surplus in the Employment Insurance Fund, surely to goodness that money could be used to reduce taxes, particularly when the premiums on the Canada Pension Plan are about to skyrocket, and virtually double. It might be a good idea to try to use some of that money as an incentive, to lower taxes and create jobs.

Senator Fairbairn: Honourable senators, I have read with interest reports of the document from which my honourable friend quoted that will carry his party into the next election campaign. I will say, with the greatest of respect, we do not agree with the numbers touted by my honourable friend's party; nor do we agree with the methods that my honourable friend's party is suggesting will have a greater impact on job creation.

There is no disagreement whatsoever as to the goals. However, our parties choose different ways, and I will not tax Senator Stratton again today with another speech about the goals and achievements of the Minister of Finance.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: It would be a short speech.

Senator Fairbairn: Senator Lynch-Staunton, it would be a long speech, for which I often feel I should apologize.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: We are talking the meat and not the potatoes.

Senator Fairbairn: I will not get into that with Senator Stratton because I did it yesterday, and several other times before. I could even write him a letter.

Senator Berntson: Write me a letter.

Senator Fairbairn: Just to conclude, our goals are the same, Senator Stratton, but we choose different methodology. In the last several years, what we have been doing has been working well indeed for the Canadian economy, and laying the foundation for the creation of the jobs which all of us wish for.

EMPLOYMENT

SKILLED IMMIGRANTS ALLOWED ENTRY TO FILL HIGH-TECH JOBS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Consiglio Di Nino: Honourable senators, my question to the Leader of the Government in the Senate is somewhat related to this issue.

Honourable senators may or may not be aware that it has been reported that the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration is seeking to change the regulations so that immigrants can be allowed into Canada much more quickly in order to fill vacancies in the high-tech job market. I understand that there are some 2,000 or 3,000 vacancies that cannot be filled from current labour pools in this country. The regulations would be changed to allow this to happen without companies having to first look in the Canadian market to fill these jobs. It was reported that this was an interim solution.

It is shameful that we must go outside this country to fill jobs in areas where we have known for the last 20 to 30 years that we would be requiring people. Frankly, with Canada suffering the longest period of high unemployment since the Depression, particularly among young Canadians, is this action not an admission of the government's failure to properly train and educate Canadians, or is it a direct result of the government's cutbacks to education?

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government): The honourable senator mentioned in his question a situation that has been developing for over 20 years. I agree with him; things have changed dramatically in 20 years, and governments on both his side and ours have not read the signals early enough to change the way in which we try to stimulate our education systems in this country, so that they will produce the kinds of skills that are required in the new economy.

•(1500)

My honourable friend will know well that, in some of the industries that are forcing us to look abroad on a temporary basis, the kinds of skills required are not those that are acquired

overnight, or even in two or three years. I have a perfect example, which I have raised before in this house, of a wonderful company in Calgary that is looking for high-tech engineers, and they are just not to be had.

My friend's question is germane, but what the Minister of Industry and the Secretary of State for Science, Research and Development are trying to do is to change our systems in this country to value the kinds of skills and training that will fill the jobs that industry requires in order to be where we Canadians like to say we are; that is, on the cutting edge of technology moving into the 21st century. It cannot be done overnight. We are trying to improve the situation. However, the announcement to which the honourable senator refers is a temporary solution, and in all cases the job descriptions will be reviewed carefully by the Department of Human Resources Development to ensure that there are no negative impacts on our labour market in Canada.

Senator Bryden: We are creating too many high-tech jobs too quickly!

Senator Di Nino: Perhaps Senator Bryden does not think this is a particularly serious issue.

Honourable senators, when I look at the record of this government over the past three years, having slashed education transfers to the provinces by 40 per cent, having taken \$5.6 billion more in Employment Insurance premiums than is needed, I am not satisfied. I am not convinced that the government is taking this situation seriously. Perhaps all you are really trying to do is tell the people of this country that you do not want to have a higher deficit. I agree with that goal.

What I would like to know from the Leader of the Government in the Senate is what specific plans does the government have to train and educate our young people, some of whom are in the gallery today, to give them hope and some sort of feeling that tomorrow they will be ready to tackle these jobs? I do not need a public statement today. I would like to know details. I would like to know plans. The Leader of the Government can bring in a full response sometime in the future.

Senator Fairbairn: Honourable senators, I will do just that. The honourable senator is aware of some of the programs that have been announced, some even in recent weeks, in an effort to stimulate assistance to young people to get them into the job market. My honourable friend knows of the recent efforts in that direction, and they will continue because youth employment is a priority.

I will take my honourable friend's suggestion. I will get a much more detailed answer to his question on training for jobs. I shall also deal with the part of his question where he repeatedly refers to 40-per-cent cuts in transfer payments. I do not know whether "misleading" is a word we use in this house, but that assertion is certainly open to question. I would be happy to get a clarification for my honourable friend.

HEALTH

GUIDELINES FOR PALLIATIVE CAREGIVERS— GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. A. Raynell Andreychuk: Honourable senators, a special committee of the Senate studied euthanasia and tabled a very admirable, exhaustive and thorough report on its findings. From the report it was clear that Canadians are somewhat divided on the issue of euthanasia. Also, I think it was clear that Canadians are worried about palliative care, how the terminally ill are cared for. They also expressed a concern for the caregivers, that there were not good guidelines and caregivers were carrying the brunt for the lack of policy on euthanasia.

Could the Leader of the Government of the Senate tell me whether the government is drafting or working on guidelines for caregivers in palliative care? If such guidelines are being contemplated, are the caregivers being consulted, most notably doctors, nurses and home-care workers? Does the government support the bill that has been introduced here, Bill S-13?

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I cannot give the honourable senator a precise answer on this matter today.

Certainly, the government has looked with gratitude to the work that was carried out by the special committee, because it is, as far as I am aware, the only major body of evidence now within our country on which to build further discussions, debates and whatever future policies will come from this Parliament.

I would have to consult the Minister of Justice to find out whether anything specific has been done at this point. I am not aware of specific guidelines. The government is aware of Senator Carstairs's private member's bill that is before the Senate, and will wait to see how that bill is disposed of in the Senate. It is a private bill, and the government's practice is to allow private bills to make their own course through the system.

Senator Andreychuk: Honourable senators, I ask that an answer be returned to this chamber soon. Those of us who understand the urgency of this issue of guidelines know that the longer we delay, the longer the difficulties in the communities are maintained. I would appreciate receiving an answer as to the government's position on this report and particularly on guidelines before I, as a member of the Senate, will have to contemplate this issue. The Senate has given the government the opportunity to respond to the report. The report was very broad. However, there were specific areas on which I would appreciate an answer, and they are palliative care and the guidelines. I would appreciate a speedy response, if possible.

Senator Fairbairn: Honourable senators, I will do my very best. As I said, I am not aware of any initiatives at the moment. However, that does not mean that work is not going on. I am simply not aware of specific measures on the issues that the honourable senator raised in her question. I know there is a great deal of thinking going on regarding this issue. I would want to get an answer for her from the minister.

DELAYED ANSWERS TO ORAL QUESTIONS

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I have a response to a question raised on February 19, 1997, by the Honourable Senator Gustafson, regarding the increase in food inspection user fees. I have a response to a question raised on March 18, 1997, by the Honourable Senator Cogger, regarding the future of the national flights into Mirabel.

AGRICULTURE

INCREASE IN FOOD INSPECTION USER FEES— REQUEST FOR DETAILS

(Response to question raised by Hon. Leonard J. Gustafson on February 19, 1997)

The requirement for revenues to be raised by means of inspection and quarantine fees in 1997/1998 is \$58.6M. This figure reflects both the revenues raised in previous years as well as new fees. It is a combined total.

In 1996/1997, the Food Production and Inspection Branch (FPIB) of Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada sought to generate \$56M in fees out of a total budget \$273M. It appears that the actual revenue will be \$34M in 1996/1997, in part because our clients have changed the way they do business and this affected their requests for inspection services.

Cost recovery is only one way that Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada is addressing the fiscal realities that the department faces. Reductions in overlap and duplication, implementing new technologies, cost reduction and cost avoidance are the preferred methods, but there is a role for cost recovery to bring market forces to bear and determine the need for services.

FPIB is managing a \$70M budget reduction which must be in place by 1997/1998. There will be a minimum of \$24M in savings through cost reduction and cost avoidance measures such as the elimination of more than 500 Full Time Equivalent positions. The balance (a maximum of \$46M), will come from cost recovery revenues. If there is any shortfall on the cost recovery revenue portion, it will be offset through additional cost reduction and cost avoidance measures.

The effect of fees on the competitive position of the Canadian agriculture and food sectors is a key consideration in all of our cost recovery consultations. On-going impact analysis studies of the existing FPIB inspection fees have found that there is no serious impact on the competitive position of Canadian producers.

If input from industry demonstrates that cost recovery seriously impacts an industry's competitive position, the government is open to reviewing its current fee structure and looking at other means of meeting today's fiscal realities.

The creation of the Canadian Food Inspection Agency will save the fiscal framework approximately \$44M by consolidating all federal food inspection and quarantine services, resulting in the removal of overlap and duplication.

In 1997/1998, FPIB proposes to recover 17.4% of expenditures for the animal and plant health programs from the general public, importers, exporters, farmers and the agri-service industry, whereas the comparative U.S. figure is 28.6% for the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

Canada will recover 18.6% of its cost in 1997/1998 for meat inspection and privatized grading services whereas the U.S. Food Safety Inspection Service recovers 22% of its cost for meat inspection and grading.

TRANSPORT

FUTURE OF INTERNATIONAL FLIGHTS INTO MIRABEL— RUMOURED ESTABLISHMENT OF AD HOC COMMITTEE OF LIBERAL CAUCUS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

(Response to question raised by Hon. Michel Cogger on March 18, 1997)

There are a number of more or less formal groups of concerned citizens or organizations who have gotten together to consider the future of the Montréal airports. This discussion is healthy. However, none of these groups or organizations has any special status excepting, of course, the Société de Promotion des Aéroports de Montréal (SOPRAM) and Aéroports de Montréal (ADM). The Minister of Transport has not asked any ad-hoc committee for any advice.

Aéroports de Montréal has appealed the decision of the Superior Court, and the appeal will be heard by the Court of Appeal April 7, 1997. The Federal Government is not a party to this case.

The Minister of Transport is on record as saying his intent is to ensure that local decision makers can make decisions in the interests of the local community. The Minister of Transport believes Aéroports de Montréal must have the freedom to manage the Montréal airports, and believes the existing lease already provides the necessary freedoms.

[Translation]

ROYAL ASSENT

NOTICE

The Hon. the Speaker informed the Senate that the following communication had been received:

RIDEAU HALL

March 20, 1997

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that the Right Honourable Antonio Lamer, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, in his capacity as Deputy Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber today, the 20th day of March 1997, at 6:15 p.m., for the purpose of giving Royal Assent to certain bills.

Yours sincerely,

Judith A. LaRocque
Secretary to the Governor General

The Honourable
The Speaker of the Senate
Ottawa

[English]

CRIMINAL CODE

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING—ORDER STANDS

On the Order:

Resuming the 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 Corbin*).

Hon. Eymard G. Corbin: Honourable senators, I was sitting with a colleague at the other end of the house when Senator Cools rose to ask if I could tell the house if I intended to participate in this debate.

•(1510)

This order does stand in my name, and it may have to stand in my name for a few days more. However, I should like to refresh the memory of the house that the report of the committee was tabled on November 25 and Senator Kinsella spoke on February 4. There were 13 intervening sitting days when no one spoke. It was only on March 12, 11 days later, that Senator Cools spoke.

I do not see why anyone would want to place pressure on me at this time for asking that the order stand in my name for a few days. Fair ball is fair ball. The matter stands in my name and it will continue to stand in my name until I am prepared to speak. That is all I have to say.

Order stands.

MANGANESE-BASED FUEL ADDITIVES BILL

CONSIDERATION OF INTERIM REPORT OF ENERGY, THE ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE—MOTION TO RETURN REPORT TO COMMITTEE NEGATIVED ON DIVISION—REPORT ADOPTED ON DIVISION

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the consideration of the sixth report of the Standing Senate Committee on Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources (Interim Report on Bill C-29, to regulate interprovincial trade in and the importation for commercial purposes of certain manganese-based substances), presented in the Senate on March 4, 1997;

And on the motion of the Honourable Senator Kinsella, seconded by the Honourable Senator Doyle, that the Interim Report concerning Bill C-29, to regulate interprovincial trade in and the importation for commercial purposes of certain manganese-based substances, be not now proceeded with but be returned to the Standing Senate Committee on Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources with instructions to implement the recommendation found on page 40 of the Interim Report, to wit:

We recommend that the Royal Society of Canada undertake a thorough assessment of all information pertinent to Bill C-29 and report its findings back to the Committee at its earliest opportunity; and

That the Senate do not proceed with further consideration of Bill C-29 until after the Committee has tabled such findings in the Senate.—(*Honourable Senator Buchanan*).

Hon. John Buchanan: Honourable senators, I have been asked by everyone on both sides to restrict my remarks to about five minutes. Although it is almost impossible for me to do so, I will do the best I can.

I wish to reiterate what I said before about the use of MMT in gasoline. There is all kinds of scientific evidence that MMT does not harm the environment according to Environment Canada, which conducted no definitive testing whatsoever to determine whether it has any negative effect on the atmosphere. However, I would suggest, honourable senators, that there will be a negative effect if it is removed because NO_x emissions from vehicles will increase, which, in turn, will increase the amount of smog in the atmosphere.

Health Canada has said that it in no way negatively affects the health of Canadians. Everyone in this house is very well aware of that fact.

There is no scientific evidence that it affects the on-board diagnostic-II or OBD-III equipment on motor vehicles. There is no scientific evidence because it has never been scientifically studied. Car dealers have told me that the OBD systems have been operating for over 100,000 kilometres with no ill-effects from gasoline containing MMT. In fact, with the use of MMT a coating is formed around spark plugs and protects them. That is scientific evidence.

Yesterday, Senator Taylor told us he was aware that some car manufacturers were having trouble with their OBD-IIs. It would be even worse if manganese were used in gas. He also said:

Why would the automobile industry care about manganese in gas unless it was gumming up their machinery? What do they have to gain? If anything, they will have egg on their faces if manganese is taken out of gas and the machinery still gums up. They are taking a tremendous chance.

That is an interesting comment, honourable senators.

It is interesting to note that California does not ban MMT, they just never use it. They have never had Ethyl Corporation ask for a waiver to use it in California. The clean air authority in San Francisco told us that they do not use MMT. However, on December 12, the California Air Resource Board held a hearing on OBD-IIs. Appearing at the hearing were representatives of Ford and General Motors. The representative from Ford stated that, although they certified their entire 1996 model year Ford product line with a fuel OBD-II monitoring deficiencies, they had to later limit the operation of the misfire monitor in most of their vehicles due to an unusually high number of malfunction indicator lights coming on, after which the misfire condition could not be repeated and thus required to be repaired when the vehicle was returned to the dealership. As a result, they had to use the deficiency provisions for the misfire monitor across most of the product line for both 1996 and 1997 models. The representative of Ford told the board that it was essential that the board revise the OBD-II regulations to allow up to two monitoring deficiencies per vehicle without fines through to the year 2003.

MMT is not used in California, yet, clearly automobiles operated there are experiencing difficulty with their OBD-II systems. We have been told time and time again that the only thing causing OBD-IIs to malfunction is MMT.

It is strange, is it not, that they do not use MMT in California and yet they are having all these problems with the OBD-II systems? QED: MMT is not causing the problems for the OBD systems. They are obviously being caused by many other factors in California and elsewhere where they do not use MMT. The whole rationale for this bill is that it gums up the OBD-IIs.

Some will say that is not the rationale, that the rationale, of course, is health and environment. If that is so, then let us look at that situation.

If it is health or the environment, why did the federal government not ban the use of MMT in Canada? They did not. Ethyl was allowed to build a plant in Nova Scotia. In fact, a plant could be built in any province and MMT was approved for use. There is no ban on MMT in this bill. Therefore, forget the argument about health and the environment. There is no scientific evidence whatsoever in that regard.

Honourable senators, eight provincial premiers, eight provincial governments and eight provincial ministers of energy have asked that we not pass this bill. They have told us that it is not scientifically proven that MMT causes what the government says it causes. They have asked us to conduct an independent study. If only one or two provinces were saying that, it might be different, but it is not. It is eight out of 10. Is it the case that they all know nothing?

This bill was introduced in the first place because Minister Sheila Copps wanted this legislation. The first time out, it died on the Order Paper. It was resurrected in exactly the same form by another minister who was told to proceed with it because the Deputy Prime Minister wants it.

You may ask, "Why is the auto industry so interested in this?" They are interested in it because they say it may cause some problems. Never mind the cost to the refineries. Never mind the refinery workers affected by this. Never mind the thousands of people employed in the industry. Never mind the fact that it will increase NO_x and smog. Minister Copps wants it, so the minister goes along with it.

•(1520)

Having said that, what about the refiners? I am so opposed to this bill because, in little old Nova Scotia, we have one refinery left. It employs some 350 people. That refinery has indicated clearly that if MMT is removed and they have to refit, it will cost them up to \$8 million, plus \$2 million to \$3 million annually to use some other additive. What will that do for them? It may not close them down right away, but watch out for those executives in Toronto and the directors in New York who look at a marginal operation like that and say, "We cannot stand to pay that much more money just to take MMT out." It may close. QED: 350 men and women will be out of work in a province that already has high unemployment.

In Newfoundland, with the Come By Chance refinery, the same situation applies. I have letters here from the general manager of Come By Chance indicating that they will have some serious difficulties because of the removal of MMT in refineries in this country. No less an authority than the minister in New Brunswick, Vaughn Blaney, says that Irving Oil will have serious difficulties competing if MMT is taken out of the refineries and they are allowed to use it in the U.S.

I think it important for senators from Quebec to know exactly what the situation is in their province. Opposition is very strong in Quebec. A unanimous resolution was passed by the Quebec National Assembly asking the Government of Canada not to pass Bill C-29. The Montreal Board of Trade issued a stern warning to the Government of Canada that some 4,000 jobs are at stake in east Montreal refineries, and urged the federal government not to pass Bill C-29.

Why are these people saying this? They are all responsible people. Some are from different political parties than the federal government, and some are from the same party as the federal government, but they are all saying the same thing, "Please do not pass Bill C-29." What are we doing here? We are not listening whatsoever to any of the evidence. We are not listening to the fact that there is no scientific evidence at all with regard to MMT.

Strange as it may sound, the Sierra Club of Canada — an organization for which I have some respect because I know the director, who is from Nova Scotia — indicated their support in a report issued in January. In reference to the Sierra Club's decision to file for judicial review on another case all together, Elizabeth May, Executive Director of the Sierra Club of Canada, stated that the club hoped that the case would be successful and compel the federal government to undertake a comprehensive environmental assessment on this project and others of a similar nature. She indicated that it was critical, in what she presumed would be an election year, that the Canadian public monitor this government's systematic efforts to weaken environmental assessments.

She was saying, "We want environmental assessments of any changes the federal government will implement insofar as the environment is concerned." You may say, "Well, that is interesting. The Sierra Club agrees with those who say we should have an assessment of MMT." Is it dangerous or not? Does it affect the environment and health? No. The Sierra Club is saying, "We do not want any assessment of this bill. We just want the bill passed period." What a contradiction.

The Sierra Club, in one instance, is saying, that for all projects, they must have environmental assessments, but as far as this bill is concerned, where there is no scientific evidence, they say, "Take it out." The product has been used for 22 years, and there have been no problems in 22 years, but the Sierra Club simply says, "Take it out, period."

Honourable senators, if you want to weigh the evidence, you have two situations in law. As per civil matters, you must ask: Is there a preponderance of evidence here? No, there is not. As per criminal cases, you must ask: Is it beyond a reasonable doubt? Yes. In this situation, it is beyond a reasonable doubt that there is no scientific evidence at all to indicate that MMT is doing any of the things that those who want to pass this bill are saying.

Keep in mind that Environment Canada has done no studies. The federal Department of Health has indicated that there are no health hazards.

In the United States, they are now allowed to use MMT. It is important that we look at that situation in the United States. The

Environmental Protection Agency, the EPA, which I think honourable senators will agree is a strong monitoring organization for the environment, concluded that MMT does not cause or contribute to the failure of vehicles to meet applicable emission standards required by the U.S. Clean Air Act. The U.S. Clean Air Act is one of the most stringent acts you will find in the world; yet the EPA says it does not cause or contribute to the failure of vehicles. The United States Supreme Court ruled that the EPA must allow Ethyl Corporation a waiver to sell MMT in the United States, except in California. They have made no application to California because California has never used it. They could sell it if they got the waiver passed, but they have not bothered to apply for it.

It is interesting to note that when the United States Supreme Court came down with that decision to order the EPA to allow the use of MMT, there was an appeal period. The deadline for appeals was October 20, 1995. The unanimous decision of the Federal Court of Appeal passed without a challenge. There was no challenge by anyone to the decision to allow MMT in the United States.

People who want this bill like to say there are only two jurisdictions in the world allowing MMT: Canada and Bulgaria. That is strange.

Senator Taylor: That is true.

Senator Buchanan: No, it is not, and the honourable senator knows it. In the United States of America, they have been able to use MMT for the past year. The honourable senator knows that.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable Senator Buchanan, I hesitate to interrupt you, but your 15 minutes has elapsed.

Senator Buchanan: Your Honour, may I have another five minutes?

The Hon. the Speaker: Is leave granted for the honourable senator to continue?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Senator Buchanan: Honourable senators, all I want to say is this: Senator Taylor comes from Alberta, an oil-rich province of Canada, and he should be one of the first lining up to oppose this bill.

Senator Spivak: There is a plant in Alberta.

Senator Buchanan: I know the position of the Honourable Senator Spivak, and we disagree. I concede that I cannot change her mind.

•(1530)

There is no question that refineries will have to lay off people who are fully employed at a time when we cannot stand any more unemployment, particularly in provinces such as Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Quebec. I urge all honourable senators from Quebec to consider what the

Government of Quebec has said unanimously: "Please, do not pass this bill." The Montreal Board of Trade and other organizations all over Quebec have said that it will hurt the province of Quebec. It will hurt Nova Scotia, Newfoundland, and New Brunswick. Eight provincial governments have said no, and two have said yes, both to protect vested interests. Ontario has a vested interest. There are big automobile plants in Ontario. Another province that has a vested interest is British Columbia, because they have an environmental law and the emissions would be in tune with this bill, which is not as it should be. They also say that automobile dealers out there will be fined \$5,000. That is not true either. Once the on-board diagnostic systems are in the vehicles in B.C., and the books are put in the glove compartments, that is it — the dealers are off the hook. We were told that specifically by the automobile dealers.

Honourable senators, in the interests of sanity, reasonableness, and ensuring that scientific studies are done, please vote against this bill or vote for the amendment — and what a simple amendment it is. The amendment simply states that a scientific study should be done under the auspices of the Royal Society of Canada, and under the umbrella of Environment Canada. The CPPI says that if the independent study, which is taking three to four months, indicates that MMT is a danger to health or the environment, they will voluntarily remove it. That is how sure they are that the study will show what it did in the United States, and that MMT is not a danger to health or the environment, and does not gum up the OBD-II systems, and that other factors are gumming up those systems. The proof lies in California, honourable senators.

The Hon. the Speaker: If no other honourable senator wishes to speak, the question before the house is on the motion by the Honourable Senator Kinsella, seconded by the Honourable Senator Doyle, that the Interim Report concerning Bill C-29 —

An Hon. Senator: Dispense.

The Hon. the Speaker: Is it agreed that we dispense, honourable senators?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

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

Some Hon. Senators: Yes.

Some Hon. Senators: No.

The Hon. the Speaker: Will those honourable senators in favour of the motion please say "yea"?

Some Hon. Senators: Yea.

The Hon. the Speaker: Will those honourable senators opposed to the motion please say "nay"?

Some Hon. Senators: Nay.

The Hon. the Speaker: In my opinions, the "nays" have it.

Senator Kinsella: On division.

The Hon. the Speaker: On division.

Motion negated, on division.

INTERIM REPORT OF COMMITTEE ADOPTED

Hon. Nicholas W. Taylor: Honourable senators, I move the adoption of the report.

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

Some Hon. Senators: No.

The Hon. the Speaker: Will those honourable senators in favour of the motion please say "yea"?

Some Hon. Senators: Yea.

The Hon. the Speaker: Will those honourable senators opposed to the motion please say "nay"?

Some Hon. Senators: Nay.

The Hon. the Speaker: In my opinion, the "yeas" have it.

Senator Kinsella: On division.

Motion agreed to and report adopted, on division.

ABORIGINAL PEOPLES

COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO EXTEND DATE OF FINAL REPORT

Hon. Landon Pearson, pursuant to notice of March 19, 1997, moved:

That, notwithstanding the Order of the Senate adopted on April 24, 1996, the Standing Senate Committee on Aboriginal Peoples, which was authorized in accordance with rule 86(1)(g), to examine such issues as may arise from time to time relating to the Aboriginal Peoples of Canada, be empowered to present its final report no later than December 15, 1997.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Hon. Richard J. Stanbury: Honourable senators, with leave of the Senate and notwithstanding rule 58(1)(h), I move:

That when the Senate adjourns today, it do stand adjourned until Tuesday, April 8, 1997, at 2 p.m.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO EXTEND DATE
OF FINAL REPORT

Leave having been given to revert to Notices of Motions:

Hon. Mira Spivak, for Senator Gustafson, with leave of the Senate and notwithstanding rule 58(1)(f), moved:

That, notwithstanding the order of the Senate adopted on Thursday, May 16, 1996, the Standing Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which was authorized to examine the present state and the future of agriculture in Canada, be empowered to present its final report no later than Monday, June 30, 1997.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

The Hon. the Speaker: There being no further business on the Order Paper, and as we are having Royal Assent later today, pursuant to rule 136(4) the sitting of the Senate is suspended until 6:10 p.m.

The Senate adjourned during pleasure.

•(1810)

The sitting of the Senate was resumed.

COPYRIGHT ACT

BILL TO AMEND—FIRST READING

The Hon. the Acting Speaker informed the Senate that a message had been received from the House of Commons with Bill C-32, to amend the Copyright Act.

Bill read first time.

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

On motion of Senator Graham, bill placed on the Orders of the Day for second reading on April 8, 1997.

**CANADA-CHILE FREE TRADE AGREEMENT
IMPLEMENTATION BILL**

FIRST READING

The Hon. the Acting Speaker informed the Senate that a message had been received from the House of Commons with Bill C-81, to implement the Canada-Chile Free Trade Agreement and related agreements.

Bill read first time.

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

On motion of Senator Graham, bill placed on the Orders of the Day for second reading on April 8, 1997.

**EXCISE TAX ACT
FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL FISCAL
ARRANGEMENTS ACT
INCOME TAX ACT
DEBT SERVICING AND REDUCTION ACCOUNT ACT**

BILL TO AMEND—MESSAGE FROM COMMONS

The Hon. the Speaker informed the Senate that a message had been received from the House of Commons returning Bill C-70, 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, and acquainting the Senate that they had agreed to the amendments made by the Senate to this bill without further amendment but with the following observation:

That this House, while disapproving of any infraction of its privileges or rights by the other House, in this case waives its claim to insist upon such rights and privileges, but the waiver of said rights and privileges is not to be drawn into a precedent.

The Senate adjourned during pleasure.

[*Translation*]

ROYAL ASSENT

The Honourable Antonio Lamer, Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, in his capacity as Deputy Governor General, having come and being seated at the foot of the Throne, and the House of Commons having been summoned, and being come with their Deputy Speaker, the Right Honourable the Deputy Governor General was pleased to give the Royal Assent to the following bills:

An Act to establish the Canadian Food Inspection Agency and to repeal and amend others Acts as a consequence (*Bill C-60, Chapter 6, 1997*)

An Act to establish the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission and to make consequential amendments to other Acts (*Bill C-23, Chapter 9, 1997*)

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 (*Bill C-70, Chapter 10, 1997*)

The Honourable Peter Milliken, Deputy Speaker of the House of Commons, then addressed the Honourable the Deputy Governor General as follows:

May it please Your Honour:

The Commons of Canada have voted certain supplies required to enable the Government to defray the expenses of the public service.

In the name of the Commons, I present to Your Honour the following bills:

An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the Government of Canada for the financial year ending March 31, 1997 (*Bill C-87, Chapter 7, 1997*)

An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the Government of Canada for the financial year ending March 31, 1998 (*Bill C-88, Chapter 8, 1997*)

To which bills I humbly request Your Honour's assent.

The Honourable the Deputy Governor General was pleased to give the Royal Assent to the said bills.

The House of Commons withdrew.

The Honourable the Deputy Governor General was pleased to retire.

The sitting of the Senate was resumed.

The Senate adjourned until Tuesday, April 8, 1997, at 2 p.m.

**THE SENATE OF CANADA
PROGRESS OF LEGISLATION
(2nd Session, 35th Parliament)
Thursday, March 20, 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	97/03/13	none	97/03/18	97/03/20	9/97
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-32	An Act to amend the Copyright Act	97/03/20							
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

No.	Title	1st	2nd	Committee	Report	Amend.	3rd	R.A.	Chap.
C-36	An Act to amend the Income Tax Act, the Excise Act, the Excise Tax Act, the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions Act, the Old Age Security Act and the Canada Shipping Act	96/06/18	96/06/19	Banking, Trade & Commerce	96/06/20	none	96/06/20	96/06/20	21/96
C-41	An Act to amend the Divorce Act, the Family Orders and Agreements Enforcement Assistance Act, the Garnishment, Attachment and Pension Diversion Act and the Canada Shipping Act	96/11/25	96/11/28	Social Affairs, Science & Technology	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	97/03/20	6/97
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	97/03/11	one	97/03/13	97/03/20	10/97
C-71	An Act to regulate the manufacture, sale, labelling and promotion of tobacco products, to make consequential amendments to another Act and to repeal certain Acts	97/03/10	97/03/13	Legal & Constitutional Affairs	—	—	—	—	—
C-81	An Act to implement the Canada—Chile Free Trade Agreement and related agreements	97/03/20	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
C-87	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	97/03/13	97/03/13	—	—	—	97/03/13	97/03/20	7/97
C-88	An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of Canada for the financial year ending March 31, 1998	97/03/13	97/03/13	—	—	—	97/03/13	97/03/20	8/97

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
C-300	An Act respecting the establishment and award of a Canadian Peacekeeping Service Medal for Canadians who have served with an international peacekeeping mission	97/03/20							
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)	96/11/06				
S-10	An Act to amend the Criminal Code (criminal organization) (Sen. Roberge)	96/06/18	96/12/10	Legal & Constitutional Affairs	97/03/13	Rec.			
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							

No.	Title	1st	2nd	Committee	Report	Amend.	3rd	R.A.	Chap.
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	none	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	97/03/13	none	97/03/18		

CONTENTS

Thursday, March 20, 1997

	PAGE		PAGE
SENATORS' STATEMENTS		QUESTION PERIOD	
Literacy Action Day		The Budget	
Senator Fairbairn	1801	C.D. Howe Institute—Report Indicating More Tax Paid by Taxpayers than Revealed—Government Position.	
Fisheries		Senator Stratton	1807
Reports and Information of Senate		Senator Fairbairn	1807
Committee on Internet. Senator Comeau	1801	Employment Insurance Fund	
Canada Council for the Arts		Current Premiums Acting as Disincentive to Job Creation—	
Fortieth Anniversary. Senator Gigantès	1802	Government Position. Senator Nolin	1807
Literacy		Senator Fairbairn	1807
Removal of Goods and Services Tax		Application of Surplus Funds to Job Training—	
from Reading Materials. Senator Di Nino	1802	Government Position. Senator Stratton	1807
International Francophonie Day		Senator Fairbairn	1808
Senator Poulin	1802	Employment	
International Assembly of French-Speaking Parliamentarians		Skilled Immigrants Allowed Entry to Fill High-Tech Jobs—	
L'Ordre de la Pléiade—Decoration Awarded to		Government Position. Senator Di Nino	1808
Clerk of the Senate.	1803	Senator Fairbairn	1808
<hr/>		Health	
ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS		Guidelines for Palliative Caregivers—	
Scrutiny of Regulations		Government Position. Senator Andreychuk	1809
Report of Standing Joint Committee Tabled. Senator Lewis	1803	Senator Fairbairn	1809
Code of Conduct		Delayed Answers to Oral Questions	
Final Report of Special Joint Committee Presented.		Senator Graham	1810
Senator Di Nino	1803	Agriculture	
National Defence		Increase in Food Inspection User Fees—Request for Details.	
Deployment of Canadian Airborne Regiment in Somalia—		Question by Senator Gustafson.	
Adequacy of Response of Chain of Command—Motion to		Senator Graham (Delayed Answer)	1810
Refer Question to Foreign Affairs Committee Withdrawn.		Transport	
Senator Graham	1803	Future of International Flights into Mirabel—Rumoured Establishment	
Senator Murray	1803	of Ad Hoc Committee of Liberal Caucus—Government Position.	
Establishment of Special Committee to Examine Activities of		Question by Senator Cogger.	
Canadian Airborne Regiment in Somalia. Senator Fairbairn ..	1804	Senator Graham (Delayed Answer)	1810
Senator Murray	1805	Royal Assent	
Senator Di Nino	1805	Notice. The Hon. the Speaker	1811
Senator MacDonald	1805	Criminal Code (Bill S-13)	
Senator Cogger	1805	Bill to Amend—Second Reading—Order Stands.	
Canadian Volunteer Service Medal for United Nations		Senator Corbin	1811
Peacekeeping Bill (Bill C-300)		Manganese-Based Fuel Additives Bill (Bill C-29)	
First Reading.	1806	Consideration of Interim Report of Energy, the Environment	
<hr/>		and Natural Resources Committee on Questions—	
		Motion Negated on Division. Senator Buchanan	1811
		Interim Report of Committee Adopted. Senator Taylor	1814

	PAGE		PAGE
Aboriginal Peoples		Canada-Chile Free Trade Agreement Implementation Bill (Bill C-81)	
Committee Authorized to Extend Date of Final Report.		First Reading.	1815
Senator Pearson	1814		
Adjournment		Excise Tax Act, Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act, Income Tax Act, Debt Servicing and Reduction Account Act (Bill C-70)	
Senator Stanbury	1815	Bill to Amend—Message from Commons.	1815
Agriculture and Forestry		Royal Assent	
Committee Authorized to Extend Date of Final Report. Senator Spivak	1815		1816
Copyright Act (Bill C-32)		Progress of Legislation	
Bill to Amend—First Reading.	1815		i



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