

S.O. 21

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM

PROCEDURES APPLICABLE TO CONFIDENCE AND NON-
CONFIDENCE MOTIONS

Mr. Stanley Hudecki (Hamilton West): Madam Speaker, a curious anomaly exists in Parliamentary procedure. Not infrequently a Member of Parliament must vote along with other Members of his or her Party on a resolution which he or she favours but which he or she must oppose on the grounds that the vote is a confidence vote. Voting against it would defeat the Party.

The rational question is: why must there be a separation of voting in Parliament into two broad categories, confidence votes and non-confidence votes? The parliamentary rules indicate that all expenditures of money are considered confidence votes, as are resolutions arising out of the Throne Speech. As for non-confidence votes, these include motions in Private Members Bills and Bills proposed by the Opposition on so-called Opposition days. However, each year the Opposition may declare not more than two of these motions as confidence motions. Accordingly the Government in power must vote against these motions whether it agrees or disagrees with them.

It is little wonder that the general public labels politicians as primarily interested in maintaining themselves elected or ensuring future election, rather than supporting enlightened and constructive legislation.

● (1110)

I feel that the rationale for having these two broad categories of motions should be discussed in some detail before the Committee on Parliamentary Reform for clarification and possible revision.

* * *

CHARTER OF RIGHTS

APPLICATION TO UNBORN INFANTS

Mr. Gus Mitges (Grey-Simcoe): Madam Speaker, Dr. Jerome Lejeune, professor of fundamental genetics at the University of Paris, and a world renowned authority in this field, has stated unequivocally that life begins at conception, that there is no diversity among his fellow scientists as to the truth of this statement, and that they are at a loss to understand the continual controversy regarding this matter.

The Charter of Rights and Freedoms as it is now constituted does not recognize and does not apply to the fetus or the unborn as a living person. This is one of the reasons, Madam Speaker, that I and 23 other Members of Parliament voted against the amended Constitution and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Section 7 of the Charter gives everyone the right to life, liberty, security of the person, and the right not to be deprived of the same except by due process of the law. This right must also apply to the living unborn fetus because such persons are obviously not in a position to speak for themselves.

It is up to us to speak on their behalf to save and protect their lives.

Therefore, I call upon the Government to correct this monstrous inequity in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms by making the necessary changes and thus eliminate the wilful slaughter and murder of some 60,000 to 80,000 Canadians every year across Canada.

* * *

WESTERN GRAIN TRANSPORTATION ACT

DISADVANTAGES TO WESTERN HOG INDUSTRY

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Madam Speaker, this is the relevant part of a telegram from a constituent:

—our business is pig breeding. We are proud of our western Canadian base and of our accomplishments as a world exporter of breeding stock and a major supplier to the industry in western Canada. We now face legislation which threatens our future. We see the impact so great so as to have us consider moving our base to a location favoured with a better future free of political interference.

—concerning the Crow question we totally oppose the capitulation to Quebec as aided and abetted by the wheat pool bureaucrats. We fully support the 67,000 farmer commodity coalition position that Gilson compromise be adopted completely.

We feel the Pepin proposal of 50 per cent to producers, 50 per cent to the railroads with a review is absolutely the furthest we can afford to go.

The current legislation before Parliament will cost our own operations \$217,000 in direct feed cost disadvantage each year. This type of distortion over time will reduce and then eliminate our customers and industry and us with them.

—secure a future for diversified agriculture in western Canada. Failure to get amendments will mean the sentencing of western agriculture to primary grain production, marketing its grain through an inefficient handling system reliant on subsidies to compete in world markets.

Bill C-155 unless amended, will impair and perhaps destroy the hog industry—

Madam Speaker: Order, please. The Hon. Member for Simcoe North (Mr. Lewis).

* * *

INCOME TAX

COMPLICATED NATURE OF TAX RETURN FORMS

Mr. Doug Lewis (Simcoe North): Madam Speaker, it is becoming more and more obvious that the Income Tax Act and the forms are far too complicated for the average Canadian to understand. In 1979, 43 per cent of the returns submitted were revised by the Income Tax Department. In 1980 that figure grew to 45 per cent, and in 1981 it was 46 per cent. When almost half of the returns submitted have to be revised by the Income Tax Department, it is an indication that the form is too complicated.

In addition, I would point out to the House that the federal Government sends refunds to 11 million Canadians each year. That is 75 per cent of Canadians who submitted returns. Clearly, the income tax tables are adjusted and weighted in favour of the federal Government. I suggest to the House that