

RCMP Act

the elaborate hearing and adjudication procedures set out in the Bill. Obviously a recommendation for transfer can constitute a punitive action which is in some cases greater than an actual breach of discipline. A member could be required to sell his home, incurring substantial financial loss.

The Hon. Member for York South-Weston spoke of a number of concerns yesterday, for example, the concern that under the provisions for discharge and demotion there were procedural inadequacies. Also there is a concern that under the grievance procedure the Commissioner is the final and binding authority, subject to review under the Federal Court Act. Both the Canadian Civil Liberties Association and the Association of 17 Divisions are of the strong view that if a grievance deals with dismissal, suspension, financial penalty or questions of basic policy, it should be subject to review, if not by the external review committee, then certainly by the Public Service Staff Relations Board.

I am pleased to note that the concern with respect to the membership of the external review committee is one which the committee will be addressing. The previous Bill provided that there had to be three members in the internal review process, and this Bill goes on to provide that one of those members should have legal training. That is a good recommendation. However, we agree as well that no member of the force, or person who has ever served on the force, should be entitled to be a member of this external review committee in order that it be seen to be completely independent. I also support the provision for a time limit with respect to decisions on grievances as was suggested by the Association of 17 Divisions.

The protection against possible future incrimination with respect to statements made in the course of investigations should apply to pre-existing criminal charges or disciplinary proceedings. As the Bill now stands, it does not do so. I suggest that that is a serious flaw in the Bill which may very well run counter to the provisions of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

● (1200)

The question of whether or not compelled testimony can be used in future disciplinary proceedings is one which was raised as well in the course of the Senate Committee hearings and is one with which the legislative committee will want to deal carefully. As well, I have noted the question of pay and allowances. I believe that in the absence of some form of collective bargaining—and I believe there should be full collective bargaining for members of the force—there should be a formula incorporated into regulations to ensure that the RCMP do not fall behind other police forces in Canada with respect to pay and benefits.

I emphasize that we do recognize that this Bill does constitute a significant step forward. The present provisions for dealing with public complaints, grievances and discipline are inadequate. However, I hope the Government will be prepared to heed the representations which have been made by the Civil Liberties Association, the Association of 17 Divisions, Attorneys General and other concerned Canadians and give this Bill

the teeth that are lacking in it so far. More important, I hope that it will give this process the integrity and appearance of integrity and independence which is so important in this essential area.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): The question is on the following motion: Mr. Wise, for Mr. Beatty and seconded by Mr. Hnatyshyn, moves that Bill C-65, an Act to amend the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act and other Acts in consequence thereof, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Motion carried on division.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

* * *

[*English*]

**SEEDS ACT
CANADA GRAIN ACT
MEASURE TO AMEND**

Hon. John Wise (Minister of Agriculture) moved that Bill C-64, and Act to amend the Seeds Act and the Canada Grain Act be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the amendments with respect to the Seeds Act contained in this Bill which was introduced in the House of Commons today, Bill C-64, are obviously long overdue. I welcome this opportunity to outline them to my colleagues in the House and I welcome the opportunity to discuss them in brief form.

The Bill will benefit Canada's important seed growing industry and will further enhance the country's already enviable reputation as a reliable supplier of quality grain. It will help to ensure that farmers get what they pay for and that the owners of seed varieties are in a fair competitive position.

A great deal has happened in the seed growing industry since the last time any major amendments were made to the Seeds Act in this House back in 1959. The industry has doubled in size during the past eight years both in terms of acreage and of authorized establishments. It generates about