

Private Members' Business

A lot of the other aspects of that pension can be defended. If we are going to draw people in mid-life and mid-career and ask them to leave a career, perhaps another pension plan or a business or professional practice of some sort, we have to provide them with a basis for recovering their financial security, at least to a limited degree. That is what the short number of years required can do.

However the notion that someone can come here for a brief period of time and leave at a very young age, as was recently done by the member for Shefford—and this is certainly not a criticism of him, this is the system that exists—and then go out and draw a rather substantial annual income for the rest of his life is objectionable to the public. I think the public is quite right in raising some questions about that.

To return to the piece of legislation that my friend from Annapolis Valley—Hants brings forward, the principle inherent in this bill is very good. I congratulate him for bringing this idea before the House. I would like to see something like this in legislation and that is why I rose today to add my support to his legislation.

[Translation]

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate this morning in the debate on Bill C-290.

[English]

I have nothing against the bill in question but the worst shortcomings of the process of reviewing Order in Council appointments right now are not addressed in it. This bill is virtually identical to the procedure we have at the moment, save and except the salary component. I will get back to that in a little while.

Standing Order 110 provides at the present time that:

A Minister of the Crown shall lay upon the Table a certified copy of an Order in Council, stating that a certain individual has been appointed to a certain non-judicial post, not later than five sitting days after the Order in Council is published in the *Canada Gazette*. The same shall be deemed to have been referred to a standing committee specified at the time of tabling, pursuant to Standing Order 32(6) for its consideration during a period not exceeding thirty sitting days.

Right now we have a process which is virtually identical to what is asked for in the bill. The bill says that within 30 days we will publish in the *Canada Gazette* the salary that is being paid to the position appointed.

Right now in all of the cases that are tabled in this House we have the salary range table. Say we are talking about a member of the National Parole Board. He would earn \$93,000 to \$106,000. Frankly, when I see who is appointed whether the person is nominated at minimum or maximum salary, \$93,000 or \$106,000, will not affect my decision much.

• (1140)

That information is available and that is what I want to see. If we can get a more precise amount, fine. I do not object to having the amount pinpointed even more exactly. I am not sure this is the improvement in the rules that is necessary now, although it is desirable.

The Order in Council review process that we have right now is deficient in a number of ways, first of all in the way it deals with the 64 or so officers of Parliament. The committee reviewing the appointments should have a right of veto. That was recommended by the committee chaired by Mr. McGrath when he was a member of this House.

He had recommended that for some 64 appointments the committee of this House charged with reviewing the appointments should have an outright power of veto. Naturally that would not be used very often and possibly never at all. This would show that Parliament is the master, that Parliament is supreme.

It would be an excellent way of demonstrating that at the very least as it deals with those officers who report to us: the Auditor General, the Sergeant-at-Arms, the Clerk of the House, the Librarian of Parliament, the Commissioner of Official Languages and so on. There are some 64 of these officers. That is a rule which needs to be improved for all hon. members.

The Order in Council review process, the scrutiny of the Order in Council nominees, is deficient at the present time. I was a member of a committee that reviewed the appointment of Dalton Camp when he worked for a while in the Prime Minister's office some years ago.