

enforcement authorities are. I do not think there is any problem when we deal with police officers. These are trained people. However, there is another designation which comes under "enforcement authority". It says:

(a) any person, or member of a class of persons, designated by the minister responsible for administering the enactment creating the contravention . . .

● (1450)

We ought to have clarification as to who the government will empower to issue the tickets. We ought to know that these people have had some training, at least, and that they are not just employees, say, of the Parks branch. If we are dealing with the right to issue a ticket to someone for a contravention, the employees should have some training and be in a position to exercise due authority.

I realize that when we discuss the principle of the bill, we should not go into the clauses of the bill, and yet I do not know how I can deal with the principle without dealing with the specifics.

Senator Frith: Some clauses contain principles, of course.

Senator Molgat: I am referring to clause 8.(1)(f) on page 4 under "Designation of Offences". It finishes off by saying:

. . . as the case may be, in the parts of Canada that are specified in the regulations.

This concerns me. If I read this correctly, under this subclause the law will not be the same across Canada. It specifically refers to the "parts of Canada that are specified in the regulations". I would hope that, whatever the outcome of the bill, it would apply throughout Canada, unless the Speaker or Senator Balfour can give us an explanation as to what is meant by "parts of Canada". Is there some logical explanation? Off hand, I cannot see any.

If, for example, we are dealing with national parks, which are to be covered under the bill, surely the rules would be the same in all national parks. There would be no exemptions. Similarly, several departments are now apparently prepared to proceed under this new law—Agriculture Canada, Atomic Energy Control Board, Canadian Ports Corporation, Communications Canada, National Defence, Environment Canada, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, National Capital Commission, Public Works Canada, St. Lawrence Seaway Authority and Transport Canada. Therefore, many government departments are prepared to use this new law in order to simplify their procedures. I agree with that, but the law ought to be the same wherever you are in Canada.

Hon. R. James Balfour: Honourable senators —

The Hon. the Acting Speaker: Honourable senators, I wish to inform the Senate that if Senator Balfour speaks, his speech will have the effect of closing the debate.

Senator Balfour: Honourable senators, Senator Molgat has raised some significant and important issues with respect to this legislation, which I think could most appropriately be

explored in greater depth in committee. Therefore, I recommend that Bill C-46 be sent to committee for further study.

Motion agreed to and bill read second time.

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

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

On motion of Senator Balfour, bill referred to the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs.

[Translation]

DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY ACT

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING

Hon. Jacques Hébert moved the second reading of Bill C-306, to amend the Department of Forestry Act and other acts in consequence thereof.

Honourable senators, it is a pleasure to move the second reading of Private Members' Bill C-306, An Act to amend the Department of Forestry Act and to make related amendments to other acts.

This legislation was introduced by the hon. member for Restigouche—Chaleur, Mr. Guy Arseneault, to change the name of the Department in the English version of the Act by substituting the name "Department of Forests" for "Department of Forestry".

According to the sponsor of this private member's bill, such a change is required for the following reasons: the French and English designations do not match; the term "Forestry" is misleading and the name of the Department must be a reflection of its mandate.

Incidentally, I should point out that the Department of Forestry supports this bill which was voted unanimously.

The main reason for this change is to make sure that the name of the Department be seen to mean the same thing both in French and in English. The translation for "Ministère des Forêts" is "Department of Forests". Unfortunately, the French "Forêts" was translated by "Forestry", which does not convey the same meaning.

[English]

The second reason behind this proposed change is that the term "forestry" is confusing. According to the report of the Standing Senate Committee on Forestry and Fisheries entitled "Canada's Forests: The Federal Role", the term "forestry" conveys different meanings to different people. For instance, to many environmentalists, the term denotes the lumber industry, while industry representatives and others feel it covers all forestry operations and their management. In short, the word "forestry" seems to focus far more on industrial development than does the word "forests", which has a far broader connotation.

Third, the mandate of the new forestry department stipulates that the ministry must play a key role in promoting the