



Debates of the Senate

2nd SESSION

•

36th PARLIAMENT

•

VOLUME 138

•

NUMBER 63

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Wednesday, June 7, 2000

—

THE HONOURABLE ROSE-MARIE LOSIER-COOL
SPEAKER *PRO TEMPORE*

CONTENTS

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

Debates and Publications: Chambers Building, Room 943, Tel. 996-0193

Published by the Senate

Available from Canada Communication Group — Publishing,
Public Works and Government Services Canada, Ottawa K1A 0S9,

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

THE SENATE

Wednesday, June 7, 2000

The Senate met at 1:30 p.m., the Speaker *pro tempore* in the Chair.

Prayers.

SENATOR'S STATEMENT

CATHOLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATION OF CANADA

STATEMENT ON SOCIAL AFFAIRS, SCIENCE AND
TECHNOLOGY REPORT "QUALITY END-OF-LIFE CARE:
THE RIGHT OF EVERY CANADIAN"

Hon. Douglas Roche: Honourable senators, yesterday Senator Carstairs tabled a report entitled "Quality End-of-Life Care: The Right of Every Canadian" and today the Catholic Health Association of Canada issued a statement with regard to it.

The Catholic Health Association of Canada is a national Christian association supportive of health care in the tradition of the Roman Catholic Church. As the national voice for Catholic health care, the CHAC acts to promote health in all its aspects — physical, emotional, spiritual and social. Its membership includes eight provincial associations, 34 sponsors and owners of health care organizations, 127 hospitals and homes, health care professionals, and affiliated organizations and individuals.

Honourable senators, with that background, I will now tell you what the Catholic Health Association of Canada said about the report. The statement issued by the chairperson, Sister Annette Noël, reads:

We are pleased to see that the Subcommittee report reflects many of the recommendations we presented. We commend in particular the emphasis the report gives to the inherent dignity and worth of the individual as a basis for end-of-life care. The inherent worth and dignity of every individual is the fundamental value that should underlie our health care system.

The press release goes on to make several complimentary and entirely supportive comments about the report tabled yesterday. This is a great credit to Senator Carstairs, who led the committee and presented such an outstanding report, which was widely commented upon in the news media across Canada today.

This report commends itself to immediate adoption by the Senate so that the Government of Canada will get the message conveyed by the report, which said unanimously that palliative care resources and activities must be greatly strengthened on behalf of all Canadians.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

CANADA LABOUR CODE

BILL TO AMEND—NOTICE OF MOTION TO
DECLARE NULL AND VOID

Hon. Dan Hays (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I wish to return to a discussion we began yesterday on Bill C-12. Yesterday, Senator Prud'homme suggested that we wait a day to see whether the government and the opposition could reach agreement on how to deal with this bill.

I suggest that I present a notice of motion today to suspend rule 63, which involves the process of withdrawing an order of the Senate and that we consider the first reading given to Bill C-12 on June 1 null and void. Furthermore, I suggest that we refer this matter to the Standing Committee on Privileges, Standing Rules and Orders for the purpose of considering inclusion in our rules a procedure whereby this type of problem could be solved.

Perhaps Erskine May's *Parliamentary Practice*, Twenty-second Edition, page 545, could be considered in this context. It states there:

If a bill is carried to the other House by mistake, or if any other serious error is discovered, a message is sent to have the bill returned or the error otherwise rectified.

• (1340)

According to the footnote in Erskine May, the circumstance used as a precedent originated in the House of Lords, which had sent a bill to the House of Commons with an error in it, and the House of Commons instituted this process.

We are in the hands of honourable senators in terms of proceeding with leave. This is a way of proceeding without leave, while acknowledging that this problem has occurred in the recent past and that we must be conscious of that and have a way of dealing with it. I suggest that we refer the matter to the Rules Committee.

I shall now take my seat and request a comment.

Hon. Noël A. Kinsella (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, a number of questions must be answered. First and foremost, this house has received a message from the other place with a bill. I am curious to find out how we, in this house, know that the bill that has been sent to us is nothing more than the bill that the House passed and sent to us. This is to assume that private communications occur.

All we can deal with is what is sent to this house from the other place by way of formal message. Thus, the bill that is before us is the bill that came with the message. I am not sure

how we have apprehended that the message did not contain the bill. How were we told? How were we informed that the bill was sent incorrectly or in error? What is the means by which the message that has been received is apprehended to be in error? Perhaps the deputy leader could explain.

Senator Hays: I shall give the question the best answer I can.

This matter, honourable senators, was drawn to my attention by the Table officer, namely, the deputy clerk. I have asked that question of the Table and have been advised that the error was discovered by the responsible ministry when reviewing the document and, I assume, communicated to the Table in the other place. Their way of dealing with the matter was to send us a reprint of Bill C-12. We now have two copies of the bill. One is the bill, which is titled “as passed,” or the terminology is “the parchment” that we received from the other place, to which we gave first reading. We received a reprint of that with a correction, which I described in the record yesterday. It is found at clause 3 of the bill and concerns the deletion, but it changes a definition. I do not see this as a typographical error. There are ways of dealing with that in omnibus bills, and so on. I do not consider this to be a typographical error because it involves several words. It is actually the text of an amendment that was made at report stage in the other place.

That is how the two bills come to us, Senator Kinsella.

Senator Kinsella: Honourable senators, if the means by which the two Houses of Parliament communicate with each other is by message, has the Deputy Leader of the Government considered whether it would be proper for a formal message to be sent to the House of Commons explaining that we have apprehended this message, by whatever means we have done so, and that we will return the bill to them? This situation is new to me and I want to learn.

Senator Hays: I am happy to instruct, but it is as new to me as it is to all senators.

I have spoken about that and considered it and sought advice on the matter. The answer I will give — and it may or may not be acceptable — is that this is not our problem. This is the problem of the House of Commons. If there is any message to be sent, one would expect that they would send it to us. However, they have not sent us a message. We could seek one, though. I guess the message would be something to which all senators would have to agree. Of course, they are busy and do not have this situation on their minds, at least at the present time. Nothing that we have done is at issue here. We are trying to respond to a circumstance in which we find ourselves, namely, where we have two bills, one sent to us as the correct version of the bill and one sent to us that we believe to be incorrect because we are told it is incorrect.

As a way of dealing with this matter, honourable senators, I suggest that we declare null and void the procedure whereby we gave first reading to the bill, in which case the Order Paper is open to receive the correct bill. It is a matter of concern for us, and that is why I have included in the notice of motion a

reference of the matter to our Standing Committee on Privileges, Standing Rules and Orders. I am suggesting in the notice of motion that this be a matter for which our rules provide.

The Hon. the Speaker *pro tempore*: Honourable senators, before we continue the discussion, for the record, I should like all honourable senators to know that we have received two copies of Bill C-12, both signed by the Clerk of the House of Commons. No explanation was included with the amendment as to why one copy is different from the other.

Hon. John Lynch-Staunton (Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, given what we have just heard, I think my question has been partly answered. How can we substitute one bill for another without receiving the same message from the House of Commons? I think the House of Commons should ask for the wrong bill to be returned to it, and then a new message should be sent to us, along with an apology for messing things up, saying, “This is what the bill should be.”

Why should we correct and even cover up for the sloppiness of the other place? It is their bill. Let them send it to us in the proper manner. As Her Honour has pointed out, we have two bills with the same numbers and the same signatures. What I think I heard is which one do we pick? While the deputy leader is trying his best to have us pick the right one, I think it is for the House of Commons to direct us and not the Deputy Leader of the Government.

Hon. Lowell Murray: Honourable senators, there is another option. Has the deputy leader had advice on what would be the effect if we pass the first bill?

Senator Hays: Honourable senators, thinking about the consequence of that option has prompted an attempt to resolve the matter in the way that I have suggested.

Let me make a final attempt and give the notice of motion. We will then have an opportunity to discuss the issue further and take other steps, if that is deemed to be prudent.

The one element of our society that should not suffer are those who would benefit from what this bill addresses — namely, amendments to the Canada Labour Code dealing with health and safety. I believe Bill C-12 passed with support all around in the other place. It is important — and do not ask me why because I am not prepared today to give the full reason for it — that the bill be dealt with expeditiously for reasons of serving our public, who wish to see these changes to health and safety regulations made. I think all parties would agree to that. We may have differences between the other place and this place, and perhaps delays are acceptable. In order to benefit those people who will be favourably treated as a result of these amendments, we should not delay. Perhaps we are not at that stage yet. I will discuss that with my counterpart.

• (1350)

Honourable senators, I give notice that, tomorrow, June 8, I will move:

That, notwithstanding Rules 63(1) and 63(2), the proceedings on Bill C-12, An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code (Part II) in respect of occupational health and safety, to make technical amendments to the Canada Labour Code (Part I) and to make consequential amendments to other Acts, which took place on Thursday, June 1, 2000, be declared null and void, and

That the Standing Committee on Privileges, Standing Rules and Orders review and make recommendations concerning the procedure described in Erskine May's *Parliamentary Practice*, Twenty-second Edition, at p. 545, as follows: "If a bill is carried to the other House by mistake, or if any other serious error is discovered, a message is sent to have the bill returned or the error otherwise rectified."

Hon. Marcel Prud'homme: Honourable senators, yesterday I humbly made the suggestion that 24 hours' reflection could be helpful. I see that it was not only helpful but that we may need to reflect even further.

I sat for years in the other chamber. You all know that I still keep close track of what is going on over there. For instance, I kept telling you that there were more people attending on Bill C-20 in the Senate than in the entire House of Commons during the day. It is to the credit of both sides of the Senate because it shows that although we are unknown, we are still there, following what they are doing.

I asked some members yesterday about our concern. One of them said to me, "What bill again? Well, I did not pay attention. I just voted, as is customary. When the whip called for the vote, I voted for it, but I had not read the bill."

Having sat in the other place, I can humbly say that that could have happened to me, too. Sometimes we do not have time to read big bills. That shows one thing. In the secrecy of the heart — a saying they use in the Vatican — the House of Commons believes that the Senate can correct their mistakes. They will not admit it, and that is probably why they have sent two bills, hoping that we would solve the problem in an intelligent way.

I am not in disagreement. I will be absent tomorrow because I am attending the unveiling of a statue of Jean Lesage in Quebec City. I was with him in 1960. I will not be here for the end of this debate. If I were to participate tomorrow or Friday or next week, I would say that perhaps the time has come to graciously — and I say that positively — return the bloody thing to the other place, ask them to make up their minds, and when they know exactly what they want the Senate to do, they can send us the appropriate bill, signed by the right person.

Lately, the House of Commons has tried, more and more, to assert itself against the Senate. I think the time has come for us to respond, without aggression, rudeness or stupidity, but with elegance, to act as senators should act, by graciously returning the bill, telling them they are wrong and asking them to correct their mistake and, at the same time, to ensure that the public is aware. Then we will act accordingly when the bill is returned.

[Senator Hays]

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Robert Gauthier: Honourable senators, I must come to the defence of the person responsible for this error. This is not a political matter, but rather an administrative error which we must not turn into a political debate. Let us correct this error without blaming the honourable members or the House of Commons. There is no reason to cast stones at them, for we, too, can make mistakes.

BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION BILL, 2000

FIRST READING

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore informed the Senate that a message had been received from the House of Commons with Bill C-32, to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 28, 2000.

Bill read first time.

[*English*]

Hon. Marcel Prud'homme: Honourable senators, the tabling of this document is debatable. I just want to ask: Do we have any assurance that members of the House of Commons really want us to table this document?

[*Translation*]

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

On motion of Senator Hays, bill placed on the Orders of the Day for second reading two days hence.

[*English*]

ABORIGINAL PEOPLES

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE TO EXAMINE OPPORTUNITIES TO EXPAND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL PARKS IN THE NORTH

Hon. Thelma J. Chalifoux: Honourable senators, I give notice that on Thursday next, June 8, 2000, I will move:

That the Standing Senate Committee on Aboriginal Peoples be authorized to examine and report upon the opportunities to expand economic development, including tourism and employment, associated with national parks in northern Canada, within the parameters of existing comprehensive land claim and associated agreements with Aboriginal peoples and in accordance with the principles of the National Parks Act; and

That the Committee submit its report no later than December 15, 2000.

QUESTION PERIOD

THE CABINET

PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE OF COMMITTEES

Hon. J. Michael Forrestall: Honourable senators, my question is for the Leader of the Government in the Senate. Has he now discovered that the lists of cabinet committee members are indeed quite public documents and that they are to be found in the *Gazette*? Indeed, they are put there and maintained there for a definite reason.

Is the minister right that there are perhaps several secret cabinet committees about which the public knows nothing at all?

Hon. J. Bernard Boudreau (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, there are certain standing committees of cabinet which function on an ongoing basis. Quite rightly, the membership on those committees is well known and it is public information. It is within the purview of the Prime Minister to ask certain members of his cabinet, on an ad hoc basis, to review or work on a specific task. Very often that is done without the formal creation of a committee and without any publication of the names of those who may be working on that topic.

Senator Forrestall: I gather that is the Honourable Herb Gray's committee. I assume that the Leader of the Government is familiar with its workings.

• (1400)

NATIONAL DEFENCE

REPLACEMENT OF SEA KING HELICOPTERS— OPENNESS OF PROCUREMENT PROCESS

Hon. J. Michael Forrestall: On behalf of the government, can the minister confirm to us that when the maritime helicopter project is initiated, it will be a fair and open competition conducted in accordance with the approved statement of requirements?

Hon. J. Bernard Boudreau (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, all announcements with respect to any government procurement will be made by the Minister of National Defence at the appropriate time. The details of those procurement announcements are, of course, left with him. I am confident that any process he initiates will be fair.

REPLACEMENT OF SEA KING HELICOPTERS—POSSIBILITY OF IMMINENT ANNOUNCEMENT ON PROCUREMENT

Hon. J. Michael Forrestall: Honourable senators, I do not know why the minister will not answer a simple question. Can we be told whether the Minister of National Defence has reserved the Charles Lynch press room for next Tuesday in order to make an announcement with regard to the initiation of the maritime helicopter project?

Hon. J. Bernard Boudreau (Leader of the Government): Perhaps I might just short-circuit this process, and instead of

asking the minister, I will consult with the honourable senator. I have no knowledge of whether that is the case but I can certainly check. As a matter of fact, I will do so, and I will let the honourable senator know.

Senator Forrestall: I know where to call to determine whether the room has been booked. Will the minister let the chamber know?

Senator Boudreau: I certainly will. I will table a written response, but I will inquire forthwith.

FUTURE OF CFB SHILO

Hon. Terry Stratton: Honourable senators, my question is addressed to the Leader of the Government in the Senate. It relates to a question I asked last week regarding the Armed Forces base in Shilo, Manitoba, which is just east of Brandon. Is the minister aware that the federal government has spent over \$80 million in the last few years putting up new buildings and improving existing facilities there? The First Regiment of the Royal Canadian Horse Artillery is located there, and it has a new headquarters building worth about \$30 million. A \$17-million maintenance facility has just been built. They have done upgrades of \$3 million to fitness facilities. The Germans, who are leaving after years of being located on that base, are leaving behind a huge maintenance facility and yard. I am saying, in essence, that the base has been totally and completely upgraded and is deserving of remaining an active Armed Forces base, particularly when it is used as an artillery range. Manitoba does have a desert, and Shilo is located on that desert. It is great for shooting off tanks and artillery. In essence, the German army was there because the terrain was much like the Russian steppes and plains.

I would ask the minister to take that information in hand when he goes to the minister to inquire into the fate of Shilo. There have been reports that the Honourable Lloyd Axworthy is adamantly opposed to the facility remaining open. This is reported in the *Winnipeg Free Press*. I would appreciate a response.

Hon. J. Bernard Boudreau (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I am not as familiar with the infrastructure on the base as is the honourable senator. However, it does appear that a significant infrastructure exists. I will specifically raise that issue with the Minister of National Defence and attempt to provide a response to the honourable senator.

POSSIBILITY OF CLOSING KAPYONG BASE

Hon. Terry Stratton: Honourable senators, there is another base in Manitoba called Kapyong. It is the base for the Princess Patricia's Canadian Light Infantry. They are located in the Kapyong barracks in the west end of Winnipeg, adjacent to probably some of the richest residential areas in Winnipeg. That base is quite old. It was built during and after the Second World War. As compared to the base in Shilo, it is really quite decrepit. The land that the base sits on is extremely valuable. If the Canadian government were to close that base, it could auction off the land for a great deal of money and thereby earn some money for Canadians instead of spending more in upgrading that base due to the closure of Shilo.

Hon. J. Bernard Boudreau (Leader of the Government): I ask this question by way of information so that I will have my inquiry properly framed. Is the honourable senator suggesting that if one base must be put out of commission, that it be the Kapyong base, and that the services of that base be transferred to Shilo?

Senator Stratton: Yes. The City of Winnipeg probably will shoot me for saying this, but I really believe that is the best use of that facility. As well, if the land upon which the Kapyong barracks are currently located is developed, the tax dollars flowing to the City of Winnipeg coffers would be quite substantial. Not only would the federal government raise quite a bit of money in auctioning the land, but the City of Winnipeg would have wonderful income from upscale housing in that area.

Senator Boudreau: I will forward that suggestion to the appropriate minister, along with the general inquiry as to the future of the base at Shilo.

DELAYED ANSWER TO ORAL QUESTION

Hon. Dan Hays (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I have a response to a question raised in the Senate on May 31, 2000, by Senator Kinsella regarding the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the effects of proposed cuts.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

EFFECT OF PROPOSED CUTS

(Response to question raised by Hon. Noël A. Kinsella on May 31, 2000)

- The CBC is an autonomous Crown corporation guaranteed journalistic, creative and programming independence under the Broadcasting Act. Accordingly, the CBC is responsible for all aspects of its operations

- CBC management is overseen by a Board of Directors comprising a cross section of Canadians. This Board sets the overall strategic direction for the CBC, within the framework created by the Broadcasting Act, and approves all major financial decisions.

- The CBC Board of Directors announced on May 29, 2000 that it had approved plans to transform CBC English television services. These plans include a new supper-hour broadcast of 30 minutes of national news and 30 minutes of local news to be produced in the regions.

- The CBC plans also feature more non-commercial, children's and youth programming and less of a commercial presence in other programming, beginning with CBC television's main news programming. Finally, the CBC's plan also committed the Corporation to ensuring more thoughtful journalism, including documentaries, investigative reporting, and public affairs.

- The May 29 announcement applies only to the CBC's English-language television services. Therefore,

these changes do not involve programming offered by the CBC's French-language television network, or its English and French radio networks, in the regions and across the country. In accordance with the Broadcasting Act, it is the CBC's responsibility to offer programming in English and in French, reflecting the different needs and circumstances of each official language community, including the particular needs and circumstances of English and French linguistic minorities.

- In public statements, the CBC President has emphasized that the Corporation's priority is to ensure taxpayers receive value for their investment in public broadcasting. He has also stressed that the Corporation must stick to its core competencies, one of which is news and information gathering.

- The federal government clearly recognizes the importance of providing the CBC with the financial stability it needs to adequately fulfil its mandate as the national public broadcaster. This responsibility, which is outlined in section 3.1 of the Broadcasting Act, includes providing programming that "informs, enlightens and entertains" and which reflects Canada and its regions.

- In the current fiscal year (2000-2001), the CBC will receive more than \$900 million in Parliamentary appropriations. The CBC also has access via independent producers to the \$200-million Canadian Television Fund. In addition, the Corporation generates more than \$400 million annually in commercial revenues, including advertising, programming sales and the operation of its specialty television services — *Newsworld* and *le Réseau de l'information*.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

DEVELOPMENTS RESPECTING EUTHANASIA AND ASSISTED SUICIDE

REPORT OF SOCIAL AFFAIRS, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Carstairs, seconded by the Honourable Senator Mercier, for the adoption of the seventh report of the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology entitled: "Quality End-of-Life Care: The Right of Every Canadian," tabled in the Senate on June 6, 2000.—*(Honourable Senator Corbin)*.

Hon. Eymard G. Corbin: As honourable senators are aware, this exercise was a review of the unanimous recommendations of the 1995 report entitled "Of Life and Death." Those honourable senators who were here at the time will recall that the mandate of the 1995 committee had been to study the question of euthanasia and assisted suicide. In no way, shape or form did the original

mandate, as approved by the Senate, deal with palliative care. This is an issue that cropped up upon hearing witness after witness in 1995 — individuals, associations, medical professionals, including people who were either opposed or in favour of euthanasia and assisted suicide. I do not intend today to deal with euthanasia and assisted suicide. That was not the purpose of this five-year review. Thus, I will leave that aside.

• (1410)

Honourable senators, it became obvious that the committee would need to deal with palliative care. I do not believe I am boasting too much by suggesting, at one point in our study, that we would need a special chapter to deal with just that issue of service to the terminally ill in Canada because it commanded itself to our attention.

[*Translation*]

That was imposed upon us as an imperative. Witnesses, in fact, addressed palliative care more often than euthanasia or assisted suicide.

[*English*]

Some general observations regarding the context in which the issue was examined, which restricted the scope of the committee study, should be noted. In proceeding with the work — and I am talking about this round — the subcommittee did not travel outside the Senate at all. It had travelled in 1995. Institutions that deliver palliative care were not visited this time around. In fact, the hearings we just completed did not leave our committee room. The appendices to the current report contain updates on the delivery of palliative care in some of the provinces, as well as other major Canadian developments in end-of-life health care since 1995.

In my view, one point that cannot be emphasized enough in our report is the urgent necessity of undertaking more in-depth research, not only on pain-relieving medication and practices, but also on clinical depression in end-of-life situations. Depression exacerbates the suffering that dying people and their families endure. Increased clinical attention and treatment should be applied, especially in the cases of younger terminally ill persons. When I use the word “younger,” I use it in a relative sense. I am not emphasizing children particularly. I am not emphasizing young adults particularly, although I am talking about them. I am talking about beyond-middle-age terminally ill people. Much older people — ages 70, 80, 85 — do not, in most cases, need to fight with depression, although it is very much a reality for the person who is dying at age 45, 50, 55, 60 or 65, especially if that person has just retired and has a pot of money set aside. A couple may have planned to enjoy life together and travel around the world, but when a person is suddenly hit with the idea that this will not be possible, that person will start spinning into a deep depression, believe me. That depression hits many people. Unfortunately, there is not sufficient research in this field. As such, I do want to underline that need.

The treatment administered should be commensurate with the needs, of course, as distinct from the requirements of older patients. Contrary to popular myth, the depression of dying individuals is treatable and can be controlled, thus diminishing the call for euthanasia and assisted suicide.

I wish to recognize the commitment and devotion of those professional medical staff who attend to dying people. In particular, the doctors who specialize in palliative care are few and are to be found mainly in the urban context. Even though this is not the most lucrative practice in the medical profession, and considering the nature of service that must be provided, I commend those doctors who nonetheless dedicate their best efforts and knowledge to this endeavour.

In addition, I especially want to emphasize my even greater appreciation and recognition for the countless number of volunteers who support terminally ill patients, especially in small towns across Canada, in the rural context, where institutional services are not readily available or are some considerable distance away.

The 1995 mandate of the committee was to study euthanasia and assisted suicide. It became readily apparent to me that we would have to treat palliative care as a special component of the 1995 report. The entire committee endorsed this view. Out of that concern came the specific recommendations, all of them unanimous relative to palliative care; hence, our current review of examining and updating those 1995 unanimous recommendations.

Palliative care gradually, but imperatively, imposed itself upon us in 1995. After hearing witness upon witness, it had become obvious that we could not ignore this expanding field of activity, with the results well known to all senators. For that reason, I very much wanted to become a member of Senator Carstairs' subcommittee that examined the unanimous recommendations of the 1995 report, since the committee's mandate would be to review, reassess and update everything dealing with palliative care. Therefore, I want to express my heartfelt appreciation to Senator Carstairs for making it possible to place me on the subcommittee. Senator Carstairs is absent at this moment because she is attending an important announcement at the University of Ottawa regarding palliative care. I am sure she will soon have a statement to make in the Senate in that connection.

Honourable senators, I also want to say how much I enjoyed working with my committee colleagues, few though we were, in a spirit of open collaboration and total frankness. These two studies have been probably the most gratifying work that I have been privileged to perform as a senator.

The utility of the recommendations made in this report is contingent upon the goodwill and supportive attitude of governments generally, which can only be reflected through a concerted action program. Indeed, one of our recommendations requests that the government agencies, the Department of Health in particular, produce an annual report to indicate the implementation of the recommendations of 1995, as well as those of the current report.

• (1420)

I believe that the motion for the adoption of the report presented by Senator Carstairs yesterday demands that it be amended with a request that a comprehensive government response to the unanimous recommendations that it contains be delivered within six months of its adoption by the Senate, if that is indeed, as I suspect it will be, the wish of the Senate.

This amendment encapsulates the committee's vision of what needs to be done to overcome the deficits of past government inaction.

MOTION IN AMENDMENT

Hon. Eymard G. Corbin: Therefore, honourable senators, I move, seconded by the Honourable Senator Ferretti Barth:

That the motion be amended by adding the following words:

“; and

That the Senate request the Government to provide a comprehensive response to the unanimous recommendations contained in this Report within six months of the adoption of this motion.”

Thank you, honourable senators.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

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

Hon. John Lynch-Staunton (Leader of the Opposition): Before carrying on this debate, we should await Senator Carstairs' comments on it. Unless another senator wishes to speak, I should like to adjourn the debate.

Senator Corbin: Honourable senators, as a matter of courtesy I spoke to Senator Carstairs about this amendment, and she endorses it.

Hon. Mabel M. DeWare: Honourable senators, I had intended to speak to the report. However, since the amendment is only asking the government to give an accounting in six months, I should like to speak to the report and the motion in amendment.

The Hon. the Speaker *pro tempore*: Is it agreed, honourable senators, that Senator DeWare speak to both the report and the motion in amendment now?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Senator DeWare: Honourable senators, I begin by commending the Subcommittee to Update “Of Life and Death” for its excellent report which was tabled in this chamber yesterday. It was aptly titled, “Quality End-of-Life Care: The Right of Every Canadian.” I wish that I had had the time to sit on that subcommittee.

The report is the result of months of hard work by our colleagues Senator Carstairs and Senator Beaudoin, the chair and deputy chair of the subcommittee respectively, by the members of the subcommittee, Senator Corbin, Senator Keon and Senator P  pin, and by Senator Roche, who was a member of the subcommittee in everything but name, I understand. Other honourable senators also contributed to the success of the subcommittee's important work and deserve our thanks.

[Senator Corbin]

I want to commend those honourable senators for their dedication and compassion in addressing some very critical issues that, undeniably, each and every one of us will have to deal with one day. When we leave this world, we should be able to expect the same quality of care that we received when we entered it.

I also salute their courage in reopening these issues, despite the controversy that at times has been associated with them, in particular in regard to euthanasia and assisted suicide.

I congratulate the subcommittee for bringing the importance of quality end-of-life care to the forefront of Canadian public awareness once again. I am pleased to see the media interest that the subcommittee has succeeded in generating for the need to ensure quality end-of-life care. The committee's findings and recommendations have earned front-page, national newspaper coverage, and the report was the top news story on many television and radio shows this morning.

Listening to the speeches made by the subcommittee members yesterday brought back many memories of the Special Senate Committee on Euthanasia and Assisted Suicide, of which I was a member. Despite the government's failure to act on the recommendations contained in our report, “Of Life and Death,” the subcommittee, in updating it, has confirmed that these points are just as relevant today as they were in 1995. In fact, they are even more so, as the subcommittee found that funding for palliative care services has decreased while the need for palliative care has increased.

Five years ago, our committee listened to a great deal of heart-wrenching testimony that we reflected in our recommendations. We found that most witnesses did not want to talk to us about euthanasia and assisted suicide. They were anxious, instead, to discuss, as Senator Corbin has stated today, the tremendous need that exists in Canada for good palliative care and pain management for terminally ill patients — in short, quality end-of-life care. If patients, their families and caregivers are given the support they need, then euthanasia and assisted suicide do not even have to be considered as options.

The problem that we found at that time was that quality of life had diminished to a point where patients were asking for euthanasia and assisted suicide as well as pain control. Pain management seemed to be the other serious problem at that time. We recommended strongly that there be research done on pain management. That was one of the recommendations in the 1995 report.

As was clearly noted by the subcommittee, that support must meet physical, emotional and spiritual needs, as well as provide income protection and assistance with the financial costs associated with this kind of care.

Honourable senators, I am in agreement with all of the subcommittee's recommendations, but I should like to mention just a few of them at this time.

First, I wholeheartedly support the recommendations that a national strategy for end-of-life care be developed, implemented and monitored. All Canadians will at one point face death — whatever province or region they live in, whether they be city dwellers or country folk, and regardless of their professional or personal circumstances. They must be assured they will be able to live out their last days, weeks, months or even years with dignity and as free from pain as possible. I urge the federal government to show the leadership in this area that Canadians are demanding of it.

The subcommittee also recommended that the federal government immediately assess the need for home care and pharmacare for the dying, and establish, in collaboration with the provinces, the funding required for these programs. It also called on Ottawa to immediately implement income security and job protection for family members who care for the dying. I believe that implementing these recommendations is necessary to ensure the success of any national strategy on end-of-life care. Not only would those programs enable Canadians to die in their homes, with dignity and with the comfort and support of their families, rather than in an institutional setting, the costs would likely be more than offset by the savings from reduced institutional care. Providing medication to patients who live at home would not cost the government any more than it pays to provide it now, at no charge, to patients who remain in hospital.

I should just like to mention one other thing that came out of our findings in 1995. A palliative care team does not necessarily have to be in an institution. They can be a community effort that involves family, friends and the family doctor, and, on the religious side, can also include one's priest or minister, and so on, people who will give this kind of care and support to families. It does not have to cost a great deal. Institutions must be involved at some point, but what is really needed are community teams. People can even look to service clubs and so on to help start such a project in their community.

I should like to take this opportunity to remind the government of its 1997-election promise to set up a national pharmacare program, a promise that appears to have been forgotten. Page 75 of the Liberal platform document, "Securing our Future Together," said:

The Liberal government endorses pharmacare as a long-term national objective....We will work with our provincial partners to ensure that all Canadians have access to medically necessary drugs within the public health care system.

Introducing pharmacare for terminally ill patients would be a good start.

• (1430)

I should like to say to Senator Carstairs that her subcommittee did a fine job updating "Of Life and Death." We on this side believe that its report should be adopted without delay and would

urge the federal government to implement the recommendations that it contains.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

On motion of Senator Hays, for Senator Pépin, debate adjourned.

INTERNAL ECONOMY, BUDGETS AND ADMINISTRATION

TENTH REPORT OF COMMITTEE ADOPTED

The Senate proceeded to consideration of the tenth report of the Standing Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration (budgets of certain Committees), presented in the Senate on June 6, 2000.—(*Honourable Senator Rompkey, P.C.*).

Hon. Bill Rompkey moved the adoption of the report.

He said: Honourable senators, this is the second tranche of the allocation of funds for committees to do their work. We had doubled, as senators will know, the amount of money available to committees because we thought that committee work is one of the strengths of the Senate and we had to support it. Therefore, twice the amount of funds was allocated to committees as compared to last year. Still, we had many more requests than we had money, and a great deal of work had to be done to keep within budget.

I should like to pay tribute to Senator Kroft and his committee and to the chairs, who put some water in their wine. We were able to work out a reasonable compromise that was within budget and that still allowed committees to do their work. There are funds left over, not a great deal, but this money will allow for further committee work. I also wish to pay tribute to the Subcommittee on Budgets.

Finally, I want to make the point that with committee work, it is not always the amount of money we spend that dictates the quality of the work. Senator Carstairs' report is a case in point. I understand that she spent only a few thousand dollars to produce that report, yet it is one of the most significant that we have produced. It has attracted a great deal of public and national attention.

I close, honourable senators, by making the point that committees can do a lot of work with minimum funding. I hope that the Senate will support the adoption of this report.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to and report adopted.

The Senate adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, June 7, 2000

	PAGE		PAGE
SENATOR'S STATEMENT			
Catholic Health Association of Canada			
Statement on Social Affairs, Science and Technology Report "Quality End-of-Life Care: The Right of Every Canadian". Senator Roche	1526		
<hr/>			
ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS			
Canada Labour Code (Bill C-12)			
Bill to Amend—Notice of Motion to Declare Null and Void. Senator Hays	1526		
Senator Kinsella	1526		
Senator Lynch-Staunton	1527		
Senator Murray	1527		
Senator Prud'homme	1528		
Senator Gauthier	1528		
Budget Implementation Bill, 2000 (Bill C-32)			
First Reading.	1528		
Senator Prud'homme	1528		
Aboriginal Peoples			
Notice of Motion to Authorize Committee to Examine Opportunities to Expand Economic Development of National Parks in the North. Senator Chalifoux	1528		
<hr/>			
QUESTION PERIOD			
The Cabinet			
Public Knowledge of Committees. Senator Forrestall	1529		
Senator Boudreau	1529		
National Defence			
Replacement of Sea King Helicopters—Openness of Procurement Process. Senator Forrestall	1529		
Senator Boudreau	1529		
Replacement of Sea King Helicopters—Possibility of Imminent Announcement on Procurement. Senator Forrestall	1529		
Senator Boudreau	1529		
Future of CFB Shilo. Senator Stratton	1529		
Senator Boudreau	1529		
Possibility of Closing Kapyong Base. Senator Stratton	1529		
Senator Boudreau	1530		
Delayed Answer to Oral Question			
Senator Hays	1530		
Canadian Broadcasting Corporation			
Effect of Proposed Cuts. Question by Senator Kinsella. Senator Hays (Delayed Answer)	1530		
<hr/>			
ORDERS OF THE DAY			
Developments Respecting Euthanasia and Assisted Suicide			
Report of Social Affairs, Science and Technology Committee— Debate Continued. Senator Corbin	1530		
Motion in Amendment. Senator Corbin	1532		
Senator Lynch-Staunton	1532		
Senator DeWare	1532		
Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration			
Tenth Report of Committee Adopted. Senator Rompkey	1533		



If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:
Public Works and Government Services Canada —
Publishing
45 Sacré-Coeur Boulevard,
Hull, Québec, Canada K1A 0S9