

As background information, please find attached a copy of the Public Accountability Principles for Canadian Airport Authorities. The chart attached thereto outlines some of the many other differences between Local Airport Authorities and Canadian Airport Authorities.

(For text of documents, see appendix, p. 1023)

The second question is why is Bill C-22, (An Act respecting certain agreements concerning the redevelopment and operation of Terminal 1 and 2 at Lester B. Pearson International Airport) necessary in order to proceed with a Canadian Airport Authority.

At this time, there exists a lease agreement between the federal government and T1T2 Development Corporation. Succinctly, there cannot be a second lease concluded for the same property to two different entities. The Minister of Transport has on several occasions outlined the larger questions behind the desire to cancel the agreement with T1T2 Development.

That a lease exists is sufficient to interfere with the options for proper public policy determination of the future of Lester B. Pearson International Airport.

The previous government wanted to give the best assets from the premier airport facility into the control of the private sector. This government wants to ensure that a consistent, logical National Airport Policy is applied at all airports, certainly including Pearson.

The Minister of Transport has recognized the Greater Toronto Airports Authority, including the federal nominees to the Board. He has indicated on several occasions that his department will work with this body in an advisory capacity only, since its true role continues to be hindered by the lack of resolution of Bill C-22.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

CRIMINAL CODE

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming the debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Gigantès, seconded by the Honourable Senator Hébert, for the second reading of Bill S-6, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (dangerous intoxication).—(Honourable Senator Petten).

Hon. Erminie J. Cohen: Honourable senators, sixteen days between November 25 and December 10 have been set aside as part of an international campaign called "Sixteen Days of Activism Against Gender Violence." The 16-day period begins

on the International Day Against Violence Against Women and ends on the United Nations Human Rights Day.

These internationally observed days also have a Canadian element, because this period includes the anniversary date of the Montreal massacre, when 16 female engineering students were killed by a man determined to kill feminists.

In light of this campaign week, it is fitting that I rise to speak on Bill S-6 and the ruling of dangerous intoxication.

I should like to thank Senator Gigantès for introducing this bill and for moving the debate on this controversial issue into the legislative arena where it belongs. Canadians have been shocked by the Supreme Court's ruling on the *Daviault* case in Quebec last September, and the precedents which have piled up since then in Alberta, Ontario, Quebec and Prince Edward Island. The cases have all been of men assaulting women while under the influence of alcohol or drugs.

The specifics of the bill's wording will be discussed further when the bill reaches committee. For now, I wish to focus my support on the principle of this legislation, and on the implications that this whole debate has had, and will have, on the women of Canada.

The Honourable Mary Collins, the minister responsible for the status of women in the last government, called for zero tolerance on violence against women. It was the recommendation of a national panel on violence against women that travelled across the country gathering evidence, and also of a report released last year by the Standing Committee on Justice and the Solicitor General in the other place.

What does zero tolerance mean? To quote the former minister, it means to stand up and say, "I simply won't tolerate violence." It means that we adopt an attitude which says violence is never acceptable behaviour. It means that we back up that attitude with action.

I should like to hear the Minister of Justice commit himself to zero tolerance of violence against women. What I have been hearing instead is that this issue is only a small part of a much larger review of the Criminal Code. That kind of approach raises two important problems which I believe the government must address. The first is that because this is a "women's issue" it does not warrant as high a profile on the government's priority list as the more esoteric questions arising from this historic overhaul of the Criminal Code. Responsibility for so-called women's issues, traditionally, have been shuffled off to a junior minister. That started to change under the last government, and I wish to suggest that the trend continue.

Well over 90 per cent of rapes and incidents of domestic violence happen to women and children. That makes it very much a women's issue. An issue of importance to 52 per cent of the Canadian population is not an issue to be sloughed off to a junior minister. I hope that the Minister of Justice will recognize that, and speak out on behalf of his female constituency.

I would argue for a little common sense to be added to this review process. The government needs to be looking not only at the theoretical implications of the law but also at its practical effects.