

well as setting pay scales? Why is there a clause giving Cabinet the power to alter the by-laws of Crown corporations?

I will tell you why, Mr. Speaker. It is very simple. It is because, to a Liberal, parliamentary accountability is a contradiction in terms. Everyone in Canada now realizes the low esteem in which the lame duck Prime Minister views the institution of Parliament and its Members. He has expressed it publicly. It often borders on contempt. Government by Order in Council has become a way of life under that administration, and Parliament has been turned into a rubber-stamping organization. Its only corollary that I can think of, Mr. Speaker, is the Politburo of the U.S.S.R. State and centralized control is the desired effect. That is why we have Bills such as this before us. That is why this Bill gives all the power over Crown corporations to the Cabinet. It would never occur to Members opposite to seek the approval of Parliament when it comes to spending the taxpayers' money, as has been pointed out by the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor) this afternoon.

Lack of accountability and lack of trust is what this is all about. In this morning's *The Toronto Sun* there is an editorial about the Canada Unity Information Office, which is a Crown corporation. It indicates that it began in a tiny way with \$10 million, which is mere peanuts to the Government. The CUIO was supposed to counter separatist rhetoric. Perhaps it did, but the CUIO is still operating after the separatist business is all washed up and its budget has tripled. I would like to quote the final paragraphs of that editorial, Mr. Speaker. It says:

And that's how come the CUIO got into the business of printing a 52 page booklet praising the virtues of eight Quebec Liberal MPs to a few hundred thousand households in their ridings.

The booklet didn't cost that much—just \$158,000—but multiply that by all the other patronage, rip-offs and handouts our governments give their favorite sons and daughters and it adds up.

A lean, small, accountable bureaucracy is not just knee-jerk thinking. It's necessary to prevent layer after layer of civil servants, playing with taxpayers' dollars in a moral vacuum that destroys the citizens' trust in government and bureaucrats' own moral worth.

That is why we want accountability in this Bill. We know what the Government has done. You cannot trust it. Canadians do not trust it. Canadians will remember that from 1968 to 1984 Government spending increased 751 per cent. That is why we want accountability. The deficit increased almost 6,000 per cent and the interest on that debt increased over 1,300 per cent. Right now 31 per cent of the Government's revenue goes for interest alone. That is why it is not trusted. That is why it must be replaced. That is why we oppose this legislation. People will remember that the dollar fell from 93 cents U.S. to 78 cents. Business bankruptcies increased 314 per cent. Should we trust it not to have accountability? I hope not. Why has all this come about? Because the Government did not care to consult Canadians on how their own dollars were being spent.

• (1700)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): It being five o'clock, the Chair regrets to interrupt the Hon. Member. He may have

Tenure of Senators

time to complete his remarks when the Bill is before the House again.

[Translation]

It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS—PUBLIC BILLS

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): Shall all orders and items preceding item No. 25 stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): Agreed.

* * *

[English]

CONSTITUTION ACTS, 1867-1984

MEASURE RESPECTING TENURE OF SENATORS

Mr. Bill Yurko (Edmonton East) moved that Bill C-231, an Act to amend the Constitution Acts, 1867-1984 (tenure of Senators) be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to bring before the House once again the urgent matter of Senate reform. More specifically, I move second reading of Bill C-231, an Act to amend the Constitution Acts, 1867-1984, tenure of Senators.

Permit me to read the last paragraph on page 41 of the Special Joint Committee on Senate Reform. It reads:

The question may be asked: if a system of direct election is not established, should the term of those senators who have already been appointed for life or to age 75 be shortened? We believe that this question should be addressed if and when it becomes clear that an elected Senate is unlikely to be put in place. It may, however, be noted that the turnover of membership in the Senate has been fairly rapid. From 1970 to 1980, for example, 59 per cent of the seats in the Senate became vacant. This would suggest that not many years would elapse before most Senators had been appointed for nine-year terms.

I would like to read the explanatory note from Bill C-231 before I get into my remarks. It reads:

Recently, the Special Joint Committee on Senate Reform recommended a single nine-year term for newly appointed Senators. If implemented, such a recommendation would create three classes of Senators: those appointed for life, those appointed until age seventy-five, and finally, those appointed for a nine-year term.

This bill, in contrast, would create one class of Senators by making all existing appointments subject to a nine-year term or retirement at seventy-five years of age, whichever occurred first. Because this amendment would not affect paragraph 42(1)(b) of the Constitution Act, 1982, 'the powers of the Senate and the method of selecting Senators', it could be passed by Parliament exclusively