

## STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S.O. 22

[English]

### CANADA PENSION PLAN

#### BENEFITS PAID TO CONVICTED WIFE MURDERER

**Mr. John Nunziata (York South-Weston):** Mr. Speaker, a case has come to my attention that deserves urgent consideration by the Government. On February 16, 1980, 28 year-old Barbara Desgroseilliers of Cornwall was brutally strangled to death. Her husband, Robert Desgroseilliers, and his cousin, Michel Quesnel, were found guilty of the killing and were sentenced to life imprisonment for first degree murder. Mr. Desgroseilliers is serving his sentence in Millhaven Maximum Security Penitentiary. Michel Quesnel was murdered in prison in Joyceville last July.

After the murder, Robert Desgroseilliers applied for and received approximately \$1,300 in a lump sum death benefit. He also applied for, and is receiving, survivor's benefits under the Canada Pension Plan. As a result of the murder of his wife, for which he was convicted, he is now receiving \$282 per month from the Government of Canada, and \$87 of this amount is going to support Mr. Desgroseilliers' daughter.

I call on both the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp) and the Solicitor General (Mr. MacKay) to investigate this outrageous case immediately, and to provide complete details on how it could have been allowed to happen.

Legislation must be introduced as soon as possible to clarify the law so that this situation cannot occur again.

While there is a common law tradition that those convicted of crimes must never be permitted to profit from those crimes, the statute law must be made more specific. Steps should also be taken by the Canada Pension Plan officials to recover all moneys paid to Mr. Desgroseilliers, at the earliest possible opportunity.

**Mr. Speaker:** I must advise the Hon. Member that his time has expired.

\* \* \*

### FINANCE

#### EFFECT OF TAX DEDUCTIONS ON CORPORATE MERGERS

**Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to a full page advertisement paid for by Wood, Gundy which appears in today's *Globe and Mail* lauding the \$8 billion in corporate takeovers which occurred in 1985. These takeovers were a small fraction of the total merger activity in Canada in 1985, but all the mergers had one thing in common, they were facilitated by our income tax system. Takeover costs are deductible as business expenses. Interest costs of capital are deductible. Even the cost of the full page advertisement is deductible.

We are entitled to ask what the ordinary Canadian people get in return for these tax concessions. Are we getting new

S.O. 22

jobs? The answer is no. Are we getting new production capacity? No. Are we getting more efficient plants to help Canadians compete? No. What we are getting are paper transactions which re-arrange share holdings but which do not produce genuine economic growth or new permanent jobs.

If the Conservative Government is serious about employment, then it needs to examine our tax system to see that tax concessions lead to investment and meaningful permanent jobs. We need something more than the part-time jobs the Government has been creating since September, 1984.

The New Democratic Party says meaningful tax reform is a priority for 1986.

\* \* \*

### ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

#### ACID RAIN—EFFECT OF CANADIAN AND UNITED STATES ENVOYS' REPORT

**Mr. Joe Reid (St. Catharines):** Mr. Speaker, the recent report by the United States and Canadian acid rain envoys will do what American lobbies, environmentalists, and the several Liberal Governments of this country failed to do in the last decade.

The United States has now officially acknowledged the existence of acid rain, and in the words of Allan Gotlieb, Canadian Ambassador to Washington:

If the President endorses the report, which I expect he will, the Americans will have moved off the dime.

It is now a question of how fast it can be done and what resources can be brought to bear on this matter of international concern. Work can now begin on a timetable with a program of action, before which we did not even have a common starting point.

The Liberal opposition critic harps on a one-year delay. Did he not read Mr. Gotlieb's comment? Was he not part of a Government that failed in the last eight years to get the Americans to move "off the dime"? Was he not a Minister of the Environment with an opportunity, but who failed to follow up on the 1980 memorandum of intent and the 1981 committee recommendations? Is he not a person who knows how hard it is to get any action from the U.S. side on environmental matters? Should he not now make a New Year's resolution to work constructively with the Government in the interests of Canadians who continue to suffer from pollution and acid rain fall-out?