

Supply

My last point is this. It seems to me this bill is an example of two types of justice. Here is why. People accused of misconduct or of leaving without just cause are automatically denied any benefits. Therefore, these people are sentenced before being judged. They will have to appeal the decision and it will take weeks if not months before they are told that they were right or wrong. The sentence is imposed before a judgment is rendered.

Under the Criminal Code or the civil code, a person is not sentenced before judgment. For example, there are a number of Conservative members accused or convicted of fraud who still get their full salary and enjoy all their privileges because a judgment has yet to be rendered or because they have appealed the verdict.

Is the member not a little uncomfortable since, on the one hand, he wants to arbitrarily cut off thousands of workers, while on the other hand he is sitting here in this House next to people who have been accused and convicted of fraud and who still receive their full salary? Is this not an example of two kinds of justice, one for the rich and one for the poor?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): I ask the hon. members to be cautious when they refer to events or issues which are still before the courts. Again I recognize the member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie.

Mr. Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that I did not mention any names. Those are established facts and I did not presume that these people were innocent or guilty. Consequently, in no way have I violated the *sub judice* rule. Absolutely not.

Therefore, I believe my comments were pertinent because they refer to facts.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): I take note of the comment made by the hon. member but the Chair does not want to take any chance and is simply advising members to be careful in this respect.

Mr. Robitaille: Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out to the Chair that my colleague did suggest that some members

had been convicted of fraud and were still sitting in this House. This is absolutely not true.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): I do not want this issue to drag on. I believe what I said earlier puts an end to this discussion. I simply want to say that it is a matter of being cautious and, as far as the Chair is concerned, the comment made by the member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie ended the debate.

[English]

Mr. McCreath: Mr. Speaker, I think I understood the intent of the hon member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie in that he was trying to illustrate his argument.

I noticed his reference to Bill 105, which in my understanding is not what is before the House. I too picked up his reference to purported allegations against members of this House and in particular, the reference he made to members of this party.

Some would suggest that there are many kinds of impropriety, one being to run for public office under the banner of a political party that stands for a strong united Canada, then walk away from that party, draw a cheque and represent a party that seeks to destroy and take apart this country. Some would suggest that is a fraudulent activity. I will not say that because I would not want to transgress the rules of this House.

I want to deal with the issue that my hon. friend raised. I think all members of this House are concerned about the fact that just cause is a meaningless concept if, when individuals leave for what they believe to be just cause, in fact end up not receiving the benefit to which they are entitled.

As I indicated earlier, my colleague from Ottawa West of the Liberal Party brought forward an amendment to Bill C-21. It was a good amendment in my judgment and I supported it, unlike her colleagues. It set out a series of categories. Since that time, we have had an abundance of decisions, 50 pages of decisions. I would be glad to make a copy of this available to my hon. friend who is raising what are legitimate concerns from his perspective.