CANADA

Debates of the Senate

2nd SESSION • 35th PARLIAMENT • VOLUME 136 • NUMBER 56

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Tuesday, December 3, 1996

THE HONOURABLE GILDAS L. MOLGAT
SPEAKER

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

CONTENTS

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

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

Published by the Senate
Available from Canada Communication Group — Publishing, Public Works and Government Services Canada, Ottawa K1A 0S9, at $1.75 per copy or $158 per year.
Also available on the Internet: http://www.parl.gc.ca

THE SENATE

Tuesday, December 3, 1996

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

Prayers.

PAGES EXCHANGE PROGRAM WITH HOUSE OF COMMONS

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, before I call for Senators' Statements, I should like to introduce to you the House of Commons pages in our continuing exchange program. They will be with us for this week until December 6.

Daniel Fisher, from Welland, Ontario, is enrolled in the Faculty of Social Sciences at the University of Ottawa, and he is a political science major.

[*Translation*]

Honourable senators, there is also Caroline Leclerc, from Aylmer, Quebec. She is enrolled in the Faculty of Social Sciences at the University of Ottawa and is a political science major. Welcome to both of you.

[*English*]

SENATORS' STATEMENTS

NEW TOBACCO LEGISLATION

CONGRATULATIONS TO MINISTER OF HEALTH

Hon. Mira Spivak: Honourable senators, I want to congratulate the Minister of Health, the Honourable David Dingwall, for introducing legislation designed to restrict the advertising and promotion of tobacco. In particular, it is designed to educate our youth and to protect them from the dangers of tobacco. We know that the tobacco companies do target the young people in this country. This is indeed very welcome legislation.

Of course, I must add that I would perhaps have done things differently, in an effort to ensure that tobacco was listed as a hazardous product. Nevertheless, I sincerely congratulate the minister. The circumstances under which we find ourselves today, make it possible for this bill to be presented at this time. However, in my opinion, there is room for further improvement.

I ask that the Honourable Leader of the Government in the Senate convey my congratulations to the minister.

INTERNATIONAL DAY FOR THE DISABLED

Hon. Noël A. Kinsella: Honourable senators, I was waiting for someone to rise from the government side to draw the attention of the house to the fact that today is the International Day for the Disabled.

For many years, Parliament has acknowledged the barriers to equality that continue to frustrate people with disabilities, and yet continue to deny them the equal opportunity that is guaranteed by Canadian society.

Honourable senators will recall that, contained in our domestic legislation by way of the provincial human rights acts across Canada, and in the Canadian Human Rights Act, there is provision for the proscription of discrimination in employment, accommodation and services against persons with disabilities. Also, as a constitutional value, the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, section 15, makes explicit mention that all Canadians are equal before and under the law without discrimination, and in particular without discrimination because of mental or physical disability.

It is one thing to have human rights instruments of this sort. It is equally important that those instruments be kept up to date. The Canadian Human Rights Commission has been recommending for many years in its annual report that the Canadian Human Rights Act be amended to provide reasonable accommodation in this respect.

There have been numerous studies over the past few years — the Obstacles report of 1981, Equality For All in 1985, the Challenge report of 1988, Consensus for Action of 1990, National Strategy for the Integration of Persons with Disabilities in 1992 and, most recently, the other place has a committee chaired by the member for Fredericton-York-Sunbury looking at the problems faced by persons with disabilities. Honourable senators, studies are one thing, but contemporary action is another. This government's inaction in this area is something we must note with sadness on a day like today.

• (1410)

Honourable senators, we need government leadership in this area to move the necessary remedial actions in order to ensure that equality exists, in practical terms, for those Canadians who are coping with disabilities.

Today, the international day for persons with disabilities, I call on the Government of Canada to introduce amendments to the Canadian Human Rights Act that would define the responsibility we have to assure reasonable accommodation for Canadians with disabilities.

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I, too, would like to note the importance of the International Day for the Disabled, and I thank my honourable friend for raising the issue.

However, I should also like to indicate to the Senate that this is an issue of very high priority with the government at this moment, which is one of the reasons that it has been a major area of discussion in the new federal-provincial-territorial council on social policy renewal, chaired by the Minister for Human Resources Development, the Honourable Pierre Pettigrew, from the federal side and the Honourable Stockwell Day from the province of Alberta.

My honourable friend has noted the past history of involvement by government in this issue. I recall as well the task force on the disabled back in the 1980s under the leadership of the Honourable David Smith from Toronto, which led to the two Obstacles reports. It was from those reports that a great many practical advances flowed, which have helped in the daily lives of people with disabilities across this country.

Much more needs to be done. This was highlighted dramatically in the most recent report, the study from the House of Commons led by the member for Fredericton-York-Sunbury, Andy Scott. The government will be studying the results, suggestions, and recommendations of that task force, as will the federal-provincial-territorial ministers.

This issue involves not just social policy, now that everything is intertwined. It is not only the social well-being of these individuals that we must be concerned about but also their economic well-being. There are focuses within this house and elsewhere on issues involving children, and right at the top of the list in terms of the importance of those issues for the citizens of Canada are the opportunities and the challenges for the disabled.

My honourable friend's suggestion will certainly be conveyed onward, but I believe he would agree with me that there are many practical advances we can make to better the lives of those who, in their search for equality of opportunity in this country, might also benefit from assistance from those of us who are in a position to give it.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

OCEANS BILL

REPORT OF COMMITTEE

Hon. Gerald J. Comeau, Chairman of the Standing Senate Committee on Fisheries, presented the following report:

Tuesday, December 3, 1996

The Standing Senate Committee on Fisheries has the honour to present its

SECOND REPORT

Your Committee, to which was referred Bill C-26, An Act respecting the Oceans of Canada, has, in obedience to the Order of Reference of Wednesday, October 23, 1996, examined the said Bill and now reports the same without amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

GERALD J. COMEAU
Chairman

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, with leave of the Senate, and notwithstanding rule 58(1)(*h*), I move:

That when the Senate adjourns today, it do stand adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 4, 1996, at one thirty o'clock in the afternoon.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

MANGANESE-BASED FUEL ADDITIVES BILL

FIRST READING

The Hon. the Speaker informed the Senate that a message had been received from the House of Commons with Bill C-29, to regulate interprovincial trade in and the importation for commercial purposes of certain manganese-based substances.

Bill read first time.

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

On motion of Senator Graham, bill placed on the Orders of the Day for second reading on Thursday, December 5, 1996.

FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION ACT

BILL TO AMEND—FIRST READING

The Hon. the Speaker informed the Senate that a message had been received from the House of Commons with Bill C-270, to amend the Financial Administration Act (session of Parliament).

Bill read first time.

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

On motion of Senator Graham, bill placed on the Orders of the Day for second reading on Thursday, December 5, 1996.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO MEET DURING SITTING OF THE SENATE

Hon. John B. Stewart, Chairman of the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, with leave of the Senate and notwithstanding rule 58(1)(*a*), moved:

> That the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs have power to sit at 3:30 p.m. today, even though the Senate may then be sitting, and that rule 95(4) be suspended in relation thereto.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTION PERIOD

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

DIRECTIVE FROM MINISTER TO MONITOR TELEPHONE COMMUNICATIONS OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Pat Carney: Honourable senators, I have already given notice to the Leader of the Government in the Senate that I will raise this issue. However, I wished particularly to draw her attention, and that of honourable senators, to the directive that has gone from the office of the Minister of Fisheries to the Regional Directors, Pacific Region, instructing them to report all telephone calls from MPs and senators to the minister's office. The minister has directed that they report the name of the individual, the office they are associated with, the phone number, and a summary of information given to the caller. All the information is to be e-mailed or faxed to the minister's office within 24 hours of the call.

• (1420)

Is this the government's new communications strategy, this concept of monitoring telephone calls by senators and MPs who are working on public business on behalf of the public? If so, I would like to know the purpose of it.

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I thank my honourable friend for drawing this matter to my attention. I was not aware of the information being sent out. I will certainly look into it. However, I would express the hope that, on issues of public policy, certainly as important as those on the West Coast, ministers would want to listen with great care to the views of senators and members of Parliament from whatever side of the political spectrum. As to the honourable senator's particular point, I will try to find out more about it.

Senator Carney: Honourable senators, I would be happy to have the Leader of the Government respond. This matter is not a frivolous issue. An attempt to intimidate MPs and senators who are working on public business, on controversial policies that receive strong opposition, is not a frivolous matter. It is inconsistent with our long tradition of parliamentary privilege.

As to the government leader's suggestion that the minister should be anxious to receive our views, I should like to point out that the minister is particularly uninterested in our views. His office has refused to meet with the mayors of three major fishing centres on the coast: Prince Rupert, Powell River and Campbell River. The mayors of these cities have asked for a meeting with the minister on policies that are devastating their coastal communities, and they have been refused. Letters from my office to the minister's office are left unanswered for weeks at a time.

I am happy at any efforts the Leader of the Government in the Senate can make to improve communications between the minister and parliamentarians — short of monitoring our telephone calls.

Senator Fairbairn: Honourable senators, I assure my honourable friend that I do not consider the matter to be a frivolous issue. I think it is a very important issue. I will certainly transfer her comments to the minister and do whatever I can to accelerate communication.

MONITORING OF FOREIGN TELEPHONE COMMUNICATIONS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Gerald J. Comeau: Honourable senators, while the Leader of the Government in the Senate is looking into this issue, I wonder if she might verify whether any kind of similar memo was sent to personnel on the East Coast as well as in the inland fisheries to report back to the minister's office any phone calls made to those regions?

I, like Senator Carney, find it extremely serious that the minister's office would be showing so much interest in what members are doing. Rather than wasting time monitoring these phone calls, it might be much more useful if he were to talk to people in those regions.

Could the leader also find out whether any similar monitoring system is in place for foreign nationals? In other words, are foreign people who make inquiries of DFO officials monitored as well?

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I will add Senator Comeau's questions to the list and get answers.

MONITORING OF TELEPHONE COMMUNICATIONS OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT BY MINISTERIAL STAFF—POSSIBLE MEANS OF OBTAINING ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Hon. David Tkachuk: Honourable senators, I am becoming a little confused here, as I am sure is Senator Carney. With this monitoring system, if I want to get a quick response from a minister, instead of putting questions on the Order Paper—which sometimes have gone unanswered for six months, I simply have to phone an official in the Department of Transport or the Department of Fisheries, the question goes to the minister within 24 hours and then, perhaps, I get a response? Is that the way we will be conducting the business of the government from now on?

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I take Senator Tkachuk's question very seriously, as I have taken the questions of the other two senators very seriously. I can assure Senator Tkachuk that the government is extremely interested and indeed conscious of comments that are made in both houses of this Parliament on important issues.

I apologize now, as I have done in the past, for the periodic slowness of responses. My colleague and I are doing everything we can to accelerate that process as well.

DIRECTIVE FROM MINISTER TO MONITOR TELEPHONE COMMUNICATIONS OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT—TABLING OF RELEVANT DOCUMENTS

Hon. Pat Carney: Honourable senators, I am in your hands, and those of His Honour. I have a copy of the minister's directive, which I would like to make part of the record of the Senate for clarification. May I read it?

Some Hon. Senators: Read it!

Senator Carney: This is addressed to Regional Directors, Pacific Region, from the Executive Assistant to the RDG, the Regional Director, Pacific Region. It is dated October 15, 1996. The subject is "phone messages from MPs or senators." It is signed by L.M.E. McFall and it reads as follows:

> We have been instructed by the Minister's office to report to them all telephone calls from MPs and Senators. The report is to include the name of the individual, the office they are associated with, phone number and issue along with a summary of what information was given to the caller.
>
> The messages are to be e-mailed or faxed to me within 24 hours of the call having been received. Attached is a form which is to be used, I can e-mail it to you also if you wish. I will provide the Minister's office with a weekly report.
>
> Please ensure all your staff are advised to report all such calls to you immediately.
>
> Thanks.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I simply want to make the point that we have not established a precedent here. Had Senator Carney asked to table the letter, she would have been perfectly in order, but it is not in order in Question Period to read a letter. However, she did it in response to a request from the Senate and I agreed, but it is not a regular practice.

POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

INCREASE IN TUITION FEES FOR OUT-OF-PROVINCE STUDENTS BY CERTAIN PROVINCES—POSSIBLE ABROGATION OF INTERPROVINCIAL AGREEMENTS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Ethel Cochrane: Honourable senators, last year the Government of British Columbia imposed a three-month waiting period on welfare eligibility for newcomers to the province. The federal government refused to tolerate this barrier to interprovincial mobility and has withheld federal welfare funding from B.C. as a penalty for that action.

I have now learned that the Government of Quebec has announced that, beginning next year, students from other provinces who attend universities or colleges in Quebec will have to pay tuition fees approximately twice as high as the fees paid by residents of Quebec.

I ask the Leader of the Government in the Senate, will the government penalize this barrier to interprovincial mobility by withholding a portion of the post-secondary education funding from the Government of Quebec?

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I will have to refer that question to the appropriate minister. As Honourable Senator Cochrane would know, the Quebec issue may well be within provincial responsibility. I will have to check for her.

Senator Cochrane: Honourable senators, I have a supplementary question, given what the minister has said. As we are all aware, this fee increase will not apply to most foreign students because the Government of Quebec has reciprocal agreements with other countries on educational matters.

Will the Government of Canada make a renewed effort to establish national standards for post-secondary education that would prohibit discrimination against out-of-province students?

Senator Fairbairn: Honourable senators, I will certainly convey my honourable friend's suggestions to the ministers involved.

• (1430)

In the case of British Columbia, my colleague will know that the question of mobility rights was involved. I understand that there is continuing discussion between the federal minister and the minister from British Columbia to see if there can be a resolution of this matter.

REQUEST FOR PARTICULARS OF TUITION FEES OF ALL POST-SECONDARY INSTITUTIONS

Hon. Marcel Prud'homme: Honourable senators, in all fairness, will the honourable minister give us an answer so that members of the Senate may better understand the outcome? Perhaps she could also table particulars of tuition fees from all of the universities and other post-secondary institutions across Canada. Honourable senators will then be astounded to see how low the fee is that Quebec charges to its students.

I do not know if that is because the Quebec university students are more militant than are students in the rest of Canada, but the difference is unbelievably attractive for any student to come to Quebec and study there. At times the tuition fee is half that of other universities in Canada. The universities in every other province have raised the tuition fees high in comparison to Quebec, which has never increased tuition fees. Unfortunately, I do not have the figures here, because I did not expect this question today.

I do not wish to clash with my honourable colleague, but in order to have an intelligent debate and an equally intelligent answer, I would kindly request from the minister that, when she tables any answers to the question put to her, she also table the price that each student across Canada pays for similar education. Either something must be done in other provinces to lower the rate, or something must be done in Quebec, at the great risk of having an immense fight.

I was a student leader in my youth, but we did nothing compared to students of today. Today, students are very militant. The government wanted to raise the price for everyone but they could not succeed. I do not mean to say that what is being done is good, but, in order to have an intelligent debate, honourable senators may wish to know the exact cost for each student across Canada in each field, be it medicine, the arts or the sciences. You will be happily surprised at the immensely low cost of tuition in Quebec compared with the rest of Canada.

Hon. Joyce Fairbairn (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, my honourable friend underscores the point that there is a variety of tuition fees set in different provinces, within provinces, and also between institutions. I should point out to him, however, that at this very moment we have in progress hearings conducted by a subcommittee of our Social Affairs Committee on Post-Secondary Education, which was the initiative of my colleague Senator Bonnell. Some of these questions, and the opportunity to talk to those who may be involved firsthand in the issues relating thereto, would be appropriately done at that committee.

Senator Prud'homme: On the same issue, you understand that as soon as honourable senators start mentioning national standards here, I see us moving further and further away from the spirit of Meech Lake. That is why I intervened. We must be careful that we know exactly what we are talking about.

Senator Fairbairn: Honourable senators, I take my honourable friend's point. The position of this government and its ministers, working with their provincial colleagues, is well established. Indeed, it has been particularly well established recently because of the discussions on the social union that are taking place among the ministers from every province and territory and the Minister of Human Resources Development.

DELAYED ANSWERS TO ORAL QUESTIONS

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I have a response to a question raised in the Senate on October 29, 1996, by the Honourable Senator Forrestall regarding the route for an offshore natural gas pipeline from Nova Scotia; a response to a question raised in the Senate on November 26, 1996, by the Honourable Senators St. Germain and Bolduc regarding the Canada-United States softwood lumber agreement; and I have responses to written questions by the Honourable Senator Forrestall, Nos. 138 and 139.

ENERGY

ROUTE FOR OFFSHORE NATURAL GAS PIPELINE FROM NOVA SCOTIA—PREFERENCE OF PRIME MINISTER—GOVERNMENT POSITION

(Response to question raised by Hon. J. Michael Forrestall on October 29, 1996)

The Prime Minister has commented on the importance of the regulatory process and project economics to the success of these projects.

The Government recognizes that two projects are competing to transport Sable offshore gas to markets. Both projects will receive the same treatment from federal regulatory agencies. The principles of fairness, equity, and efficiency are applied to all proposed natural gas pipeline projects.

The National Energy Board has jurisdiction over international and interprovincial pipelines. It is an independent, quasi-judicial regulatory body. National Energy Board recommendations pertaining to natural gas pipelines construction and natural gas exports are approved by the Governor in Council. The Governor in Council's role is limited to approving or refusing a National Energy Board recommendation. The Government cannot alter or review a National Energy Board recommendation.

The Sable Offshore Energy Project is market driven. Natural gas market dynamics and project economics will dictate when Sable offshore gas comes onshore, what markets are served, and what route the associated onshore pipeline takes.

NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

SOFTWOOD LUMBER—AGREEMENT WITH THE UNITED STATES ON EXPORT QUOTAS—REASONS FOR FIVE-YEAR TERM—EFFECT ON JOBS IN PRODUCING PROVINCES—GOVERNMENT POSITION

(Response to questions raised by Hon. Gerry St. Germain and Hon. Roch Bolduc on November 26, 1996)

The allocations were based on recent exports to the United States by eligible primary producers and remanufacturers. To implement the new fee system under the agreement, the federal government worked out an allocation system in close consultation with industry associations in all four provinces, as well as with the provinces themselves. Specifically:

- the allocations take into account direct exports to the U.S. by primary producers and remanufacturers, plus shipments they made to the U.S. through wholesalers;
- they include an amount for new entrants that have started new mills, made verifiable investments, or undertaken major expansions of capacity;
- they are adjusted to take account of shipments already made by firms in the first six months; and
- they apply to the full year between April 1, 1996 and March 31, 1997.

In order to assist companies in the transition to allocations, the government has provided a special adjustment allocation to companies whose shipments in the first two quarters of this year exceeded their allocation. In addition, an allocation bank has been established for companies in this situation to borrow forward from their allocations for next year. The government has also established a small reserve to assist companies experiencing extreme hardship as a result of the transition to company-specific allocations. If companies have already run out of allocations this year, it is because they shipped a great deal of lumber in the first six months. Prices have surged and they were shipping at a faster pace than in the past.

When the 14.7 billion board feet of fee-free quota plus the 650 million board feet of lower base fee are added, and the 92 million board feet bonus the government has obtained for each of the first two quarters of the agreement — the government is also well under way to obtaining an additional 92 million board feet bonus for the third quarter — Canada's exports of softwood lumber to the United States will either equal or surpass its exports from previous years.

The allocation limit does not prevent companies from paying the fee and shipping more if they wish. Depending on market prices, this may be a viable option for some firms even if the fee is US$100 per thousand board feet.

Lumber companies are operating profitably this year because of a high level of exports to the U.S. at good prices. The average price at this time last year was US$233 and is now US$505. The government is not about to renege on its trade obligations with the United States; it is fully implementing its commitments under the agreement.

The Canadian industry and provincial governments decided that negotiating an acceptable agreement to guarantee security of access to the U.S. market is preferable to the uncertainties and costs of fighting a countervailing duty case. If the United States had decided to launch a countervailing duty investigation against Canadian softwood lumber products, the imposed duty and legal costs associated with another countervailing duty case would have had a major negative impact on the Canadian lumber industry and its employees.

These growing pains are expected to dissipate as companies adjust to the market realities and the new rules associated with the issuance of softwood lumber allocations.

This industry is important to the Canadian economy. It employs about 60,000 people across Canada. Canadian exports of softwood lumber to the United States reached record levels in 1995 of over $8 billion. This represented approximately 60% of the Canadian softwood lumber production. The value of these exports has grown substantially since 1990.

Therefore the agreement with the United States is designed to avoid another long and costly trade battle. The agreement, which came into effect on April 1, 1996, will give Canadian softwood lumber exporters security of market access to the U.S. market for five years. It includes an unprecedented commitment by the United States not to take any trade action against Canadian exports during this period.

The agreement was not only supported by the softwood lumber industry and the provinces, but was designed by them. For this purpose the government consulted closely with provinces and industry who were also involved throughout the negotiations. These consultations have continued on implementation of the agreement.

ANSWERS TO ORDER PAPER QUESTIONS TABLED

PARTICULARS OF CORNWALLIS PARK DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Deputy Leader of the Government) tabled the answer to question No. 138 on the Order Paper—by Senator Forrestall.

REPORT OF KPMG ON CORNWALLIS PARK DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Deputy Leader of the Government) tabled the answer to question No. 139 on the Order Paper—by Senator Forrestall.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

CANADA ELECTIONS ACT
PARLIAMENT OF CANADA ACT
REFERENDUM ACT

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING—DEBATE ADJOURNED

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

He said: Honourable senators, I am pleased to begin the second reading debate on Bill C-63, to amend the Canada Elections Act, the Parliament of Canada Act and the Referendum Act.

This bill will bring about important changes to the way in which federal elections are conducted — changes that will directly address concerns and frustrations expressed by many Canadians over the last number of years. This bill will help to ensure that every Canadian has an opportunity to participate in a meaningful way in federal elections and to know that his or her voice is heard.

Herman Bakvis, who edited several of the research studies prepared for the Royal Commission on Electoral Reform and Party Financing, commonly known as the Lortie commission, wrote:

> The act of voting in an election is perhaps the single most important form of political participation in modern democracies. It remains the most direct means available to citizens of signalling their interests and preferences to the government and of controlling those who seek to govern them. The extent to which citizens exercise this most fundamental right can be seen as an indicator of the health of democracy.

Here in Canada, we have enjoyed a high voter turnout rate, particularly when compared to other democratic nations — notably, the United States. However, that rate is far from 100 per cent. Our rate is generally between 69 and 76 per cent.

In particular, since the mid-1980s, there has been increasing dissatisfaction among Canadians with our process of voter enumeration and registration. Our system of voter registration is unique, with all stages carried out after an election call, and with electors lists compiled by door-to-door enumeration. We are the only major democracy that waits to register electors to vote until after the election campaign has begun. While this used to work just fine, the briefs and testimonies received by the Lortie commission attest to the problems Canadians have experienced in recent years with this system.

One of the background studies prepared for the royal commission was specifically on voter registration, entitled: "Registering Voters: Canada in a Comparative Context." The study examined the evidence before the commission and found:

> The primary concern expressed in these documents is, without question, the quality of enumeration and the frustration of electors, parties and candidates that results from inaccurate lists or from the exclusion of individuals from voting because of the current registration process.

Bill C-63 would address these concerns by establishing a permanent register of electors. This is an idea that has been discussed for many years and, indeed, was recommended by the Lortie commission. Now, however, we have the technology necessary to make it a reality. The bill would enable us to take advantage of the latest technologies and provide for intergovernmental cooperation so that we can build and then maintain, in a cost effective way, a reliable, permanent voters list.

• (1440)

There are many advantages to this proposed system. In addition to saving the very great expense of door-to-door enumeration for each election and avoiding the difficulties experienced recently with the system, a permanent register will provide opportunities for federal-provincial cooperation, including the reduction of duplication and overlapping among jurisdictions — an additional cost saving for taxpayers.

The creation and maintenance of a permanent voters list is directly linked to the second key element of Bill C-63, namely, shortening the general election period from 47 days to 36 days. We know that Canadians want shorter elections. In fact, the very large number of briefs submitted to the Lortie commission — some 120 — that advocated a permanent voters list gave as their major reasons problems with enumeration and "the desire to reduce the length of Canadian elections." In this age of rapid transportation and communication, there is no need for such a lengthy campaign.

The third major element of the bill is that it would change the voting hours, establishing a staggered voting schedule designed to respond to the concern, of which we are all aware, of many Western Canadians that they may still be voting after a result has been projected from the rest of the country.

I will discuss each of these elements in more detail, but, first, I want to describe briefly the process that led to this bill. This bill is the result of a long period of extensive work, consultation and cooperation among various institutions at the federal level, various levels of government and diverse political parties. As I mentioned, many elements of the bill have their genesis in the work of the Lortie commission, which conducted a detailed study of the voter registration system. This work was complemented by that of Elections Canada which continued over several years and during which there was extensive consultation with provincial governments, the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs in the other place, the Privacy Commissioner of Canada and political parties. Indeed, the bill before us today incorporates a number of amendments passed in the other place to address, among other things, concerns raised in committee and by opposition parties. The provisions on the staggered voting hours are the result of an initiative launched in a private member's bill in the House of Commons.

I will now briefly describe some of the details of the bill. First, as I mentioned, the bill would authorize the creation of a permanent voters list to eliminate the need for full-scale, door-to-door enumeration for every election. There would be one final nationwide enumeration conducted prior to the next election using traditional door-to-door procedures to build this list. The timing of this enumeration means that Canada could move to the shorter minimum campaign period of 36 days, the second major initiative of the bill, in time for the next election.

The Chief Electoral Officer has said that it would be feasible to launch this last enumeration by April 1, 1997, and complete it within 21 to 25 days. Once it is completed, the final enumeration would be used to produce the preliminary list of electors for the next general election. Candidates would receive the preliminary list within five days of the issuance of the writ. This is a significant improvement over the existing system.

Under the current 47-day calendar, as many of us are well aware, preliminary lists of electors are distributed to candidates and political parties on the twenty-fourth day before polling day, more than three weeks into the campaign. Under the proposed 36-day calendar, the preliminary list will be available on the thirty-first day before polling day, five days into the campaign. These lists will be provided to political parties as well as to individual candidates. In this way, if no candidate has yet been nominated for a particular riding, the party will not be delayed in obtaining the electors lists. As a result, parties and candidates would have a week longer to campaign using the preliminary lists than is now the case, even though the minimum total election campaign would be 11 days shorter than the current minimum campaign.

This means that spending limits also will be known much earlier in the process. They are now confirmed to candidates and political parties on the twenty-fifth day before polling date. Under the new calendar, they will be available on the thirty-first day before polling day, five days after the issuance of the writ.

These deadlines apply when an election is called. However, a benefit of a permanent voters list is that it can be used by members of Parliament and political parties at other times as well. The list of electors, updated using information that I will outline shortly, would be distributed every October 15 to MPs and political parties for the districts in which a candidate of that party was officially nominated at the last election.

Another amendment agreed to will ensure that registered parties receive a preliminary voters list after the final door-to-door enumeration to build the permanent register. The list will be made available within 30 days after the Chief Electoral Officer gives notice in the Canada *Gazette* that the information is complete. Of course, if an election is called sooner, the list will be available five days after the writ is issued.

The shortened campaign calendar would also change the time frame within which political parties must advise broadcasters of the hours and schedule for advertising time they want to purchase. Currently, the Election Act provides for 6.5 hours of paid broadcasting time to be allocated among registered political parties, and a 28-day period during which political parties may advertise. Notwithstanding the shortened election campaign period, the bill would not change these provisions. The same 6.5 hours will have to be provided and the same 28-day period will be available for paid political advertisements.

The only change concerns the deadline for parties to advise broadcasters of the time they wish to purchase according to the allocation. Currently, the act allows 10 days to notify broadcasters of their advertising plans. Originally, this bill would have reduced this period to three days. However, concern was expressed that it would be difficult for parties to anticipate their needs and inform the broadcasters within three days. To meet this concern, the bill was amended to provide parties with a "rolling window" of up to 10 days after the issue of the writ within which they could notify broadcasters of their requests.

Another amendment was passed in the other place to provide greater certainty as to when Canada moves to this shorter election calendar. Under the amendment, the Chief Electoral Officer would not conduct the final door-to-door enumeration until April 1, 1997. Once it is completed, as I mentioned, the final enumeration would take a total of between 21 and 25 days.The Prime Minister could take steps leading to the issuance of a writ for a general election based on the 36-day calendar. An election could, of course, be called earlier, but that would have to use the 47-day minimum calendar.

The question of what information would be collected in this last door-to-door enumeration, and then maintained on the permanent register of voters, was considered at some length, both in the discussions leading up to the introduction of Bill C-63 and during the deliberations in the other place. One issue of great importance throughout was that the privacy of electors be respected. Enumerators will be required to determine whether a person is a Canadian citizen and 18 years of age or older. They will also ask electors to provide their full name, gender, address and date of birth, information that will be particularly helpful in identifying and matching electors when addresses change. However, no information about the voter's date of birth, or his or her gender, will be provided to candidates or political parties.

The bill contains a number of other provisions specifically to ensure the privacy of voters. As I mentioned earlier, the Privacy Commissioner of Canada was consulted during the preparation of this legislation. Indeed, his office was included in the process by the Chief Electoral Officer from the outset of the two years the legislation was in development. Over this period, a number of issues were raised and resolved to ensure that privacy concerns were fully addressed. For example, once a permanent voters list is established based on this final door-to-door enumeration, it will be updated and maintained through the use of certain federal as well as provincial data bases. A key principle of the federal Privacy Act is that information collected by the government from Canadian citizens for a specific purpose is not to be used for unrelated purposes without their knowledge and consent.

• (1450)

Bill C-63 incorporates this principle of prior, informed consent to ensure that such data bases can only be used with the prior informed consent of the particular Canadian citizen. For example, information concerning address changes and new 18-year olds that might be available from Revenue Canada's records could only be accessed with the consent of the individual taxpayer. A proper consent form would be developed jointly by Elections Canada and the Privacy Commissioner's office that would form part of an individual tax return.

There is also a provision to allow electors to opt out of the register, without affecting their right to vote, or directing that their information not be shared with other electoral jurisdictions. As a result of an amendment made in the other place, the bill now obliges the Chief Electoral Officer to change any elector's information upon proper request from the elector.

Other measures included in the bill to address privacy concerns include provisions ensuring that information contained in the register of electors will be used solely for electoral purposes specifically defined in the bill. The register of electors would be shared only with bodies responsible under provincial law for establishing lists of electors, including municipalities and school boards. There would be provisions making it an offence to misuse the information in the register of electors.

Indeed, the Privacy Commissioner of Canada, Mr. Bruce Phillips, has given this bill an A-plus for the way it addresses personal privacy issues.

I alluded earlier to the maintenance of the permanent register of electors through the use of federal-provincial data bases. Let me briefly elaborate: Once the process of building the permanent register is completed through the traditional door-to-door enumeration, the task will be to maintain it. Using the now available technologies, it will be possible to update the register with information from existing federal and provincial data bases. In particular, changes of address, new 18-year-olds, new citizens and deaths would all be incorporated to ensure the reliability of the register. Elections Canada has been working closely with the provinces and territories to secure data to be used to build up and maintain the register; in particular, from drivers' licences and vital statistics offices, as well as with Revenue Canada and Citizenship and Immigration Canada.

There would not be any interconnection of computers between Elections Canada and either Revenue Canada or Citizenship and Immigration Canada. The data would have to be hand carried, in the form of disks or tapes, over to Elections Canada. This is another example of the protections being provided to ensure the privacy of each voter.

Once the writs are issued for an election, a more streamlined process would be used as well to ensure that all eligible Canadians have the opportunity to have their names on voting lists and to vote. This would include special door-to-door enumeration and mail-in/mail-back revision cards in areas of high mobility and new residential areas, enhanced public information campaigns and voter registration booths. In addition, electors would be able to register on polling day itself.

I want to turn now to the final of the three major initiatives in the bill; namely, the staggered voting hours. We are all very much aware of concerns that have been expressed in western provinces and the territories about the existing system. Right now, some British Columbians and Albertans are still voting when early results from the East are being projected to predict the outcome of the election. The bill proposes a system under which polls would close at different times throughout the country after a longer period of voting. The voting day in each time zone would last 12 hours instead of the current 11. However, the local times of this 12-hour period would differ depending on the time zones.

As proposed, the polls would close at the following local times in each time zone: Newfoundland, 8:30 p.m.; maritime provinces, 8:30 p.m.; Quebec and Ontario, 9:30 p.m., Manitoba and Saskatchewan, 8:30 p.m.; Alberta and the Northwest Territories, 7:30 p.m.; British Columbia and the Yukon, 7 p.m.

Under this proposed schedule, polls would close in Newfoundland three hours before they close in British Columbia and in the maritimes they would close 2.5 hours before they close in British Columbia. However, in Ontario, Quebec, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and the Northwest Territories, they would close at the same time, which would be only a half hour before they close in British Columbia.

Is this a perfect solution? The answer is no. It requires the polls to open later than they do now in some provinces, such as Quebec and Ontario, and closing earlier than they do now in other provinces. However, this seems to be a case where the perfect is the enemy of the possible. To ensure that all voters have an equal opportunity to vote, the 12-hour voting period must be identical. As I noted before, the bill would increase this period by one hour from the current 11-hour period.

The bill would reduce the time off work that employers provide their employees from the current four hours to three. This should mitigate any problems caused to employers from this extended voting schedule. At the same time, this will give employees ample time either to vote in the morning and arrive late at work, or to leave work early to vote in the evening. For example, if someone usually starts work at 9 a.m., under this section they could arrive at noon. Even in a province where the polls would only open at 9:30, this is plenty of time to have an opportunity to vote. Similarly, someone who normally leaves work at 5 p.m., could leave at 2 p.m. and have plenty of time to vote, even if the polls close at 7 p.m.

This bill has met with considerable support from the media across the country. Editorial writers have welcomed the key initiatives, the privacy provisions of the bill and the cost savings that would result. Bill C-63 would enable us to significantly modernize our electoral system. It affords opportunities for federal-provincial cooperation both in information sharing to maintain the permanent register of voters and in the opportunities to share electors lists and avoid duplication and overlapping. Indeed, as a result of an amendment passed in the other place, the Chief Electoral Officer will be able to use provincial lists both to build and maintain the federal register, provided certain conditions are met to ensure the accuracy and quality of the federal register.

This amendment likely means that the list of electors in Prince Edward Island and Alberta could be used next spring to build the federal register. It would therefore not be necessary to have a federal door-to-door enumeration in those two provinces.

There are also, of course, substantial cost savings that would be realized by the adoption of this bill. Once the permanent register of electors is in place, there will be cost savings of about $30 million for each election. The shorter election period alone will save taxpayers approximately $8 million for each election. Insofar as voting lists are shared with the province for their use, as is anticipated, taxpayers will realize further savings.

• (1500)

Honourable senators, I believe this is a good bill that serves the interests of all Canadians, especially the voters, the candidates and the political parties. For these reasons, I invite you to join me in supporting this important legislative initiative.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marcel Prud'homme: Honourable senators, I am very pleased with this bill. There are, however, two or three small points that might be worrisome. The first concerns the hours of polling. This change has been well received in certain parts of the country, and not in others.

When I sat in the House of Commons, the minister responsible or the chief whip always appointed me to that parliamentary commission.

Over the years, I got to know the Elections Act and the Referendum Act practically inside out. I think we all agree on the issue of enumeration. You have pointed out the risks concerning confidentiality of documents, mentioning, for example, the place of residence and the age of a person; even if these documents are not meant to be given out, the information will get out. I have some doubts about this question of requiring people to give their age. People are very touchy about that, particularly when they reach a certain age. So the matter of age is the first problem I wanted to mention.

The second is the matter of hours of polling across Canada. If I have understood correctly, Central Canada, that is Quebec and Ontario mainly, along with some of the Atlantic provinces, will be very harshly penalized by this. We agree that there ought to be an end to the foolishness we have seen in the United States, where Californians did not even feel like turning out to vote any more, because the outcome of the election was already decided. We want to remedy that.

I have a suggestion for you, honourable senators, and I would like to make it to the committee that will be considering this bill.

[*English*]

Would it not be appropriate, if it is still possible, to split the bill, to pass everything and except that portion dealing with the hours? There is much discussion of the hours. I assure you, people are awakening to the question of the hours for central Canada, and much discussion will take place. Sadly, that will delay the bill. We all want the bill with perhaps some changes here and there, but the question of hours is very controversial.

If we were not to split the bill, I would propose to the committee that Elections Canada stop the voting earlier. If need be, we can only penalize the workers by paying them extra money. Everyone works there, but I suggest the boxes not be opened for an hour, for instance. Then you are only penalizing the political workers, who will not mind. You would only be penalizing those who work in the polling stations, and who will have to wait before they open the boxes to have the votes counted, instead of penalizing 10 million people in Ontario and 7 million in Quebec.

All honourable senators want Canada to be different from the United States of America, where a vote is a vote, and every vote counts.

[*Translation*]

The Hon. the Speaker: Senator Prud'homme, would you ask your question, please?

[*English*]

Senator Bryden: Senator Prud'homme, I think your question is: Would this matter be considered at committee if you made a suggestion? My answer is yes.

Hon. Lowell Murray: Honourable senators, let me begin by picking up on the subject raised by Senator Prud'homme in his question, because the provisions concerning the hours at which the polls would be open is an important part of the bill, albeit one that was added at the last minute — the very last minute — during the committee hearings. As the honourable senator said, the question of staggered voting hours did not form part of Bill C-63 as it was originally introduced in the House of Commons and sent to the committee.

[*Translation*]

It does not matter that Senator Prud'homme said the new hours of polling proposed in the bill were welcomed in certain parts of the country —

Senator Prud'homme: I did not say that.

Senator Murray: You did say that the proposal was well received in certain parts of the country.

Senator Prud'homme: Yes.

Senator Murray: We must, however, note that the opposition members in the House of Commons from British Columbia are unanimous in their contention that closing the polls there at 7 p.m. is too early for those who want to vote after work.

[*English*]

Of course, we have been told editorially by *The Toronto Star* and by the *The Globe and Mail* in the last few days that there is a hardship, on the other hand, in Quebec and Ontario, namely that opening the polling booths at 9:30 in the morning is too late for those who wish to vote on the way to work. Both of those newspapers have suggested editorially that the Senate should give these provisions sober second thought. Even without such eminent support, I am sure that we would do so. There is no point in trying to alleviate the aggravation of British Columbians and Albertans, to which Senator Bryden has referred, with a formula that serves to further aggravate and inconvenience them while, at the same time, creating new inconvenience for voters in Quebec and Ontario.

Having said that, honourable senators, I do wish to thank the sponsor of the bill, Senator Bryden, for having given us such a clear overview of the purpose of this bill and the rationale behind it, and for having given us such a complete description of the provisions of the bill.

In common with a good number of us in this place, Senator Bryden has had considerable experience in organizing and managing election campaigns for his political party. No doubt this experience will be very useful to us as this bill moves along, as I expect it will, through second reading and into committee. We must do our utmost to resist the temptation to take the time of the committee for swapping anecdotes on the many campaigns in which we have been involved over the years.

• (1510)

Honourable senators, to the principle of a shortened election campaign, to the principle of staggered voting hours, to the principle of a permanent voters register, there is no objection on this side at all. Indeed, there is no objection to any of the new concepts being introduced into the elections law via this bill. As Senator Bryden has pointed out, a fair number of them flow from recommendations made by the Lortie royal commission which reported in 1991.

We have, however, several substantive concerns that must be satisfactorily addressed when, as I expect, the bill goes to the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs. At that time, I hope and expect, we will have the opportunity of discussing the bill with the responsible minister, the Honourable Herb Gray, and with the Chief Electoral Officer, Mr. Jean-Pierre Kingsley.

As the honourable senator has pointed out, it is generally agreed, at least by those involved in election campaigns, that they are too long. Certainly the 60-day campaigns that we had for many years and the approximately 50-day campaigns that we have had latterly are somewhat long, and unnecessarily so in an age when travel and communications are much more rapid than they used to be.

We also know that one of the most time-consuming features of federal elections is the door-to-door enumeration of voters, which takes place after the election has been called. According to the present law, it requires 20 days, with a further 23 days provided for revision of the preliminary lists and the completion of the final voters lists in every province.

I may have misunderstood Senator Bryden, but I thought I heard him say that there was a deficiency in the door-to-door enumeration in that, increasingly, people are left off the list or the information compiled through the door-to-door enumeration is somehow faulty or inaccurate. The information we have about the door-to-door enumeration is to the contrary — that, as Mr. Kingsley said, its great advantage is that it captures 92 per cent of the eligible voters in the preliminary round. The revision process captures a further 3 per cent of the voters.

As Senator Bryden has said, there is no other country in the world that proceeds in this way. I am sure that there is no other major country that takes such care to have an accurate, up-to-date voters list for its elections. No doubt that is to our credit.

However, I must admit there is a problem with the door-to-door enumeration. I think it is fair to say that the day of the door-to-door enumeration is coming to an end. It is becoming more and more difficult to conduct. Even the political parties that are called upon to provide names of enumerators are, in many cases now, not providing sufficient numbers of enumerators. Enumerators are reluctant to take on the job and, in particular, to go into some parts of some constituencies, it is sad to say. On the other hand, many people are reluctant to answer a doorbell, especially after dark. In reading the verbatim transcript of the House of Commons committee, I see that a member of Parliament said that she advises her 19-year-old and 21-year-old daughters not to answer the door after 7 p.m. Every election brings horror stories or near-horror stories from the field to the central office in Ottawa of enumerators who have found themselves in very difficult and scary positions. In some cases, enumerators were sequestered in the course of trying to carry out their duties. It is fair to say that the day of the door-to door enumeration is coming to a end.

The great advantage of replacing the door-to-door enumeration with a permanent voters list is that it makes possible the shorter campaign period, and it is said to be less expensive. This is the case only if the lists are shared widely by both the federal and provincial jurisdictions, and perhaps by municipal governments, and if they are used frequently. If that is the case, the savings are considerable. When we get to the committee, however, we will want to look behind the numbers provided by the Chief Electoral Officer and the documentation that he made available at the time of tabling the bill. In particular, we will want to ask some questions about the size and cost of the bureaucracy that will be necessary at the centre to maintain these lists.

The permanent registry would have an accuracy of about 80 per cent, but the hope of its proponents, including the Chief Electoral Officer, is that the lists will be accurate and complete as a result of various provisions in Bill C-63, as well as the fact that since 1993, voters, whether or not they are on a list, have been able to register and vote on election day wherever they live. It used to be that you could only attend and register on an election day if you lived in a rural area. That was changed in 1993. The government of the day was persuaded that there was a potential charter problem in that the act was seen to discriminate against urban voters, and rural and urban voters had to be placed on the same plane. That is my recollection of the rationale for the change.

In 1991, the Royal Commission on Electoral Reform and Party Financing, the Lortie commission, recommended a minimum 40-day campaign. They believed a 40-day campaign could still accommodate a door-to door enumeration. The House of Commons committee at the time studied the matter and recommended a maximum 56-day period with a minimum of 47 days. This recommendation was adopted in 1993, and in fact, the 1993 election was fought on a 47-day writ.

Honourable senators, what gives me pause about the proposed 36-day writ and the permanent register of voters is whether we can vote this bill into law with full confidence that the new system will work successfully and that there is almost no possibility of a fiasco. One contemplates with horror any possibility of a major problem with voters lists coming to light in the middle of an election. We must be sure of what we are doing, and the government wants this bill to receive Royal Assent before Christmas.

Senator Bryden has referred to the very extensive consultative process that proceeded the bill. He is right. There has been widespread consultation and discussion. None of these concepts is new. The discussion and debate has centred around various alternatives. Here again, sometimes the devil is in the details. At the time of this bill's introduction earlier this autumn, it received fairly positive reviews from opposition parties as well as from knowledgeable commentators in the media. It went to committee in the House of Commons before second reading. By the time it returned to the house, all of the opposition parties were against it and the government had to invoke closure at second reading, report stage and third reading to get it through. This, in itself, is cause for concern. In the past, major changes to election law have been made on the basis of consensus among the parties. This bill has now been imposed by the government in the fourth year of its mandate, over the opposition of other parties.

• (1520)

The government is so anxious to have this bill come into force next April that it brought in a further amendment at the committee stage to exempt the key sections of this bill from section 331(1) of the Canada Elections Act. Section 331(1) expressly provides that no amendment to the act could be in force in relation to an election called within six months of the passage of the amendment. The idea, a very prudent one, was that the Chief Electoral Officer would always need that much time to implement any major amendment and to ensure, as far as humanly possible, that there were no glitches.

However, in this instance, the government is in a great hurry. I do not reproach it for that. I suppose that I, too, would be in a hurry if I enjoyed the lead in the public opinion polls that the government enjoys today. However, there are other considerations to which honourable senators should attend, the most important of which is to ensure that our electoral democracy continues to function well, as it has generally in the past.

Assuming that this bill does receive Royal Assent by Christmas, what is the schedule? Senator Bryden has described it to us. There will be one final door-to-door enumeration during the month of April, except in those provinces where they have had a provincial enumeration in the previous 12 months. That, at the present time, would cover Prince Edward Island and Alberta. Any election called after the end of the third week in April would be under the revised act, and of a minimum 36 days' duration.

If, as many people predict, the election is announced in late April or early May for a June vote, there should be no problem with the voters lists. Because the door-to-door enumeration in most provinces will have taken place shortly before the election call, the lists should be as accurate and complete as they have traditionally been.

However, what will be the state of the voters lists if the next election is put off until the fall of 1997, the spring of 1998, or even the fall of 1998, as the Prime Minister could decide to do? Indeed, what will be the state of the voters lists in any future election? The basic list will be that as compiled in the door-to-door enumeration in April of 1997. Senator Bryden has described in a general way how it is hoped to keep it up to date, but at this point the future, to me, becomes somewhat murky.

The Chief Electoral Officer, when he testified before a House of Commons committee in 1992, said that at a minimum, after a year, 20 per cent of the list is no good. He documented what he meant by this in the material that he provided when Bill C-63 was tabled. He meant that Canadians are a very mobile people. Every year, 3.2 million Canadians move. That is 16 per cent of the electors; 380,000 Canadians turn 18 each year and become eligible to vote, which is 2 per cent of the electorate; there are 200,000 new citizens every year. The names of the 195,000 who die must obviously be taken off the list.

How will Elections Canada keep track of these changes? They hope to have access to provincial voters lists. This will be helpful, depending on the date of the most recent provincial enumeration. If an elector has moved or has just turned 18, Elections Canada expects to get this information from provincial and territorial drivers' licence bureaux and from Revenue Canada files, once the electors have given their permission to the provincial departments and to Revenue Canada to share this information with the Chief Electoral Officer. When an elector dies, Elections Canada expects to get this information from the Departments of Vital Statistics in the provinces. The names of new citizens will be supplied by the federal Department of Citizenship and Immigration.

It will be obvious to honourable senators that keeping the lists up to date will require a very considerable reliance on provincial data. Even Revenue Canada, as Senator Bryden has pointed out, will not be able to share this information until it has obtained the taxpayer's consent, presumably on the income tax return that is due before April 30. Presumably at the time of renewing their licences, drivers in the provinces will be asked to consent to have information shared with Elections Canada. All this assumes that the provinces themselves have agreed to share the relevant data with the federal government, specifically the Chief Electoral Officer. Mr. Kingsley is confident that this cooperation will be forthcoming, and Senator Bryden, in his speech this afternoon, has reflected that confidence.

At the House of Commons committee on October 30, Mr. Kingsley testified that "provincial and territorial authorities have shown interest and support." He added:

> We have apprised our provincial and territorial colleagues of the progress of the register of electors project at every major step through meetings and annual conferences. We have also established close working relationships and have met on a regular basis with representatives as well as the members of the Vital Statistics Council for Canada and the Canadian Council of Motor Transport Administrators.

Then he added this:

> But I must also tell the committee that all of the systems have not been developed to the same point, in a way that would allow us to say that as regards drivers' licences, for instance, the systems will come into effect at the same time from one end of the country to the other.

Honourable senators, a month has passed since Mr. Kingsley's appearance before the House of Commons committee. It may well be that agreements with the provinces have now been nailed down. I want to emphasize our conviction that those agreements should be government to government and that they should be nailed down before this bill comes into force. Otherwise, I believe we will be running some risk that future elections, or the next election, if it is held much later than the spring of 1997, could, in some provinces at least, be conducted on a badly outdated voters list. This, it seems to me, is a possibility on which we must foreclose.

Last April, when Mr. Kingsley briefed the House of Commons committee, one of the scenarios he put forward was that the next election, whenever it is held, would be conducted under the present act, that is, on the basis of a door-to-door enumeration held after the writ is issued. The list compiled from that enumeration would be the foundation of the permanent register. It would be kept up to date and used for subsequent elections. We may find, after consideration in the committee, that that scenario is still the more prudent course to follow.

There is a broader issue that I have not raised today, but which honourable senators will want to examine in depth when the bill is before the committee. The issue is whether the sources, provincial and federal, and the process envisaged by the Chief Electoral Officer and by Bill C-63, are, in fact, the best way to keep the voters lists up to date.

• (1530)

The Lortie commission had what seems to me to be a rather different proposal. They thought that the basis of any shared list should be the provincial voters lists, and said this at page 128 of Volume 2:

> A careful examination of several key policy and technical issues suggests that a system of provincial registers of voters represents a plausible alternative to the current federal enumeration process.

It is clear from a reading of that chapter that the Lortie commission believed that that system was preferable on many counts, including the expense of the operation, to a federally generated voters list. At page 135 of Volume 2, they recommend:

> ...that the Canada Elections Commission develop and use the computer technology and software that would allow federal voters lists to be produced from provincial and territorial data bases established as voters registers, as well as from provincial voters lists prepared through enumeration.

At page 137, they recommend:

> ...that the Canada Elections Commission enter into an agreement with each province and territory to acquire from either provincial voters registers or provincial voters lists the information to generate preliminary voters lists for federal polling divisions.

Honourable senators, finally, I want to flag another problem that was brought to my attention by Jan Brown, MP, from the House of Commons. That is an apparent injustice suffered by one class of citizens who have been disenfranchised by the operation of section 51.1, Schedule IIC of the Canada Elections Act. I refer to Canadian religious missionaries overseas. They are caught up in the provision that, if they are absent from Canada for more than five consecutive years, they cannot vote. Although many of these people return annually to Canada for several months, and some of them own homes here and intend to return as residents, they are still regarded as absent from the country. This could most easily be corrected by designating missionaries specifically, along with public servants, members of the armed forces, and employees of international organizations who are now listed as eligible voters even while absent from Canada. I intend to return to this matter at the committee.

On motion of Senator Oliver, debate adjourned.

CRIMINAL CODE

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. Sharon Carstairs moved the second reading of Bill S-13, to amend the Criminal Code (protection of health care providers).

She said: Honourable senators, first, let me thank the seconders, Senator Milne and Senator Berntson, who seconded the bill the other day at first reading due to the absence of Senator Keon, who received an emergency call from the hospital. Today, he has been called to an emergency meeting in Toronto. He has assured me that he will speak to this bill tomorrow when he returns.

Honourable senators, it is with a great deal of pride that I introduce Bill S-13. Let me begin by saying that this bill is not a result of my hard work particularly, but of the diligent effort of many senators who devoted countless hours to the work of the Senate Special Committee on Euthanasia and Assisted Suicide, which issued its report entitled "Of Life and Death" in June 1995. This bill comes directly from the unanimous recommendations in two chapters in the report, one entitled, "The Withholding and Withdrawal of Life-Sustaining Treatment," and the other entitled, "Pain Control and Sedation Practices."

Honourable senators, in particular, I should like to dedicate this bill to former Senator Joan Neiman, the then chair of the committee, who encouraged me to pursue this matter, and to the late Jean Noël Desmarais. Senator Desmarais was not formally a member of the committee, but he replaced Senator DeWare had during those months that she was lending her support to her husband who had had a serious heart attack. Senator Desmarais continued to attend this committee long after Senator DeWare had returned and was dedicated to the development of its report. Only the diagnosis of his own cancer — and subsequent death — prevented him from being with us until its completion.

This bill is also the hard work of our Law Clerk, Mark Audcent, and more particularly his assistant Deborah Palumbo, who went far beyond the call of duty. I asked Mr. Audcent to assign Ms Palumbo to the bill because she had written the final draft of the report, "Of Life and Death," and she was intimately aware not only of the report itself but of the feelings of each senator who had dedicated herself or himself to the report. Ms Palumbo's drafting skills and sensitivity to the visions in the report are reflected in this bill.

This bill has also been the hard work of my staff, particularly my research assistant Michelle MacDonald, who gave many long hours to the coordination effort, not only with the Law Clerk's office but also with former Senator Jean-Louis Roux, who originally proposed that we do this together, and Senator Keon, who is the seconder of this legislation.

However, honourable senators, I have another and much more personal reason for proposing this bill. I have gone on the record in the past, and will continue to do so in the future, saying that this institution in which we all sit needs reform. Unlike most Canadians, however, I have known about the valuable work of Senate committees and have long been an admirer of their work. At the same time, I have been dismayed that many reports of special committees sit on shelves gathering dust, to be reviewed on occasion by academics, but not to be translated into the law of the land.

In 1969, my husband and I had just had our first daughter, Catherine. We were living in Calgary, Alberta. My father, a senator from Nova Scotia, was in Vancouver, with the Senate Committee on Poverty, chaired by the late Senator David Croll. When my father arrived in Calgary, on his way back to Ottawa, to visit his newest grandchild, she being number 12, he was clearly exhausted both physically and mentally. He described the testimony they had heard and he was clearly disturbed by the depth of poverty in this country and, in particular, by the level of child poverty.

In the midst of his explanation, his speech started to slur, and he stumbled across our kitchen floor. My father was not much of a drinker so I knew that was not the cause, and both he and I put it down to exhaustion. He slept for 12 hours and appeared fine when he awoke the next day. Several months later, he suffered a massive stroke, which left him, in the short term, without speech and without control of many of his bodily functions. In the long term, he was permanently paralyzed on his right side. Although he returned to the chamber a few times after this, he was never again able to fully participate. The incident in my kitchen, we now know, had been a little stroke and a warning sign, but we all failed to recognize it as such.

• (1540)

Throughout his last years — and he lived for 10 more — he was dismayed at the lack of response to the report on poverty. Whether his stroke was partly the result of his exhaustion is not to be known. However, it led me to the belief that I had a responsibility beyond the publication of the report to which I had been a party. That is why, earlier this year, I introduced an inquiry on palliative care and why, today, I am moving second reading of this bill.

It is also why, honourable senators, there is a preamble in the bill. This preamble makes specific and very special reference to the work of the Special Committee on Euthanasia and Assisted Suicide. I agree with our Law Clerk, Mr. Audcent, that preambles are generally not a good example of legal drafting. However, this preamble is in the bill for two reasons: first, because I want to remind the public of the fine work of this committee, and second, because, if there is any confusion as to the intent of the bill, then the reference for clarity of understanding can be found in the report.

The title of this bill, Protection of Health Care Providers, implies that the purpose of the bill is primarily to protect doctors and nurses. However, the intent of the bill is to ensure that, by protecting health care providers, we allow patients in this country to be as free from pain as it is scientifically possible to be, and that their wishes as to the kind of treatment they receive or, conversely, do not receive, are respected.

This bill is not about euthanasia and assisted suicide. Both of these acts are covered in section 241, Parts A and B of the Criminal Code. Nothing in this bill amends, in any way, those sections of the Criminal Code.

What, then, does this bill do? Honourable senators, it is divided into two sections. The first section deals with the withholding and withdrawal of life-sustaining treatment. Section 2 deals with the administration of adequate pain control. In the report "Of Life and Death," the Senate committee defined "withholding life-sustaining treatment" as "not starting treatment that has the potential to sustain life"— for example, not initiating cardiopulmonary resuscitation, or CPR, not giving a blood transfusion, or not starting artificial hydration or nutrition. It defined "withdrawing of life sustaining treatment" as "stopping treatment that has the potential to sustain life" — for example, removing a respirator.

The general principle of the right of a competent person to refuse treatment is widely accepted. Canadian courts have recognized a common law right of patients to refuse consent to medical treatment or to demand that that treatment, once commenced, be withdrawn. Cases such as *Mallette v. Shulman* in 1990; and *Nancy B. v. the Hotel-Dieu de Quebec* in 1992; and the *Rodriguez* case in 1993, specifically recognized this right, even though the withholding or withdrawing of treatment may result in death.

In the Nancy B. decision of the Supreme Court of Quebec, the court granted a competent woman permission to stop treatment by a respirator. To refresh your memories, Nancy B., who was 25 years of age at the time, had suffered from Guillain Barré Syndrome for two-and-one-half years. She could breathe only with the assistance of a respirator. With the help of that respirator, she might live a very long time; without it, her life would be brief. Her intellectual capacity and mental competence were unaffected.

To establish her right to refuse further treatment — including the continued use of the respirator — she commenced an action for an injunction against the hospital and her physician to require them to comply with her decision. The court ruled that the person is inviolable except with the person's consent or legal authority, and no one need submit to any treatment, examination or other intervention. It was ruled that the plaintiff's death, once removed from the respirator, would be natural and would not involve homicide or suicide. As we know, Nancy B.'s respirator was removed and she died.

In *Malette v. Shulman*, the Ontario Appeal Court Division affirmed that a competent adult is generally entitled to refuse treatment, even if the decision may hasten death. In this case, the decision to refuse treatment was based upon religious grounds. The patient was a Jehovah's Witness and was given a blood transfusion in an emergency, even though she had a card in her wallet indicating that she did not want such treatment. Indeed, the transfusions were continued, even after her daughter requested their termination. The patient recovered, sued the doctor, and won.

In the *Rodriguez* case of 1993, the Supreme Court of Canada, while ultimately denying her request for an assisted suicide, acknowledged her right — and every other patient's right — to refuse to consent to treatment, or to demand that treatment be withdrawn, even where doing so would result in death. Clearly, the Supreme Court of Canada differentiated between the two concepts: one being the withholding and withdrawal of treatment, and the other being assisted suicide or euthanasia.

However, the Senate committee heard evidence that medical professionals across the country require clearer direction with respect to the withholding and withdrawing of life-sustaining treatment. Witnesses testified that in some cases patients' wishes were not being honoured because the Criminal Code was unclear, and health care providers feared that they would be held liable.

Although the committee recognized that the withholding and withdrawing of life-sustaining treatment is legal, based on this reluctance on the part of some medical practitioners to honour the wishes of patients for fear of being held liable, the committee unanimously recommended that the Criminal Code be clarified. Clarification of the Criminal Code in this area had also been recommended by the Law Reform Commission in its report of 1983. Since 1992, the Canadian Medical Association has advocated clarification of the code to protect health care providers.

Honourable senators, this bill seeks to address the problem of health care providers. It is comprised of one clause, which would add a new section, 45.1, to the Criminal Code. This new section would provide that no health care provider is guilty of an offence under the Criminal Code by reason only that they withhold or withdraw life-sustaining medical treatment from a competent person who requests that the treatment be withheld or withdrawn.

Proposed section 45.1 subsections (2),(3) and (4) clarify what circumstances constitute a request. An advance written directive, valid under the laws of a province, will always take precedence. Unfortunately, in Canada today, only the provinces of Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Nova Scotia, and British Columbia, have such legislation.

In the absence of a written directive under the laws of a province, a written directive made at any time would take precedence; or, if there is not a written directive of any kind immediately before or during the time that life-sustaining treatment is in place, a patient may make a request verbally or by signs, in the presence of at least one witness. A substitute request can come from a proxy, legal representative or spouse, only if the patient is not competent and did not, while competent, have a written request or an advance directive.

• (1550)

Proposed subparagraph (1)(*b)* of the bill would clarify issues surrounding the administration of adequate amounts of pain control, even though, in some cases, the drug might shorten life. The operative word here is "might." Quite frankly, we simply do not know.

Dr. Neil Macdonald, Director, Cancer Ethics Program, Clinical Institute of Montreal, and formerly head of Palliative Care at the Royal Alexander Hospital in Edmonton, told the committee:

> Another area of confusion is whether or not we are killing the patient with these drugs. That was a subject of correspondence I had with the committee. People think, for example, if we increase the dose of opioids so that a patient is stuporous, we may kill the patient if we give them a little more. In my experience that is highly unlikely to happen. Patients rapidly become tolerant to the respiratory effect of opioids, morphine and like drugs. If we give them a large dosage of a drug, we may sedate the patient but it is unlikely that the patient would die of our drug.

The Minister of Justice, the Honourable Allan Rock, in appearing before the Special Senate Committee on Euthanasia and Assisted Suicide testified that the current legal status of providing treatment that aimed at the alleviation of suffering that may shorten life is relatively clear. He said that the Criminal Code does not prohibit palliative care, even if it results in the death of the patient, so long as the care is carried out in accordance with generally accepted medical practices. However, the minister went on to say that despite the fact that there is little doubt that the practice is legal, there does seem to be some confusion in the medical profession and the general public as to what is legally permissible and what is not.

A number of other witnesses testified before the committee that doctors, for fear of being held liable, are often reluctant to provide sufficient pain control medicine to alleviate suffering if there is a possibility it may shorten the patient's life. The great tragedy is that because of this patients are not always receiving adequate palliative care and pain control. The 1983 Law Reform Commission report called for greater clarification in this area, as has the Canadian Medical Association.

Although the committee recognized that providing treatment aimed at alleviating suffering, even though it may shorten life, is currently legal, it unanimously recommended that the Criminal Code be clarified in this regard. That is the intention of proposed paragraph 45.1(1)(*b*) of the bill. This paragraph provides that no health care provider is guilty of an offence under the code by reason of administering medication in dosages that might shorten the life of a person with the intention of alleviating or removing the physical pain of that person.

This, honourable senators, is the bill. It is my hope and, indeed, my prayer that the passage of this bill both here and in the House of Commons the right of all Canadians to control the medical treatment they receive will be guaranteed. To an even greater degree, it is my profound wish that no Canadian will be denied adequate amounts of pain control because some doctor is fearful of a lawsuit.

Honourable senators, all of us wish for a pain-free easy death. Because most Canadians are more fearful of the dying than they are of the death, this bill will make it possible to ease those final days and hours. I urge the speedy passage of this legislation. I welcome any questions that honourable senators may have.

On motion of Senator Lavoie-Roux, debate adjourned.

[*Translation*]

BROADCASTING ACT

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING

On the Order:

> Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Whelan, P.C., seconded by the Honourable Senator Losier-Cool, for the second reading of Bill C-216, An Act to amend the Broadcasting Act (broadcasting policy).—(*Honourable Senator Gauthier*).

Hon. Rose-Marie Losier-Cool: Honourable senators, Senator Gauthier was so kind as to let me speak in his stead today. I welcome this opportunity to express my concerns about Bill C-216. My comments will focus on the bill and not on the way people would like to order the Senate around.

Honourable senators, I am concerned about certain provisions of Bill C-216. In addition to providing a remedy for negative option billing, this bill creates some major problems for francophone communities in Canada. The Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission, the CRTC, has never regulated marketing techniques based on negative option billing, for the simple reason that in the past such practices have helped to launch new specialized services and to achieve the objectives of Canadian cultural development as defined in the Broadcasting Act.

Honourable senators, Bill C-216 in its present form would prevent the cable distributor from adding any new services to the basic service or to services already being offered and increasing his rates accordingly. It provides that no specialty programming service may be added without the consent of the purchaser. Anglophone consumers will prefer to receive English channels. If this bill is passed, francophone and Acadian communities living in a minority environment will no longer have access to new speciality channels in their own language.

For instance, RDI is offered to only 50 per cent of minority francophone communities. Regions that do not receive the channel today will never be able to do so. The Federation of Francophone and Acadian Communities takes the position that this service should be compulsory, and I support that position. Francophone communities in Canada need a strong and durable infrastructure that will help them to grow and develop their potential. Their needs are different from those of the anglophone majorities. The Senate should examine the needs of this community as regards the cable distribution industry and the impact this bill will have.

We must grasp the scope of this bill. I want to see this bill examined thoroughly so that my honourable colleagues will be fully aware of the position of francophone communities in our country.

Negative option billing should not be eliminated at the expense of francophones in minority regions. I look forward to seeing this bill studied in committee, so that we can get the facts as defined in the bill from the experts, not from reports in the media or from our voice mail.

Coming from a part of Canada where francophones are a minority, I am very much aware of the need for speciality services in French. It is an advantage to have access to such services, as francophones in a minority position. We must preserve and protect that access.

[*English*]

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I want to make a brief intervention before Senator Whelan speaks, whose comments will have the effect of closing the debate at second reading of Bill C-216.

As indicated last week, I have been in touch with Senator Gauthier, in whose name the debate has been adjourned. I have been assured by his office, as late as this morning, that it would be Senator Gauthier's wish that due process be carried out and that the bill be sent to committee at the first opportunity. I believe it is the intention of Senator Whelan to so move.

[*Translation*]

The Hon. the Speaker: Senator Simard, I believe you have already spoken to this bill.

Hon. Jean-Maurice Simard: Honourable senators, I did not use up all my time. I moved the adjournment of the debate, and the motion stood in the name of Senator Bolduc.

I will not make a long speech. I support the decision by Senator Gauthier and the Liberal leadership to refer this bill to committee as soon as possible, to Legal and Constitutional Affairs or to Social Affairs, perhaps.

In any event, I support what was said by Senator Losier-Cool from New Brunswick. If anyone knows the Acadians and French-speaking communities, Senator Losier-Cool does. I fully agree with what she said. Especially the comment she made at the beginning of her speech to the effect that many journalists, mostly anglophones, made attempts in various articles published in their newspapers, as well as on television, by mail and by fax, to intimidate us by urging us to rush. I was one of the people who told these journalists to let us get on with our job and stop putting on the pressure.

I say this not because, on the basis of their knowledge and experience, these journalists felt this was a good bill that demanded the immediate attention of the Senate. Honourable senators, I am not too impressed by the repeated and numerous requests we received, because it is not up to the journalists to tell senators how to examine a bill that comes before the Senate. Senator Losier-Cool referred to this earlier and I appreciate her comments.

When I spoke earlier, I reacted to a comment made by two Reform Party members who accused the vice-chairman of the CRTC, Mr. Bélisle, of lobbying. I corrected these misapprehensions, and I think it was my duty to do so. In my two previous speeches, I mentioned the fact that I met the vice-chairman of the CRTC, Mr. Bélisle, and that I would be meeting representatives of the Fédération des communautés francophones et Acadiennes du Canada. I believe you received a letter from this association dated November 27, 1996.

This association is totally opposed to the bill. I do not agree with the position recently taken by this association when its members asked us to kill this bill. They are proposing no amendments. I do not agree with them.

The bill will be referred to committee. I am confident that the senators will do their duty and invite this association along with the Société des Acadiens et Acadiennes du Nouveau-Brunswick — our national association — which took a stand on the bill. I would like it to be invited to appear before the committee as well.

Cable companies have been accused of lobbying. These journalists accused cable companies in New Brunswick and across Canada of lobbying to have this bill shot down on the Order Paper. I have always considered that companies and individuals reveal themselves when they lobby. They send us letters. They make statements in the papers. In the matter before us, honourable senators, if the cable companies did in fact do any lobbying, it was not with me. I defy any journalist to prove that they lobbied my colleagues. They sent me no letter. They made no statement either for or against the bill. This is an odd way to lobby.

I would like the committee considering the bill to invite the cable companies and their association to appear before it. I would ask the committee to contact Fundy Cable, which serves nearly 95 per cent of cable users in New Brunswick.

• (1610)

They did not do any lobbying either. I had to call them. New Brunswick is divided into six regions, with different services in different regions. They honoured my request and sent me the list of services provided.

In short, I would like the committee to invite, and this is a formal request I am making now, the SANB, the Association des communautés francophones et Acadiennes du Canada, the association of Canadian cable companies and Fundy Cable.

I still reside in New Brunswick.

Senator Gigantès: Do you watch television?

Senator Simard: Yes, when I am in New Brunswick. So I can explain that the reason the committee asked Fundy Cable to appear before it is that New Brunswick is the only bilingual province. The company's representative, Mr. McLellan, from Saint John, informed me that his company would be pleased to appear.

I therefore suggest, and I support Senator Losier-Cool in this, that the Senate examine this bill in depth. It is easy to agree with a bill that proposes to eliminate negative billing. We are all in agreement. However, it is not acceptable that francophones in Canada be denied access. My colleague, Senator Losier-Cool, mentioned that 50 per cent of francophone communities in Canada are currently getting RDI.

This is already indicative of a problem. But if Bill C-216 is not amended and is passed as it now stands, this 50 per cent could fall to 40 or 30 per cent. And if the decision is left up to the majority of customers and cable companies, future French language specialty channels will not be included.

I therefore hope, contrary to the position taken by the Association des Acadiens et des Acadiennes du Canada, that this bill can be amended, if it is possible to do so without destroying the bulk of what it says about negative billing. This will mean that one day perhaps 100 per cent of French-speaking communities in Canada will have access to RDI, a television channel partially funded by Canadians, and also to new French-language speciality channels.

In conclusion, I hope that, despite the pressures brought to bear by reporters briefed by the bill's sponsor, MP Roger Gallaway, that we will not be stampeded and required to debate and pass this bill before Christmas.

There is one week, or 10 days, remaining. I strongly oppose this idea that it must be rushed through. There will be enough time in February, March, April and May to give it serious consideration. This bill must be looked at carefully. We, and all our colleagues, should take the time to examine it properly.

Hon. Philippe Deane Gigantès: I support Senator Losier-Cool and, to my great surprise, Senator Simard. There is one very important thing at stake here, access to French-language television for francophone communities in this country outside Quebec. We are a bilingual nation, a bilingual country. If French-language television across the country is abolished, will the next step not be to say that, there not being many francophones in Alberta, it is not necessary to have 1.5 per cent of federal public servants in Alberta able to speak French? That 1.5 per cent of federal jobs in Alberta that are francophone will have to be eliminated. Then British Columbia would follow. That is the logic of the matter.

Television is abolished, federal services in French are then abolished for francophone minorities in the country. How can we consider ourselves a bilingual country? How can we put ourselves on this very slippery slope at a time when there is a party in power in Quebec that wants to prove to the francophones of Quebec that the rest of Canada has no interest whatsoever in preserving the French language?

This is an enormous risk. This bill must go to committee and be amended, in order to ensure that there is no reduction in access to French-language television throughout the country. There are some who are not in agreement with this principle, but this will not be the first time. The Parliament of Canada is not generally in agreement with those members of the public who are in favour of the death penalty. The majority of the public want the death penalty. The Canadian Parliament will not pass a bill to reinstate the death penalty to the statutes because the Parliament of Canada, in its wisdom, is not in agreement with the majority of Canadians. There is nothing wrong with that.

The Senate, in particular, was created in order to say no, even if the elected members say yes. I have something to say to certain colleagues in the other place who claim that we are not entitled to say no, because we are not elected. They use the most unpleasant language in referring to us. I would like to ask them to reflect: Ought they really to continue to insult the Senate? Do they want to get their bill passed, their private member's bill, not a government bill, or do they just want to insult the senators? They cannot have it both ways. Let them take a little time to think this over.

• (1620)

[*English*]

Hon. Jean B. Forest: Honourable senators, I am from Alberta which has, admittedly, a small francophone population. From my many years of working in the school system, including at the university level, to establish bilingual, immersion and francophone schools in Alberta, I have a keen interest in protecting the rights of francophones to have access to French television.

I have received a number of calls and letters from Alberta urging me to vote in favour of the bill to end negative billing. I am prepared to do that because I think that is most important. However, I insist that we do something in committee to preserve the access to French television by francophones across the country.

Motion agreed to and bill read second time.

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

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

Hon. Eugene Whelan: I move that the bill be referred to the Standing Senate Committee on Transport and Communications.

Hon. Finlay MacDonald: Honourable senators, should the motion to send this bill to committee include an order that the matter be discharged from the Order Paper? It is difficult to reconcile the view of Senator Simard, that we should take our time, possibly until spring, and the matter will disappear from the Order Paper. Is it automatic that when the bill is referred to committee it drops from the Order Paper? I do not think it will.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, there is some misunderstanding. The bill has passed second reading. The next motion is to refer the bill to committee, as we do with all bills.

The question now before the Senate is the following: Is it your pleasure to refer the bill to the Standing Senate Committee on Transport and Communications?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to and bill referred to the Standing Senate Committee on Transport and Communications.

INTERNAL ECONOMY, BUDGETS AND ADMINISTRATION

ELEVENTH REPORT OF COMMITTEE ADOPTED

The Senate proceeded to consideration of the eleventh report of the Standing Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration (*budget of the Committee on Privileges, Standing Rules and Orders*), presented in the Senate on October 2, 1996.

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

Motion agreed to and report adopted.

INTER-PARLIAMENTARY UNION

NINETY-SIXTH CONFERENCE, BEIJING, CHINA—INQUIRY DEBATED

On the Order:

> Resuming debate on the inquiry of the Honourable Senator Bosa, calling the attention of the Senate to the 96th Inter-Parliamentary Conference, held at Beijing, China, from September 14 to 21, 1996.—(*Honourable Senator Di Nino*).

Hon. Consiglio Di Nino: Honourable senators, I want to make a few comments on this report. I will try to be brief.

Between September 14 and September 21, as a member of the IPU, I participated in the 1996 inter-parliamentary conference in Beijing, China. In the 6 years I have had the honour to serve Canadians as a senator, that was the first time I participated in a foreign conference. I was impressed by the efforts of all Canadian participants, both parliamentarians and staff. The sessions commenced very early in the morning with a 7 a.m. briefing and ended with an evening event, usually around 10 p.m. I am not sure if other parliamentary groups followed similar gruelling schedules, but our chairman, Senator Bosa, made sure that the Canadian contingent put in its time and more.

I neither challenge nor disagree with the report.

Honourable senators, before, during and after this conference, I have attempted to evaluate the investments Canadians make in funding parliamentary associations. Since this is the only conference I have attended, my comments are limited to this singular experience.

I quote:

> The IPU is the world organization of parliaments of sovereign States. It is the focal point for world-wide parliamentary dialogue and works for peace and cooperation among peoples and for the firm establishment of representative democracy. To that end, it:
>
> Fosters contacts, coordination, and the exchange of experience among parliaments and parliamentarians of all countries;
>
> Considers questions of international interest and concerns and expresses its views on such issues in order to bring about action by parliaments and parliamentarians;
>
> Contributes to the defence and promotion of human rights — an essential factor of parliamentary democracy and development;
>
> Contributes to better knowledge of the working of representative institutions and to the strengthening and development of their means of actions.

I believe one of the main and true values of interparliamentary groups is the opportunity to dialogue with colleagues around the world on issues both national and international in an open, non-partisan and, where necessary, critical manner.

This conference dealt with three principal issues: human rights, food and land mines. The Canadian IPU's positions on these issues were established with little or no consultation with the participants. These were obviously positions of the Government of Canada. Our group, for example, recommended the Honourable Charles Caccia to the committee on environment and sustainable development. His name was put forth by our chairman without consultation with of any us. I am not questioning the capacity or ability of Mr. Caccia to serve on the committee, but I believe the selection process should include consultation with all participants.

In Beijing I was told that during the last conference in Turkey our group was reluctant to openly discuss the Kurdish issue for fear of embarrassing the Turkish government. As well, my own attempts to publicly criticize China for its human rights abuses, including its occupation of Tibet, were met with some resistance and discomfort by Senator Bosa, our leader.

Honourable senators, I believe that these are important issues. I believe that the fora of which I speak are essential and critical in providing alternative viewpoints in a non-partisan manner. Should these conferences only be used to put forth positions of the government? Should those who participate not also be involved in establishing position papers on the issues that are being examined? If not, I believe that it defeats the purpose of a true interparliamentary organization. I believe that the IPU has a value from which all Canadians and the world can benefit, and that it should reflect the various positions of Canadians. The government of the day has other vehicles through the UN and other fora to put forth its own agenda.

• (1630)

Another concern I have is the cost of the IPU. I acknowledge the efforts of Senator Bosa on this matter. He has raised the issue at the international level for the past two or three years. The IPU appears to be the costliest of all Canadian parliamentary groups and thus must be examined. Unlike other critics, I do not subscribe to the opinion that would have us abandon these opportunities to liaise with parliamentarians from around the world, but at the end of the day we must satisfy ourselves that the investment of Canadian taxpayers is benefiting Canada and that the positions the IPU puts forth at conferences are not solely the positions of the government of the day. If the IPU is merely another forum for the government to spread its own partisan message, then I do question its value and whether or not Canadians are simply paying for a redundant exercise. It is time that the Canadian branch of the IPU review its mandate, purpose and role and that it refocus itself on those areas where it can be of best value.

Hon. Peter Bosa: Honourable senators, I am glad that Senator Di Nino has spoken on the international conference which was held in Beijing in September 1996, and that he has put on the record of the Senate his views about the conference. He prefaced his remarks by saying that this was the first conference he had attended, and that therefore he was speaking on the strength of his experience.

I wish to point out to Senator Di Nino that the Canadian Inter-Parliamentary Union Group does not attend these conferences as an instrument of the government to promote government policies necessarily. It may do so on some occasions because it may share the same views.

The Inter-Parliamentary Union has great value in that it brings parliamentarians in contact with other parliamentarians from other countries. It broadens our perspective; it broadens our understanding of other parliamentarians. We usually debate important issues that affect the world. It is through these debates and exchanges that parliamentarians as a whole benefit.

When my honourable friend states he had no consultation with reference to human rights, food and land mines, I would point out to him that these topics were picked at the previous conference in Istanbul, six months earlier, in consultation with the representatives of all the 135 countries that represent the membership of the Inter-Parliamentary Union.

Human rights might have been in harmony with government policy. We are members of the United Nations, and we subscribe to universal rights and freedoms. Consequently, we would have been in sympathy with this particular topic.

As far as the ban on land mines is concerned, that topic was first presented by the Belgian group two years ago as a supplementary item. It was not adopted by the general assembly. It was reintroduced a year later by four countries — namely Britain, Belgium, Switzerland and Canada — in Istanbul earlier this year in plenary. There it lost by four votes.

When it came to preparing for the Beijing conference, I suggested that we should consider again the ban on anti-personnel mines because it was a topic that was strongly felt, generally, by all the delegations participating at these conferences. Before we sent to convention organizers our suggestion to include the topic of land mines on the agenda, we sent notices to all members of the Canadian IPU group asking them for suggestions as to what subject we should put forward. We did receive some responses. Hence, when my honourable friend states that there was no consultation, that is not accurate. There was consultation. He may not have been consulted directly and he may feel that the process should be expanded, but I wish to remind him of a few things.

First, when the delegations are selected, it is usually at a time when these topics have already been determined. The delegates are briefed by departmental officials, who explain to us the particulars of the issues at hand. They do not tell us how to present our views.

No one has ever denied a member of the Canadian IPU the opportunity to speak his or her own mind, so long as the person states at the beginning that that person speaks on his or her behalf but not on behalf of Canada. This policy has prevailed in the Inter-Parliamentary Union from the time His Honour Senator Molgat was the chairman in the late 1970s and early 1980s. It was always stated that if you wish to speak your mind, and your opinion differs from that of Canada, you may do so, but you must indicate that you speak on your own behalf.

Honourable senators, something else gave me discomfort with respect to the position of my honourable friend on Tibet. I said to him, as he can attest, that if he wished to speak on human rights violations in Tibet or the occupation of Tibet, as he has often discussed, he must do so under his own name. My discomfort with my honourable friend became stronger when he said that he had initiated a motion and an inquiry in this chamber about the violation of human rights in Tibet. He stated that the Senate had given its blessing to his interventions. I understand that he was not the only one who spoke on the inquiry or the motion.

The fact of the matter is that any senator can bring forth an inquiry in this chamber. Any other senator can pick up on that inquiry. When no one else wishes to continue the debate, the inquiry dies. It is not pursued. It is not put to a vote. It is not a formal motion by the Leader of the Government in the Senate. Nothing is decided by the Senate as a whole with a mandate that it be referred to the other place for adoption. Consequently, when my honourable friend said to me that the Senate of Canada had officially adopted this position on the human rights question in Tibet, it gave me great discomfort. I tried to reason with him and let him know that that was not the case. If the subject died there and did not continue, it did not mean that it had the approval of the chamber, the approval of Parliament or the approval of the Government of Canada for that matter.

To say that an inquiry such as that carries the weight of the approval of the Senate is tantamount to saying that that is government policy. It is not government policy. It is government policy to fight for the freedom of all people. When Canada recognized China, it also recognized the borders of China. At this stage, it is not for us to declare war on China or to criticize them openly. That does not mean that our diplomats and our Prime Minister do not take every opportunity to harp away at the Chinese to ease up on human rights violations.

• (1640)

This is something that Senator Di Nino should understand. He also referred to re-evaluating the aims of the Canadian group of the IPU. I am in favour of reviewing them if, for no other reason, than to acquaint the present members with the organization, most of whom are new to the IPU. Many of them, particularly from the other place, were elected three years ago and do not have the experience of some of the senators who have been part of this organization for a long time, the oldest world organization, which was founded in 1889. I do not know if my honourable friend is aware of that.

The IPU does not necessarily promote the policies of the government. The IPU's membership is made up of both government supporters and members of the opposition. Members can speak their minds if they state that they are speaking on their own behalf and not on behalf of Canada.

Having said that, I hope I have been able to clarify for Senator Di Nino some of the points on the policies of the IPU about which he was mistaken.

Senator Di Nino: Honourable senators, I did not say that the motion that was passed in the Senate was government policy. I did say that the Senate passed a motion recommending certain things, which were all listed. It is on the record and the honourable senator can check that later.

Would the Honourable Senator Bosa not agree with me that, if a committee is struck to represent certain positions on certain issues — whether it is a national or an international forum — those positions should be at least discussed and that the participants be made aware of those positions before they are asked to participate in the debate or to vote on the issues? Would that not be an appropriate position which my friend would support?

Senator Bosa: Honourable senators, I am not sure I understand the question fully. If a group of senators get together and they wish to pursue a study on a given topic, they do so. They can arrive at a conclusion; they can make some suggestions. However, it cannot be said that whatever decisions that group makes represent official policy of the Senate.

Senator Di Nino: Honourable senators, I did not say that. I suggested to the honourable senator that, as chairman of that particular group, would it not have been appropriate for him to sit down with the rest of the contingent to ask how we should respond as a contingent of the Canadian IPU to the issue on human rights; or on food; or on whether we should be promoting the Honourable Charles Caccia or someone else for the position that was vacant at that time, as opposed to stating a particular position? Consultation is what I was talking about, dear colleague.

Senator Bosa: Regarding Mr. Caccia, his name had been submitted. First, he is well known in the secretariat of the IPU because he married one of the officers of the IPU. As a former Minister of the Environment, his name had been put forward during the time when the Conservatives were in power. I believe it was when Dr. Halliday was the leader of the Canadian Inter-Parliamentary Union. Mr. Caccia's name was put forward because the 12-plus members were asked to name a person who would qualify for that position on the committee on renewable resources. By coincidence, another name was put forward at the same time. That person was from Switzerland and he was also named Caccia. In fact, they know each other. The Swiss delegate nominated Charles Caccia to be part of the committee. It was not a unilateral decision taken by myself or by a group of the IPU without consultation with the others.

As far as the other matter is concerned, as I stated before, the topics of food and human rights were chosen in Istanbul in plenary by all participants at that conference.

We had briefings from officials of the department, who gave us the benefit of their views. We did not have to adhere to the suggestions that they gave or to the facts that they presented. Senator Di Nino was present at those briefings. That is the extent of the consultation that I had with anyone else on that topic.

Anyone who is particularly interested and who wants to go deeper into the subject-matter of a topic may do so. For instance, the Honourable Warren Allmand is very much concerned with human rights. He has spoken out on the topic of Tibet on previous occasions. Anyone who has a particular, keen interest in a given topic can get into it as deeply as they want. However, that does not necessarily mean that we must consult each other when the particular topic is not part of the agenda.

I do not know if I have answered Senator Di Nino's questions,.

Senator Di Nino: You are skating, Senator Bosa.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, if no other senator wishes to speak on this inquiry, it is considered debated.

[*Translation*]

REFLECTIONS ON THE SENATE

INQUIRY

Hon. Maurice Riel rose, pursuant to notice of Monday, November 25, 1996:

> That he will bring to the attention of the Senate his 23 years of experience as a senator.

He said: Honourable senators, I thank you for your patience in holding on until the end of the afternoon. It was 23 years ago that I came to the Senate. As the statutory age limit will soon force me to leave, I thought I should take a look back and share with you some of my thoughts about this period of almost a quarter of a century. I use the word "century" on purpose, for it feels almost that long — I can feel it in my bones and sinews. I remind you of the words of a 17th century poet we studied at college:

> Tircis, upon retirement we must think
> As into well deserved old age we sink.

It is said that, when people sense their death is imminent, they can see their whole lives flash before their eyes, as though they were watching a film. As my days in the Senate draw to an end, I shall therefore take this tried and true approach. I also find the English expression "swan song" a very apt way of describing a speech made at the end of one's career, because it is said that a swan sings only once in its life, just before dying, and very badly at that, according to legend.

• (1650)

On March 12, 1974, after spending the first six months of my career in the Senate co-chairing a joint committee of the House of Commons and the Senate on immigration, I made my maiden speech in a debate on the motion on the address in reply to the speech from the throne for that session.

At that time, I covered the following topics: greater involvement of women in public life; the possible abolition of the Senate, as advocated by some media; the influence of the media on public life; and Canadian unity.

I also expressed the wish that the Senate would come up, if not with a definition, at least with a description of *Homo Canadensis*, that is to say what makes a Canadian a Canadian, with his or her attributes, characteristics and ideals. I concluded by stating that:

> All Canadians must be able to identify themselves with a common idea.

On the subject of women's involvement in public life, I said:

> ...it is also with great pleasure that I have found in this assembly where I have been called, a number of ladies whose contribution to the debates of this place I have listened to carefully to my great intellectual enrichment. I have always felt that the wisdom developed in the home by women throughout the ages of history of mankind had a unique pragmatic depth, and very foolish were those who neglected to make use of it throughout the centuries.

I added:

> When the government states that it has taken and will continue to take steps to improve the status of women in Canada, I applaud.

I showed my colours and I am very pleased to see that the Trudeau government stayed that course, as did subsequent governments, under Brian Mulroney and, of course, Jean Chrétien.

There are many more women sitting in the Senate today than when I joined 23 years ago. I think this marks an improvement in the quality of work, research and results of the Senate. During my 23 years as a parliamentarian, I have noticed that women involved in parliamentary life tend to be more thorough, resilient, and tenacious; they are more steadfast, so to speak, in pursuing their ideas than men are. Senator MacEachen said basically the same thing in his last speech before the Senate, on June 19, 1996, and I quote:

[*English*]

> The appointment of women in greater numbers is also a positive development for the Senate...
>
> Female senators now have within their power the ability to improve dramatically the image of the Senate in the country as a whole. Within the Senate, they have an opportunity to have a powerful influence on the habits and the orientation of the Senate. I think that is a big positive.

[*Translation*]

Coming from a confirmed bachelor, these comments are a remarkable tribute, and they confirm what I always thought and said of the eminently positive contribution of women to our country's political life.

Recently, I was talking to Senator Keon and deploring the meagre retirement benefits granted to senators. Senator Keon pointed out that, with the arrival of more and more women in the Senate, our retirement pension will improve because, as he said, women are more persistent than men and, once they bring pressure to bear in larger numbers, the government of the day will have to give in and provide more adequate pension benefits to senators. This is a testimony which I appreciate, because it comes from a man whose judgment I value highly. A great doctor is often a great psychologist also.

Among the remarkable women who have played a major role in the political life of our country, we have to include former Governor General Jeanne Sauvé, the first woman to become our head of state. Mrs. Sauvé, who honoured me with her friendship, was a strong advocate of women's rights, and she sought to improve those rights. She always strived to excel, so that whatever position she held, no one could claim it was because she was a woman. In the United States, this is known as affirmative action.

I remember that, when Pope John Paul II came to Canada, she spoke to him — she was a former president of the Young Catholic Students — about ordaining women as priests in the Roman Catholic Church. I do not think she managed to convince John Paul II, but she felt it was her duty to raise this issue with His Holiness. Given her position as Canada's head of state, she did so, and Heaven knows how persuasive she could be. She also brought up the issue of marriage for Catholic priests, an idea which she supported. Those were major issues. To those who would ask for political or social changes that were too drastic or too quick, Maurice Duplessis used to say: "Not in my lifetime."

Senator Grimard will recall that.

Time will no doubt provide the answer in due course. However, reasonable developments continue, particularly when women are promoting them and leading the fight.

Since my arrival in the Senate, we have had a woman Governor General, who, previously, had been minister of science and then Speaker of the House of Commons. Since then, we have had a woman Prime Minister. We have had women at the forefront all over the place. Currently, our ambassador to Moscow is a woman, as is our consul general in Los Angeles. And how many women have there been in senior positions in the public service? Women are said to be excellent administrators.

That reminds me that, in the Great Depression in the 1930s, when the City of Montreal was threatened with bankruptcy, a suggestion was made that the Grey Nuns run the city, because they were enlightened administrators. Montreal's financial situation was so bad at the time that they even passed a bylaw to levy a special tax on those who were not married. The bylaw was quashed by the courts as being *ultra vires*. Sister Bonneau was in charge of providing help to the poor and distributed soup to the

needy in Montreal. We must remember that there was no unemployment insurance then. This power was transferred to the federal government only in 1942, as Mr. Duplessis often reminded us in later speeches. That, however, is another story. I can never praise women enough. They work with us, they are ever our equals, and I would go so far as to say that they are often our superiors.

When I arrived in the Senate, the Speaker was Mrs. Fergusson. A few years later it was Mrs. Lapointe. Both women were eminently tactful and wise and unanimously respected.

• (1700)

I see we have come a long way in the last 23 years, when women were reduced to the status of minors and interdicted persons in Quebec's Civil Code.

This ignominious treatment has been discontinued, but we still have to recognize equal pay for equal work in any business. The 20th century will have been the century of the recognition of women's rights in the West, and this will undoubtedly be the greatest honour of our century, which did not deserve many others, unfortunately, in the area of human rights.

The second point I mentioned was the abolition of the Senate.

Someone had then placed in the newspapers, as it happens now and then, an advertisement advocating the abolition of the Senate, citing the fact that Canadian senators were not elected and claiming this was contrary to democracy. I responded to this attack by naming some professions where people are not elected, such as judges in our courts of law who are appointed by governments and who are irremovable. In the United States, judges are elected in several jurisdictions. Does this make them more impartial, when they owe their election to voters and must submit to an election by the same voters who vote for senators, congressmen, mayors and other public representatives and who also vote in referendums on public borrowing?

I also said that there are among controllers or leaders or manipulators of public opinion media people who have highly responsible functions, fulfilling on the air or on television or in the newspapers the role our preachers used to have in the pulpits of our churches. I remind you of the influence that preachers used to have, through sermons every Sunday and every holy day, the influence of retreats preached by professionals. I remind you of the political effects these preachings had until the Quiet Revolution.

Today, have the priests and preachers of yesteryear not been replaced with television figures, news anchors, open line hosts, in fact, anyone who can play whatever role or function on a regular basis on radio or television? René Lévesque, a commentator of the highest calibre, became the Premier of Quebec, and his election came about as a direct result of his talent and success on television. Currently, through their comments, Jean-François Lépine and Bernard Derome carry more weight than all the archbishops of Quebec put together.

Yet, these commentators are not elected representatives. Their views and statements are like dogma or gospel to a great many listeners; in fact, their ratings, scientifically measured almost every month, enable them to reach a public that no man of the cloth can rival. What is a politician, first rate and all, worth next to a commentator with good ratings or a popular hot-line host making regular radio or television appearances? Yet, these commentators are not elected representatives.

In my speech on March 12, 1974, I made the following remarks:

> may I invite you to listen to the radio and look at television at any time of the day, and you will realize that political, social or even religious problems are dealt with as by a court of last resort by an array of non-elected people. You hear them present all kinds of ideas, serious, preposterous, prejudiced or biased, while the duly elected member of Parliament cannot express himself through such mass media precisely because he has been elected and that broadcasting and T.V. time is restricted by law to very short periods for the elected representatives of recognized political parties.

A case in point is Jean Lapierre, this young Montreal commentator. As a member of Parliament or even as a minister, what he said seldom went far beyond the walls of Parliament. Now that he has become a radio commentator, his ratings are phenomenal and he is very popular.

> The real power today is that of communication.

Roger Lemelin made this comment at a conference, and he added:

> And Quebec's power rests with Radio-Canada.

In other words, the power rests with those who manipulate and truly control Radio-Canada — and I do not think that, either back then or today, these people were or are federalists. A little further on, he gave an example of what he meant:

> An incredible number of people complained that, during the 1970 October crisis, terrorists were depicted on television much more like Robin Hoods than like killers.

Has the spirit that prevails at Radio-Canada changed much since then, given the network's most recent performances? It seems that the media, and particularly radio and television networks, led by Radio-Canada, try hard, especially during periods of tension, to create a psychosis fuelled by a climate of nervousness and destabilization. This is reminiscent of that part of the Gospel where false prophets proclaim that the end is nigh and frighten people.

Are there any regulations? What guidelines apply to newscasts? Everything goes so fast.

There is nothing older than the morning paper.

Péguy said that over 80 years ago. A news item sends the previous headline into oblivion, and so does bad news. Incidentally, can anyone file a complaint? It seems so complicated, lengthy or slow that the average citizen does not want to be bothered. In fact, when the media admit to having made a mistake, it is commonly felt that the correction made usually aggravates the damage caused by the comments involved, or their inaccuracy. This reminds me of Aesop, who said that "language is the best and the worst thing in the world." It can make you white or black, without your having any say.

The media are not the only culprits. In the general public, except for vigilant citizens or citizens' groups, anything goes, without further ado. However, talking about the Senate and all the bad things people say about it, is the Senate doing everything it should to establish its usefulness and its credibility? The public in general and journalists know nothing about the powers and responsibilities of the Senate and senators. All that relates to the Senate receives little or no publicity at all. Unless there is a rare blunder, journalists cover next to nothing in the Senate. So many citizens believe that senators are some kind of privileged members of Parliament who do not need to be elected, who do nothing since they do not have any constituents nor any riding offices and are only members of political parties for whom they have to do things in return for their appointment.

What is the role of a senator? Allow me to share with you some thoughts I have had for almost a quarter of a century. The senator's role is to consider, reflect and revise. He has to consider bills — Senator MacEachen said that too on June 16 — he has to consider bills coming from the Commons, to study them, to reflect and to revise them if need be. Some authors have defined this role as one of a quasi-judicial entity. To play this role in a judicious and effective manner, the Constitution gave senators a permanent function, without the need to be elected. The Constitution gives them no duty or obligation in terms of local representation. Not being accountable to voters, they do not have any office or staff in the senatorial constituencies. They have an office only in the Senate precincts in Ottawa.

Having no electors, being non-elected, it does not matter whether a senator is appointed for this division or that. That designation is fortuitous, depending on the vacancy to be filled and the availability of the person to be appointed. The name of the division in Quebec refers only to the qualification in terms of real property set up in 1867, and which has become symbolic.

• (1710)

Especially since the ethnic origin of citizens is now taken into consideration when appointments to the Senate are made.

It is crucial and normal that Canadians should know that the duties of senators are not the same as the duties of members of Parliament, because, if they were the same, there would be duplication or competition between senators and members of Parliament, especially if they were from different regions or different parties.

The people of Canada have to know that the responsibilities of senators and members of Parliament are not the same, that the services the two houses provide to the country are complementary and equal in quality, although they are different.

A member of Parliament has a direct responsibility to his or her voters. He or she is elected by the voters and is accountable to them. That is why members of Parliament have, besides their office on Parliament Hill, a riding office and staff paid for by the government. They have to get elected, to meet with their voters, and they are held accountable at every election. The member of Parliament is the only representative of his or her voters, which is why he or she is accountable to them.

The duties of a senator are similar to those of a justice in the highest courts of the provinces and of the country. Their responsibility is just as great. Senate decisions have a determining influence on the social, moral and economic makeup of our nation. The Senate decision on abortion, which was subjected to a free non-partisan vote in the Senate, is a very good example of the moral and social responsibilities of senators, hence of the importance of their duties.

This vote was one of the most significant moments in the recent history of the Senate. Senators set aside party politics and considered the motion at length, and voted in equal numbers for and against the bill, thus blocking its passage. We saw the leader of the opposition vote for a government bill and the former whip of the government vote against legislation brought forward by his own government.

Senator Dandurand was right, at the beginning of the century, as several authors did after him, to compare the Senate to a quasi-judicial entity. In fact, senators consider the bills and the philosophy behind them before voting, just as judges consider the acts before implementing them. In both cases, sound judgment is of the utmost importance.

In a speech I made in the Senate in 1985, I suggested, with respect to the provision allowing the government to appoint 8 additional senators, two for each region of the country, as stipulated in the Constitution, that we use or amend this provision to automatically appoint former prime ministers of Canada and former premiers of the various provinces at the end of their mandates as senators not affiliated to any party caucus. That would mean they would be independent senators or "cross benchers" as they are called in England. They would sit neither on the right nor on the left of the Speaker, but rather in the centre aisle, just as in the House of Lords. I thought that would have given us a corps of independent senators devoid of the partisanship that sometimes tarnishes our debates. I received the support of Mr. Trudeau, but Senator MacEachen had a hard time

believing that a former prime minister would look forward to sitting in the Senate alongside his predecessor. At the time, Senator Flynn was not very supportive either. The suggestion to have "cross benchers" in this house was dear to the heart of Senator Molson, who had come up with the idea, but it was supported neither during his time nor mine. I dreamt of seeing Trudeau, Mulroney, Lévesque, Davies, Parizeau, Lougheed and many others taking part in the Senate deliberations. However, my dream never came true.

Furthermore, I must admit that a prime minister must always be able to count on a majority in the Senate, or he could never be sure of his legislation passing. In the House of Lords, they have resolved this impasse through a gentlemen's agreement, which always assumes a government majority on a measure that is part of the government program. And in no case may the lords hold up a financial measure for more than 30 days. Whatever their recommendation, the British House of Commons is free to carry on after 30 days.

I have also given some thought to how senators are appointed. I have said and repeated on occasion, the last time during my participation in the debate in this Chamber on the Charlottetown agreement, that the Senate would be closer to the people if there were a better balance between senators from urban centres and those from rural areas.

The Hon. the Speaker: Senator Riel, I am sorry to interrupt, but your 15-minute period has expired.

Hon. Senators: Continue.

The Hon. the Speaker: Leave is granted.

Senator Riel: Thank you. Many Quebec senators come from cities, but none of us come from rural areas. Admittedly, this would undoubtedly be more difficult in a minority chamber, a multicultural chamber with a Senate elected by local voters, as is the case in France, where they are elected by delegates from municipal councils.

It is essential, as I said, that the Prime Minister always control his Senate, if he wants to be able to pass his legislation. You will recall that Prime Minister Mulroney was forced to turn to a never before used clause in the Constitution in order to name eight additional senators all at once to get the GST bill, which had been passed in the House of Commons, through the Senate, but that the Liberal opposition then in the Senate blocked it with a persistent, noisy, and perhaps ill-advised — as further events showed — filibuster. It was an unfortunate case of partisan politics getting in the way of sober second thought. Nothing is perfect in this world.

Furthermore, the best laid plans are subject to unexpected effects. Serendipitous effects, Prime Minister Chrétien would call them. This is most often the case for senators who are not in politics full time and must continue to practice their primary profession to make a living. Sometimes the time a senator spends in the Senate and his senatorial duties infringe on the hours required by his private practice, and vice versa. There is a conflict of interest, one that is never discussed but of which the senator is a victim. The senator who is a politician by profession gives all his time to his senatorial duties. It is an extension of his profession. It does not change anything in his life, but a doctor, lawyer, engineer or any other professional who becomes a senator, finds himself caught between these two activities that require his full-time attention. He therefore suffers from a work-related illness, not yet recognized in the labour code, known as discontinuity. As the Gospel says: "No man can serve two masters." In pursuing one activity, a person neglects the other. The senator's life greatly suffers from this dual responsibility. Progress is made in one area only at the expense of the other. In the best case, the two activities cancel each other out.

• (1720)

A senator cannot, any more than a member of Parliament, engage easily and successfully in a professional career outside his or her functions as a senator. And I do have a profession other than being a senator; therefore, I speak from experience.

Is it possible to solve this problem? I will leave this to senators who will be here after me, but I submit one worthy solution would be a better pay for senators. They should get the same salary and benefits as judges of the Superior Court in Quebec or Supreme Court in all other provinces.

I do not want to try your patience, but I would like to deal briefly with a subject I raised in 1974, the Canadian identity, or the definition, characteristics, and qualities of *Homo canadensis*.

Marshall McLuhan was quoted as saying these memorable words:

> Canada is the only country in the world that knows how to live without an identity.

However, what is the identity of a country's inhabitants? Is it not found in the habits of everyday life, the climate, geography, customs and interaction with other inhabitants of our country?

It has long been the practice in Canada to define Canadians by their ethnic origins, by their ethnic and linguistic characteristics, and even by their ethnic antagonisms.

Why do we seek divisions, when we live in the same geographic context, when our lifestyles and needs are the same? We are all affected by the climate. General de Gaulle, citing Napoleon, I believe, said that a nation's geographic environment was the most important factor in its destiny. Who could deny that we are prisoners of the geographic environment in which we live, and our geographic environment, North America, is now the most important in the world. We are right next to the world's richest nation, which absorbs almost all the goods we produce, and provides us with the products we lack in winter.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senator, I must interrupt. There is no interpretation. It would seem that your speech can only be heard in French.

Senator Riel: It provides us with whatever we are not able to produce in winter as well as a sunny destination. It is the country that develops the most useful and advanced new technology.

We have been favoured by the geography of our land, but not as much by its climate. We did the best we could. We have achieved a comfortable balance and are pleased with it.

We are all the richer for speaking two languages, and even more for speaking three — as proposed in a resolution passed at the last PQ convention and also stated in a recent French law. Limiting our fellow citizens to speaking one language is like forcing them to use only one arm when they were born with two. In these times of globalization and NAFTA, we must be equal to the task of fulfilling our ambitions.

Let us gain enrichment from our differences. Could we not think of a sense of belonging as Canadians that goes beyond nationalisms, through the acceptance by each of us of a code of values that we could call the code of Canadian values, which includes traditional values as well as a code of conduct as citizens. Within religions, people do not all speak the same language, but they agree on belonging to a religion no matter what the person's language or ethnic origin might be, because of commonly held dogmas.

I tried to establish such a list of Canadian values. It would read like a Decalogue: good faith, common sense, respect for the law, work ethic, entrepreneurship, generosity, tolerance, humour, civic sense and perseverance.

Subscribing to a shared list of civic values of practical moral values would be one way to give a concrete idea of what the Canadian identity is, and this could then become the basis for Canadian unity. We had better see to it that our values are respected before some other values are foisted on us by the media, the advertising agencies or the tale spinners.

The idea for this code came to me after I read *Blood & Belonging* by Michael Ignatieff and *The Europeans* by Luigi Barzini. It set me thinking. And if my suggestion sounds useful, perhaps the Senate could pursue the matter. I will come back 23 years from now to see what happened.

Finally, I would like to say a few words about a certain Pierre Trudeau, now that I have reached the end of my career in the Senate. As you know, Pierre Trudeau appointed me to the Senate. He was a fellow student at university, where we became friends. I was a militant Liberal from way back. Our families came from the same region south of Montreal between the St. Lawrence and the American border. He went to Bréboeuf and lived in Outremont, next door to my cousins the Pagers, when I first knew him and later on, my friend Georges Lapalme became his neighbour.

We knew each other well enough for him to invite me in October 1968, when he had become Prime Minister, to fly with him to Regina in the government plane to attend the inauguration of a monument to Louis Riel, erected by the Government of Saskatchewan, headed by Ross Thatcher.

All senators have feelings of gratitude, admiration and even reverence for the prime minister who appointed them. I know how they feel. And I feel that way about Pierre Trudeau. As far as I am concerned, he was the Pericles of our generation. Everywhere he went, he was always first. At university, he was already outstanding and way ahead of his fellow students with his profound intellect, his sharp reasoning, his lively and incredibly quick mind and also his reserve. At university as in politics, he was always in a class by himself, which was immediately felt by everyone who approached him.

I remember reading in a history of the last war about a sitting of the British House of Commons around the end of 1940 or 1941. Lloyd George, who was still living at the time, got up to leave the House. Churchill, who was then Prime Minister, rose from the government benches to offer his arm to his former Prime Minister, Lloyd George, who was no longer a young man.

A gesture that was moving, respectful and dramatic. Something similar would have occurred to Pierre Trudeau, because as you know, there were times when he would do something dramatic, and he did so with elegance, style and a certain flair. And he still does today.

He had courage that verged on the foolhardy. When he reached a decision after a long period of reflection, he acted with determination, cool and collected, a prisoner of his own logic. He loved Quebecers and did not want us to be marginal, inferior whiners. He was convinced that we had a vast pool of talent and that we should use those talents to develop our collective potential. He believed we had the intellectual capacity to do as well as the so-called anglophones in our province and the other provinces, although for a host of reasons, we got off to a slow start. In that case, you have to try harder.

Like our ancestors, the Gauls, we Quebecers are in a permanent state of division and lack discipline. Premier Bouchard commented on this to his followers not too long ago, and all his PQ predecessors were affected by this or even became casualties.

• (1730)

In the same vein, Robert Bourassa rejected the Victoria Charter, which our colleague Senator Beaudoin considers the best constitutional proposal ever made to Quebec, adding that "this would have spared us 25 years of unproductive constitutional wrangling."

Pierre Trudeau made his contribution, with talent, imagination and brilliance, to accomplish the updating of Quebec and Canada. I am pleased to have been involved in the Trudeau years. Now, after so many years, after so many leaders who have not seen their dreams come true — Trudeau, Lévesque, Bourassa, Parizeau, Mulroney, and a few more — I am sure that, in our country, we will reach a *modus vivendi* in which all the others, all the members of the diverse population groups, will be pleased to live together and to gather the fruits of the "pursuit of happiness."

I could not finish these reflections without a tribute to our Prime Minister, Jean Chrétien, a personality that is a mixture of Harry Truman and Antoine Pinay — two of the greatest post-war statesmen, men of the land, who were down to earth and had their fingers on the pulse of the times, who knew people. I would also say that there is a bit of Harry Hays in our Prime Minister. A practical man, and more of a deeply philosophical psychologist than people realize.The French thinker, Vauvenargues, said:

> ...true politicians know human nature better than those who call themselves philosophers. I want to say that they are truer philosophers.

Jean Chrétien is one of that kind, and as effective as can be, to boot.

At the present time, Canada is doing well economically and socially, despite the serious upheaval of the October 30, 1995 referendum in Quebec, thanks to the wise political leadership of Jean Chrétien.

When I was in Paris two weeks ago, Mr. Barre, the former Prime Minister of France, in a major hour-long televised conversation with several top journalists, cited Mr. Chrétien as an example to the French, on the strength of his successful battle to reduce Canada's deficit, his reduction of government spending, and the downsizing of the civil service, all within an atmosphere of social peace. As you know, the French government is currently experiencing a great deal of difficulty in those areas.

The Team Canada trips, originated by Mr. Chrétien when he became Prime Minister, have been an immense success and the one he is just finishing up now, according to the favourable news reports so far, has been another immense success. Such a success that the Premier of Quebec, Mr. Bouchard, is preparing to come on board.

We cannot ask for more. I would love to be younger, so that I could have served under him longer, but I can assure you all, honourable senators, that I have been proud that my senatorial college shares the name of Shawinagan with him, although I have not been able to visit it often. I trust that, when I have retired, I shall have the time to get there more often.

Before people start to speak of me in the past tense, I would like to tell you all, my dear colleagues, how grateful I have been for the good relationships I have had with each and every one of you. When I leave, believe me, I shall have nothing but good memories of you all and of the time I spent in the Senate. I shall treasure those memories.

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

[*English*]

LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS

COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED TO MEET DURING SITTING OF THE SENATE

Hon. Sharon Carstairs, pursuant to notice of November 28, 1996, moved:

> That the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs have power to sit at 3:15 p.m. on Wednesday, December 4th, 1996, even though the Senate may then be sitting and that rule 95(4) be suspended in relation thereto.

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

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

The Senate adjourned to Wednesday, December 4, 1996, at 1:30 p.m.

APPENDIX

Officers of the Senate

The Ministry

Senators

(Listed according to seniority, alphabetically and by provinces)

Committees of the Senate

THE SPEAKER

THE HONOURABLE GILDAS L. MOLGAT

THE LEADER OF THE GOVERNMENT

THE HONOURABLE JOYCE FAIRBAIRN, P.C.

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

THE HONOURABLE JOHN LYNCH-STAUNTON

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

CLERK OF THE SENATE AND CLERK OF THE PARLIAMENTS

PAUL C. BÉLISLE ESQ.

DEPUTY CLERK, PRINCIPAL CLERK, LEGISLATIVE SERVICES

RICHARD G. GREENE

LAW CLERK AND PARLIAMENTARY COUNSEL

Mark A. Audcent, B.A. (Hon), LL.B

GENTLEMAN USHER OF THE BLACK ROD

COL. JEAN DORÉ, C.D.

THE MINISTRY

According to Precedence

(December 3, 1996)

The Right Hon. Jean Chrétien	Prime Minister
The Hon. Herbert Eser Gray	Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada
The Hon. Lloyd Axworthy	Minister of Foreign Affairs
The Hon. David Anderson	Minister of Transport
The Hon. Ralph E. Goodale	Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
The Hon. David Charles Dingwall	Minister of Health
The Hon. Ron Irwin	Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
The Hon. Joyce Fairbairn	Leader of the Government in the Senate and Minister with special responsibility for Literacy
The Hon. Sheila Copps	Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage
The Hon. Sergio Marchi	Minister of Environment
The Hon. John Manley	Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Minister of Western Economic Diversification and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development-Quebec
The Hon. Diane Marleau	Minister of Public Works and Government Services
The Hon. Paul Martin	Minister of Finance
The Hon. Douglas Young	Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs
The Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton	Minister of International Trade
The Hon. Marcel Massé	President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure
The Hon. Anne McLellan	Minister of Natural Resources
The Hon. Allan Rock	Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
The Hon. Alfonso Gagliano	Minister of Labour and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
The Hon. Lucienne Robillard	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
The Hon. Fred J. Mifflin	Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
The Hon. Jane Stewart	Minister of National Revenue
The Hon. Stéphane Dion	President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal
The Hon. Pierre Pettigrew	Minister of Human Resources Development
The Hon. Don Boudria	Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie
The Hon. Fernand Robichaud	Secretary of State (Agriculture and Agri-food, Fisheries and Oceans)
The Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew	Secretary of State (Training and Youth)
The Hon. Lawrence MacAulay	Secretary of State (Veterans) (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)
The Hon. Christine Stewart	Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)
The Hon. Raymond Chan	Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)
The Hon. Jon Gerrard	Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development) (Western Economic Diversification)
The Hon. Douglas Peters	Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)
The Hon. Martin Cauchon	Secretary of State (Federal Office of Regional Development-Quebec)
The Hon. Hedy Fry	Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)

SENATORS OF CANADA

ACCORDING TO SENIORITY

(December 3, 1996)

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
John Michael Macdonald	Cape Breton	North Sydney, N.S.
Orville Howard Phillips	Prince	Alberton, P.E.I.
Andrew Ernest Thompson	Dovercourt	Kendal, Ont.
Herbert O. Sparrow	Saskatchewan	North Battleford, Sask.
Richard James Stanbury	York Centre	Toronto, Ont.
William John Petten	Bonavista	St. John's, Nfld.
Gildas L. Molgat, Speaker	Ste-Rose	Winnipeg, Man.
Edward M. Lawson	Vancouver	Vancouver, B.C.
Mark Lorne Bonnell	Murray River	Murray River, P.E.I.
Bernard Alasdair Graham	The Highlands	Sydney, N.S.
Raymond J. Perrault, P.C.	North Shore-Burnaby	North Vancouver, B.C.
Maurice Riel, P.C.	Chaouinigane	Montréal, Qué.
Louis-J. Robichaud, P.C.	L'Acadie-Acadia	Saint-Antoine, N.B.
Jack Austin, P.C.	Vancouver South	Vancouver, B.C.
Paul Lucier	Yukon	Whitehorse, Yukon
Pietro Rizzuto	Repentigny	Laval-sur-le-Lac, Qué.
Willie Adams	Northwest Territories	Rankin Inlet, N.W.T.
Peter Bosa	York-Caboto	Etobicoke, Ont.
Stanley Haidasz, P.C.	Toronto-Parkdale	Toronto, Ont.
Philip Derek Lewis	St. John's	St. John's, Nfld.
Dalia Wood	Montarville	Montréal, Qué.
Reginald James Balfour	Regina	Regina, Sask.
Lowell Murray, P.C.	Pakenham	Ottawa, Ont.
Guy Charbonneau	Kennebec	Montréal, Qué.
C. William Doody	Harbour Main-Bell Island	St. John's, Nfld.
Peter Alan Stollery	Bloor and Yonge	Toronto, Ont.
Peter Michael Pitfield, P.C.	Ontario	Ottawa, Ont.
William McDonough Kelly	Port Severn	Mississauga, Ont.
Jacques Hébert	Wellington	Montréal, Qué.
Leo E. Kolber	Victoria	Westmount, Qué.
Philippe Deane Gigantès	De Lorimier	Montréal, Qué.
John B. Stewart	Antigonish-Guysborough	Bayfield, N.S.
Michael Kirby	South Shore	Halifax, N.S.
Jerahmiel S. Grafstein	Metro Toronto	Toronto, Ont.
Anne C. Cools	Toronto Centre	Toronto, Ont.
Charlie Watt	Inkerman	Kuujjuaq, Qué.
Leonard Stephen Marchand, P.C.	Kamloops-Cariboo	Kamloops, B.C.
Daniel Phillip Hays	Calgary	Calgary, Alta.
Joyce Fairbairn, P.C.	Lethbridge	Lethbridge, Alta.
Colin Kenny	Rideau	Ottawa, Ont.
Pierre De Bané, P.C.	De la Vallière	Montréal, Qué.
Eymard Georges Corbin	Grand-Sault	Grand-Sault, N.B.
Finlay MacDonald	Halifax	Halifax, N.S.
Brenda Mary Robertson	Riverview	Shediac, N.B.
Richard J. Doyle	North York	Toronto, Ont.
Jean-Maurice Simard	Edmundston	Edmundston, N.B.
Michel Cogger	Lauzon	Knowlton, Qué.
Norman K. Atkins	Markham	Toronto, Ont.

ACCORDING TO SENIORITY

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
Ethel Cochrane	Newfoundland	Port-au-Port, Nfld.
Eileen Rossiter	Prince Edward Island	Charlottetown, P.E.I.
Mira Spivak	Manitoba	Winnipeg, Man.
Gerald R. Ottenheimer	Waterford-Trinity	St. John's, Nfld.
Roch Bolduc	Golfe	Ste-Foy, Qué.
Gérald-A. Beaudoin	Rigaud	Hull, Qué.
Pat Carney, P.C.	British Columbia	Vancouver, B.C.
Gérald J. Comeau	Nova Scotia	Church Point, N.S.
Consiglio Di Nino	Ontario	Downsview, Ont.
Donald H. Oliver	Nova Scotia	Halifax, N.S.
Noël A. Kinsella	New Brunswick	Fredericton, N.B.
John Buchanan, P.C.	Nova Scotia	Halifax, N.S.
Mabel Margaret DeWare	New Brunswick	Moncton, N.B.
John Lynch-Staunton	Grandville	Georgeville, Qué.
James Francis Kelleher, P.C.	Ontario	Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.
J. Trevor Eyton	Ontario	Caledon, Ont.
Walter Patrick Twinn	Alberta	Slave Lake, Alta.
Wilbert Joseph Keon	Ottawa	Ottawa, Ont.
Michael Arthur Meighen	St. Marys	Toronto, Ont.
Normand Grimard	Québec	Noranda, Qué.
Thérèse Lavoie-Roux	Québec	Montréal, Qué.
J. Michael Forrestall	Dartmouth and Eastern Shore	Dartmouth, N.S.
Janis Johnson	Winnipeg-Interlake	Winnipeg, Man.
Eric Arthur Berntson	Saskatchewan	Saskatoon, Sask.
A. Raynell Andreychuk	Regina	Regina, Sask.
Jean-Claude Rivest	Stadacona	Québec, Qué.
Ronald D. Ghitter	Alberta	Calgary, Alta.
Terrance R. Stratton	Manitoba	St. Norbert, Man.
Marcel Prud'homme, P.C.	La Salle	Montréal, Qué.
Fernand Roberge	Saurel	Ville St-Laurent, Qué.
Duncan James Jessiman	Manitoba	Winnipeg, Man.
Leonard J. Gustafson	Saskatchewan	Macoun, Sask.
Erminie Joy Cohen	New Brunswick	Saint John, N.B.
David Tkachuk	Saskatchewan	Saskatoon, Sask.
W. David Angus	Alma	Montréal, Qué.
Pierre Claude Nolin	De Salaberry	Québec, Qué.
Marjory LeBreton	Ontario	Manotick, Ont.
Gerry St. Germain, P.C.	Langley-Pemberton-Whistler	Maple Ridge, B.C.
Lise Bacon	De la Durantaye	Laval, Qué.
Sharon Carstairs	Manitoba	Victoria Beach, Man.
Landon Pearson	Ontario	Ottawa, Ont.
Jean-Robert Gauthier	Ottawa-Vanier	Ottawa, Ontario
John G. Bryden	New Brunswick	Bayfield, N.B.
Rose-Marie Losier-Cool	New Brunswick	Bathurst, N.B.
Céline Hervieux-Payette, P.C.	Bedford	Montréal, Qué.
William H. Rompkey, P.C.	Newfoundland	North West River, Labrador
Doris M. Anderson	Prince Edward Island	St. Peter's, Kings County, P.E.I.
Lorna Milne	Ontario	Brampton, Ont.
Marie-P. Poulin	Northern Ontario	Ottawa, Ont.
Shirley Maheu	Rougement	Ville de Saint-Laurent, Qué.
Joseph Gérard Lauri P. Landry	New Brunswick	Cap-Pelé, N.B.
Nicholas William Taylor	Alberta	Bon Accord, Alta.
Jean B. Forest	Alberta	Edmonton, Alta.
Eugene Francis Whelan, P.C.	Western Ontario	Ottawa, Ont.
Léonce Mercier	Mille Isles	Saint Élie d'Orford, Qué.
Wilfred P. Moore	Nova Scotia	Chester, N.S.

SENATORS OF CANADA

ALPHABETICAL LIST

(December 3, 1996)

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
Adams, Willie	Northwest Territories	Rankin Inlet, N.W.T.
Anderson, Doris M.	Prince Edward Island	St. Peter's, Kings County, Nfld.
Andreychuk, A. Raynell.	Regina	Regina, Sask.
Angus, W. David	Alma	Montréal, Qué.
Atkins, Norman K.	Markham	Toronto, Ont.
Austin, Jack, P.C.	Vancouver South	Vancouver, B.C.
Bacon, Lise	De la Durantaye	Laval, Qué.
Balfour, Reginald James	Regina	Regina, Sask.
Beaudoin, Gérald-A.	Rigaud	Hull, Qué.
Berntson, Eric Arthur	Saskatchewan	Saskatoon, Sask.
Bolduc, Roch	Golfe	Ste-Foy, Qué.
Bonnell, M. Lorne	Murray River	Murray River, P.E.I.
Bosa, Peter	York-Caboto	Etobicoke, Ont.
Bryden, John G.	New Brunswick	Bayfield, N.B.
Buchanan, John, P.C.	Nova Scotia	Halifax, N.S.
Carney, Pat, P.C.	British Columbia	Vancouver, B.C.
Carstairs, Sharon	Manitoba	Victoria Beach, Man.
Charbonneau, Guy	Kennebec	Montréal, Qué.
Cochrane, Ethel	Newfoundland	Port-au-Port, Nfld.
Cogger, Michel	Lauzon	Knowlton, Qué.
Cohen, Erminie Joy	New Brunswick	Saint John, N.B.
Comeau, Gérald J.	Nova Scotia	Church Point, N.S.
Cools, Anne C.	Toronto Centre	Toronto, Ont.
Corbin, Eymard Georges	Grand-Sault	Grand-Sault, N.B.
De Bané, Pierre, P.C.	De la Vallière	Montréal, Qué.
DeWare, Mabel Margaret	New Brunswick	Moncton, N.B.
Di Nino, Consiglio	Ontario	Downsview, Ont.
Doody, C. William	Harbour Main-Bell Island	St. John's, Nfld.
Doyle, Richard J.	North York	Toronto, Ont.
Eyton, J. Trevor	Ontario	Caledon, Ont.
Fairbairn, Joyce, P.C.	Lethbridge	Lethbridge, Alta.
Forest, Jean B.	Alberta	Edmonton, Alta.
Forrestall, J. Michael	Dartmouth and Eastern Shore	Dartmouth, N.S.
Gauthier, Jean-Robert	Ottawa-Vanier	Ottawa, Ont.
Ghitter, Ronald D.	Alberta	Calgary, Alta.
Gigantès, Philippe Deane	De Lorimier	Montréal, Qué.
Grafstein, Jerahmiel S.	Metro Toronto	Toronto, Ont.
Graham, Bernard Alasdair	The Highlands	Sydney, N.S.
Grimard, Normand	Québec	Noranda, Qué.
Gustafson Leonard J.	Saskatchewan	Macoun, Sask.
Haidasz, Stanley, P.C.	Toronto-Parkdale	Toronto, Ont.
Hays, Daniel Phillip	Calgary	Calgary, Alta.
Hébert, Jacques	Wellington	Montréal, Qué.
Hervieux-Payette, Céline, P.C.	Bedford	Montréal, Qué.
Jessiman, Duncan James	Manitoba	Winnipeg, Man.
Johnson, Janis	Winnipeg-Interlake	Winnipeg, Man.
Kelleher, James Francis, P.C.	Ontario	Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.
Kelly, William McDonough	Port Severn	Mississauga, Ont.
Kenny, Colin	Rideau	Ottawa, Ont.
Keon, Wilbert Joseph	Ottawa	Ottawa, Ont.
Kinsella, Noël A.	New Brunswick	Fredericton, N.B.

Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
THE HONOURABLE		
Kirby, Michael	South Shore	Halifax, N.S.
Kolber, Leo E.	Victoria	Westmount, Qué.
Landry, Joseph Gérard Lauri P.	New Brunswick	Cap Pelé, N.B.
Lavoie-Roux, Thérèse	Québec	Montréal, Qué.
Lawson, Edward M.	Vancouver	Vancouver, B.C.
LeBreton, Marjory	Ontario	Manotick, Ont.
Lewis, Philip Derek	St. John's	St. John's, Nfld.
Losier-Cool, Rose-Marie	New Brunswick	Bathurst, N.B.
Lucier, Paul	Yukon	Whitehorse, Yukon
Lynch-Staunton, John	Grandville	Georgeville, Qué.
MacDonald, Finlay	Halifax	Halifax, N.S.
Macdonald, John M.	Cape Breton	North Sydney, N.S.
Maheu, Shirley.	Rougemont	Ville de Saint-Laurent, Qué.
Marchand, Leonard Stephen, P.C.	Kamloops-Cariboo	Kamloops, B.C.
Meighen, Michael Arthur	St. Marys	Toronto, Ont.
Mercier, Léonce	Mille Isles	Saint-Élie d'Orford, Qué.
Milne, Lorna	Ontario	Brampton, Ont.
Molgat, Gildas L. Speaker	Ste-Rose	Winnipeg, Man.
Moore, Wilfred P.	Nova Scotia	Chester, N.S.
Murray, Lowell, P.C.	Pakenham	Ottawa, Ont.
Nolin, Pierre Claude	De Salaberry	Québec, Qué.
Oliver, Donald H.	Nova Scotia	Halifax, N.S.
Ottenheimer, Gerald R.	Waterford-Trinity	St. John's, Nfld.
Pearson, Landon	Ontario	Ottawa, Ontario
Perrault, Raymond J., P.C.	North Shore-Burnaby	North Vancouver, B.C.
Petten, William J.	Bonavista	St. John's, Nfld.
Phillips, Orville H.	Prince	Alberton, P.E.I.
Pitfield, Peter Michael, P.C.	Ontario	Ottawa, Ont.
Poulin, Marie-P.	Northern Ontario	Ottawa, Ont.
Prud'homme, Marcel, P.C.	La Salle	Montréal, Qué.
Riel, Maurice, P.C.	Chaouinigane	Montréal, Qué.
Rivest, Jean-Claude.	Stadacona	Québec, Qué.
Rizzuto, Pietro	Repentigny	Laval-sur-le-Lac, Qué.
Roberge, Fernand	Saurel	Ville St-Laurent, Qué.
Robertson, Brenda Mary	Riverview	Shediac, N.B.
Robichaud, Louis-J., P.C.	L'Acadie-Acadia	Saint-Antoine, N.B.
Rompkey, William H., P.C..	Newfoundland	North West River, Labrador
Rossiter, Eileen	Prince Edward Island	Charlottetown, P.E.I.
St. Germain, Gerry, P.C.	Langley-Pemberton-Whistler	Maple Ridge, B.C.
Simard, Jean-Maurice	Edmundston	Edmundston, N.B.
Sparrow, Herbert O.	Saskatchewan	North Battleford, Sask.
Spivak, Mira	Manitoba	Winnipeg, Man.
Stanbury, Richard J.	York Centre	Toronto, Ont.
Stewart, John B.	Antigonish-Guysborough	Bayfield, N.S.
Stollery, Peter Alan	Bloor and Yonge	Toronto, Ont.
Stratton, Terrance R.	Manitoba	St. Norbert, Man.
Taylor, Nicholas William	Alberta	Bon Accord, Alta.
Thompson, Andrew	Dovercourt	Kendal, Ont.
Tkachuk, David	Saskatchewan	Saskatoon, Sask.
Twinn, Walter Patrick	Alberta	Slave Lake, Alta.
Watt, Charlie	Inkerman	Kuujjuaq, Qué.
Whelan, Eugene Francis	Western Ontario	Ottawa, Ont.
Wood, Dalia	Montarville	Montréal, Qué.

SENATORS OF CANADA

BY PROVINCE AND TERRITORY

(December 3, 1996)

ONTARIO—24

	Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
	THE HONOURABLE		
1	Andrew Ernest Thompson	Dovercourt	Kendal
2	Richard James Stanbury	York Centre	Toronto
3	Peter Bosa	York-Caboto	Etobicoke
4	Stanley Haidasz, P.C.	Toronto-Parkdale	Toronto
5	Lowell Murray, P.C.	Pakenham	Ottawa
6	Peter Alan Stollery	Bloor and Yonge	Toronto
7	Peter Michael Pitfield, P.C.	Ontario	Ottawa
8	William McDonough Kelly	Port Severn	Missassauga
9	Jerahmiel S. Grafstein	Metro Toronto	Toronto
10	Anne C. Cools	Toronto Centre	Toronto
11	Colin Kenny	Rideau	Ottawa
12	Richard J. Doyle	North York	Toronto
13	Norman K. Atkins	Markham	Toronto
14	Consiglio Di Nino	Ontario	Downsview
15	James Francis Kelleher P.C.	Ontario	Sault Ste. Marie
16	John Trevor Eyton	Ontario	Caledon
17	Wilbert Joseph Keon	Ottawa	Ottawa
18	Michael Arthur Meighen	St. Marys	Toronto
19	Marjory LeBreton	Ontario	Manotick
20	Landon Pearson	Ontario	Ottawa
21	Jean-Robert Gauthier	Ottawa-Vanier	Ottawa
22	Lorna Milne	Ontario	Brampton
23	Marie-P. Poulin	Northern Ontario	Ottawa
24	Eugene Francis Whelan, P.C.	Western Ontario	Ottawa

SENATORS BY PROVINCE AND TERRITORY

QUÉBEC—24

	Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
	THE HONOURABLE		
1	Maurice Riel, P.C.	Chaouinigane	Montréal
2	Pietro Rizzuto	Repentigny	Laval-sur-le-Lac
3	Dalia Wood	Montarville	Montréal
4	Guy Charbonneau	Kennebec	Montréal
5	Jacques Hébert	Wellington	Montréal
6	Leo E. Kolber	Victoria	Westmount
7	Philippe Deane Gigantès	De Lorimier	Montréal
8	Charlie Watt	Inkerman	Kuujjuaq
9	Pierre De Bané, P.C.	De la Vallière	Montréal
10	Michel Cogger	Lauzon	Knowlton
11	Roch Bolduc	Golfe	Ste-Foy
12	Gérald-A. Beaudoin	Rigaud	Hull
13	John Lynch-Staunton	Grandville	Georgeville
14	Jean-Claude Rivest	Stadacona	Québec
15	Marcel Prud'homme, P.C	La Salle	Montréal
16	Fernand Roberge	Saurel.	Ville de Saint-Laurent
17	W. David Angus	Alma	Montréal
18	Pierre Claude Nolin	De Salaberry.	Québec
19	Lise Bacon	De la Durantaye	Laval
20	Céline Hervieux-Payette, P.C.	Bedford	Montréal
21	Shirley Maheu	Rougemont	Ville de Saint-Laurent
22	Léonce Mercier	Mille Isles	Saint-Élie d'Orford
23			
24			

SENATORS BY PROVINCE—MARITIME DIVISION

NOVA SCOTIA—10

	Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
	THE HONOURABLE		
1	John Michael Macdonald	Cape Breton	North Sydney
2	Bernard Alasdair Graham	The Highlands	Sydney
3	John B. Stewart	Antigonish-Guysborough	Bayfield
4	Michael Kirby	South Shore	Halifax
5	Finlay MacDonald	Halifax	Halifax
6	Gérald J. Comeau	Nova Scotia	Church Point
7	Donald H. Oliver	Nova Scotia	Halifax
8	John Buchanan, P.C.	Nova Scotia	Halifax
9	J. Michael Forrestall	Dartmouth and Eastern Shore	Dartmouth
10	Wilfred P. Moore	Nova Scotia	Chester

NEW BRUNSWICK—10

	THE HONOURABLE		
1	Louis-J. Robichaud	L'Acadie-Acadia	Saint-Antoine
2	Eymard Georges Corbin	Grand-Sault	Grand-Sault
3	Brenda Mary Robertson	Riverview	Shediac
4	Jean-Maurice Simard	Edmundston	Edmundston
5	Noël A. Kinsella	New Brunswick	Fredericton
6	Mabel Margaret DeWare	New Brunswick	Moncton
7	Erminie Joy Cohen	New Brunswick	Saint John
8	John G. Bryden	New Brunswick	Bayfield
9	Rose-Marie Losier-Cool	New Brunswick	Bathurst
10	Joseph Gérard Lauri P. Landry	New Brunswick	Cap-Pelé

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—4

	THE HONOURABLE		
1	Orville Howard Phillips	Prince	Alberton
2	Mark Lorne Bonnell	Murray River	Murray River
3	Eileen Rossiter	Prince Edward Island	Charlottetown
4	Doris M. Anderson	Prince Edward Island	St. Peter's, Kings County

SENATORS BY PROVINCE—WESTERN DIVISION

MANITOBA—6

	Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
	THE HONOURABLE		
1	Gildas L. Molgat, Speaker	Ste-Rose	Winnipeg
2	Mira Spivak	Manitoba	Winnipeg
3	Janis Johnson	Winnipeg-Interlake	Winnipeg
4	Terrance R. Stratton	Manitoba	St. Norbert
5	Duncan James Jessiman	Manitoba	Winnipeg
6	Sharon Carstairs	Manitoba	Victoria Beach

BRITISH COLUMBIA—6

	THE HONOURABLE		
1	Edward M. Lawson	Vancouver	Vancouver
2	Raymond J. Perrault, P.C.	North Shore-Burnaby	North Vancouver
3	Jack Austin, P.C.	Vancouver South	Vancouver
4	Leonard Stephen Marchand, P.C.	Kamloops-Cariboo	Kamloops
5	Pat Carney, P.C.	British Columbia	Vancouver
6	Gerry St. Germain, P.C.	Langley-Pemberton-Whistler	Maple Ridge

SASKATCHEWAN—6

	THE HONOURABLE		
1	Herbert O. Sparrow	Saskatchewan	North Battleford
2	Reginald James Balfour	Regina	Regina
3	Eric Arthur Berntson	Saskatchewan	Saskatoon
4	A. Raynell Andreychuk	Regina	Regina
5	Leonard J. Gustafson	Saskatchewan	Macoun
6	David Tkachuk	Saskatchewan	Saskatoon

ALBERTA—6

	THE HONOURABLE		
1	Daniel Phillip Hays	Calgary	Calgary
2	Joyce Fairbairn, P.C.	Lethbridge	Lethbridge
3	Walter Patrick Twinn	Alberta	Slave Lake
4	Ronald D. Ghitter	Alberta	Calgary
5	Nicholas William Taylor.	Alberta	Bon Accord
6	Jean B. Forest	Alberta	Edmonton

SENATORS BY PROVINCE AND TERRITORY

NEWFOUNDLAND—6

	Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
	THE HONOURABLE		
1	William John Petten	Bonavista	St. John's
2	Philip Derek Lewis	St. John's	St. John's
3	C. William Doody	Harbour Main-Bell Island	St. John's
4	Ethel Cochrane	Newfoundland	Port-au-Port
5	Gerald R. Ottenheimer	Waterford-Trinity	St. John's
6	William H. Rompkey, P.C.	Newfoundland	North West River, Labrador

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES—1

	THE HONOURABLE		
1	Willie Adams	Northwest Territories	Rankin Inlet

YUKON TERRITORY—1

	THE HONOURABLE		
1	Paul Lucier	Yukon	Whitehorse

DIVISIONAL SENATORS

	Senator	Designation	Post Office Address
	THE HONOURABLE		
1	Normand Grimard	Québec	Noranda, Qué.
2	Thérèse Lavoie-Roux	Québec	Montréal, Qué.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, December 3, 1996