

Estimates for 1992-93 and 1994-95 reveal some interesting statistics. In 1992-93, the last full fiscal year of the Mulroney government, it cost \$39.8 million to support 39 ministers. This breaks down to an average of \$1.02 million per minister. For fiscal 1994-95, the Chrétien government has budgeted \$25 million for 22 full-time cabinet ministers, not including secretaries of state. That works out to an average of \$1.1 million per minister. So much for the slashed budgets for political staffers and operating costs. The Prime Minister can still claim the Red Book promised savings of over \$10 million, but it is thanks to his predecessor who showed him the way to do it.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: Hear, hear!

Senator Berntson: As for political staff, some ministers have been quite ingenious at circumventing this restriction, going through the back door. As has been reported, a popular route is to use departmental funds to hire political staffers. In this fashion, the hiring does not show up in a ministerial office budget.

I wish to be clear here, honourable senators. I am not against the hiring of political staff when required, or the need for a cabinet with secretaries of state. That should be the choice of the government of the day. I do, however, disagree strongly with the juxtaposing of these decisions in a holier-than-thou attitude with those of the previous government. In the last campaign, the Liberal Party made all sorts of promises relating to the size and operational aspects of its government, should it be elected. Canadians are now witnessing a systematic reversal of all of these promises. "A different structure to government" is really the same as presented by Kim Campbell. "A smaller cabinet" is really larger. "A smaller ministerial office budget for political staff" has not become a reality. In fact, the use of departmental budgets that can be almost limitless makes this type of hiring more difficult to monitor.

Colleagues, the rhetoric and the hypocrisy from the new government will soon have to end. The Liberal Party was elected to govern Canada for the next four years and, as we know only too well in this chamber, their first year has not been very productive, to say the least. They were elected on a series of promises: A Liberal government would scrap the GST. I have three questions, honourable senators. What will replace it? When? Where? A Liberal government would renegotiate NAFTA. Whoops! Did I say "renegotiate"? A Liberal government would review the appointment process. Is that before or after Justice Hugessen's inquiry into the Immigration and Refugee Board? A Liberal government would end double dipping. When?

We are well aware of the promises, but where is the action? Where is the legislation? If it were not for Kim Campbell's initiative in June of 1993, the few bills that are trickling before us would not be here. This government should stop trying to make borrowed ideas look like their own, whether they be trade policy or the structure of government, and get on with the business of governing Canada.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and bill read second time.

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

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

On motion of Senator Kenny, bill referred to the Standing Senate Committee on Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources.

• (1530)

EUTHANASIA AND ASSISTED SUICIDE

EXTENSION OF FINAL REPORT DATE— REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ADOPTED AS AMENDED

The Senate proceeded to consideration of the third report of the Special Senate Committee on Euthanasia and Assisted Suicide, presented in the Senate on November 24, 1994.

Hon. Joan Neiman moved the adoption of the report.

She said: Honourable senators, last February, when this house approved the formation of a committee to study the legal, ethical, and social aspects of euthanasia and assisted suicide, it directed us to make our final report on December 15 of this year. At that time, of course, the deadline seemed realistic and achievable. In the interim, our committee has worked long hours and heard from numerous witnesses. To date, we have heard somewhere over 100 witnesses.

Part of our mandate has been to involve and inform the public. We have had an enormous public response, to the extent that at this point we are having to tell people who want to come before us and give us their opinions that we no longer have the time. We are trying to select witnesses who bring a perspective that we have not already heard sometimes two and three and four different times. At this point, we still have witnesses, and we will be hearing from them during the next few weeks. In the final week before the House adjourns on December 16, we will be hearing from both the Minister of Health and the Minister of Justice.

We are therefore asking for an extension until March 15, 1995, in order to give us sufficient time to prepare the kind of report that this subject deserves.

Before asking for your approval, with leave, I should like to amend my original motion of the other day, as follows:

That the report be amended by adding the following words: "and that the Committee retain all powers necessary to publicize the findings of the Committee contained in the Final Report until March 30, 1995."

I am asking to amend the original motion on the advice of some of my colleagues, who tell me that when we do make our final report on March 15, the committee will be *functus* and can no longer operate. This causes difficulties, particularly in trying to complete the publicity attendant to the tabling of the report. This amendment will give us a couple weeks' cushion to tidy up that part of the necessary sequence to the tabling of the report.