

Oral Questions

years ago, one Paul Débien, was wrongly singled out by the RCMP drug squad and he had a very difficult time getting redress. In fact I am not certain if he ever did.

I come back to my first question. Is the Minister prepared to strengthen the process of accountability so that agents who make an error, supposing it is an honest error, will have it duly noted and the people affected will have an apology and some measure of quick redress by the Government, rather than having to go through a lengthy court process with a lot of dissembling as has been the case in the past?

Hon. Bob Kaplan (Solicitor General of Canada): Madam Speaker, if it is a complaint affecting national security and this agency, you do not have to go to court, although at present, as the Hon. Member knows, the redress is to the Solicitor General. There is less of the appearance and apparatus review and safeguard in that way than this Bill would propose. I draw the Hon. Member's attention to clause 37 which says that any person may make a complaint to the review committee with respect to anything done by the Service. I would urge the Hon. Member and his party to support this Bill as it is in principle, and take it to committee for a full hearing. The situation he has raised with me I think is covered by the Bill; whether additional machinery could be provided is something I think the committee should examine.

* * *

INCOME TAX**TAXATION OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO PENSION FUNDS**

Miss Pat Carney (Vancouver Centre): Madam Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Finance who is present but not in his seat. To save the time of the House, may I defer my question until he is in his place?

Mr. Paproski: He is only half present.

Miss Carney: Madam Speaker, many Canadians are facing possible double taxation of their pensions because the amount of pension contributions they are required to pay exceeds the limit they may deduct in calculating their income taxes. That means they are being taxed on both their contributions as well as the benefits when they take them. What steps will the Minister take to rectify this unfair situation?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member knows that at the present time there is a tax exemption for up to \$3,500 for contributions to pension funds. There are certain groups, comparatively better off, who obviously have more money to contribute to pension funds than the maximum \$3,500. These are subject to taxation, as she knows. I am examining this situation. The limit of \$3,500 has not been increased for some time.

I have asked my officials to review this situation and I would intend to publish a working document in the next few months which I would like to see addressed and examined, particularly in the context of the review of pensions that Parliament is

proceeding with at the present time, to try to ensure that there is equity in the treatment of all concerned.

Mr. Nielsen: Will there be a photo opportunity?

REQUEST THAT TAX EXEMPTION LIMIT BE RAISED

Miss Pat Carney (Vancouver Centre): Madam Speaker, my supplementary is directed to the same Minister. I would hope he addresses the limits for people who are self employed and whose pension fund is their only source of pension. Would the Minister consider raising the limit on an interim basis until the pension review and reform work have been completed?

[Translation]

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): No, Madam Speaker.

* * *

[English]

CANADIAN SECURITY INTELLIGENCE SERVICE**REQUEST THAT SUBJECT MATTER OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION BE STUDIED BY COMMITTEE**

Hon. Walter Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Madam Speaker, my question is supplementary to those put to the Solicitor General with respect to the security Bill.

It is interesting, Madam Speaker, that almost each group in the country who has commented on the security Bill has been very much concerned about it and has raised some grave questions about it. The Minister himself has questioned the Bill and some of its provisions by saying that he is open to amendment. Would the Minister not consider it appropriate if, rather than proceeding with the Bill at this time, the subject matter could be sent to a committee of this House to be reviewed over a definite period of time in order that those groups could be heard, Parliament be consulted with respect to the Bill, and time would not be wasted? There are many who do not question the necessity of a Security Service for Canada but do indeed question the methods adopted by the Minister. Would he consider that?

Hon. Bob Kaplan (Solicitor General of Canada): Well, I would like to have some time to consider that and know if that is the position which would commend itself to other Members of the Hon. Member's Party and other Parties on the floor.

Mr. Broadbent: Yes.

Mr. Kaplan: But I must say at the heart of it a Security Service is hundreds and hundreds of men and women who are working in the interests of the national security of the country. I think Royal Commissions have recommended that they and their work, and national security in general, require a much greater degree of direction and control from Parliament than the national security agency has received in the past. I would not want it to be taken, by agreeing to such a proposal, that the Government was not committed in general, and to a rather