

Supply

absurdities. I repeat, who did the people of Delorimier vote for on October 25, senator? Again, who do you represent?

I would like to shed light on something. I would like to quote from two articles that appeared in *La Presse* to show the intellectual rigour of this senator from Delorimier. In September 1992, this senator said about the Charlottetown Agreement:

A no vote in Quebec would not be a return to the current status quo. Under the current status quo, all the premiers from English Canada approved the agreement which, as Professor André Tremblay said, contains all the concessions that English Canada would be prepared to grant to Quebec.

Two months after the Charlottetown Accord failed, this senator said: "Obviously, if the rest of Canada could not swallow the Charlottetown Accord, Quebecers now have only two choices, namely the status quo and independence without previously negotiated economic association".

Two months earlier he was saying that the status quo was not an option and two months later, that it was the only option. What a wise man!

In the wake of the Charlottetown Accord he said this:

The rest of Canada will never allow the Bloc Quebecois to wield influence by holding the balance of power.

Someone who was appointed in a non-democratic fashion and who represents a Quebec division dares to speak against democracy. That is the Senate for you!

An hon. member: Against duly elected representatives.

Mr. Sauvageau: Against duly elected representatives!

• (1735)

Let us now look at these exorbitant costs of this other House, by the way. According to the Auditor General's report of 1991, the Financial Administration Act could not apply to the Senate. The Auditor General says that the usual accountability mechanisms do not apply to the Senate. Without such mechanisms or appropriate alternatives, neither the Senate nor the people can be sure that it is managed with sufficient concern for economy and efficiency.

Moreover, the expenditures declared by senators in the public accounts are incomplete. The Auditor General's report tells us that neither the Senate's policies nor its practices provide assurance that all the amounts reimbursed were spent for the operation of the Senate. The Senate administrators cannot distinguish the Senate's operating expenses from the senators' personal expenses.

That is serious, Mr. Speaker. But what are the Senate's actual expenses? In 1990-91, the total budget of the Upper House was \$40 million and today it is \$43 million. Need I say that this is public money, funds provided by the taxpayers, and the Auditor General's report tells us that there is no control over this

spending. Forty-three million dollars with which we could create jobs for the unemployed is wasted.

The senators have a very busy schedule but they still have plenty of free time. They sat for 29 days in the four months from February to May 1993 and they collect an annual salary of \$64,400, which is public, plus a \$10,000 non-taxable expense allowance, which is also public, to which we must add 64 travel points to which they are entitled and this is also public.

This is a little more than the average salary of taxpayers who work 40 hours a week. We could go on talking for a long time about what journalist Claude Picher in *La Presse* calls a list of horrors.

For example, based on the Auditor General's report for 1990-91, I would like to ask you a question now, Mr. Speaker. Because I do not know her division, can I name Senator Cochrane or not?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I want to clarify some points at the end of your comments, for the benefit of the House.

I simply want to say that your 10 minutes have now expired. However, I will recognize you for another minute if you want to conclude your remarks.

Mr. Sauvageau: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, a public report released by the Auditor General refers to Senator Cochrane, not to mention any names, who, on top of her \$60,000 salary, as I was saying earlier, and her expense allowance of \$9,000, cost Canadian taxpayers \$35,000 in travelling expenses and \$49,000 in office-related costs. Canada does have its own museum of horrors and its own villains in that museum.

In the minute I have left, I want to point out how absurd it is, in a democratic system, to have a house of non-elected members with decision-making power. Canadian dignitaries who are so proud of their democracy have no lesson to teach to other countries. When will they abolish that House which costs Quebecers and Canadians \$43 million every year, even though it is ineffective and non-democratic?

We are in the midst of an economic crisis and our debt increases by thousands of dollars every minute. The federal government cannot continue to waste public money on a useless institution.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Before proceeding to the period of questions and comments following the intervention from the hon. member for Terrebonne, I would like to bring some clarification to the issue of naming either members of Parliament or senators.

[Translation]

Those comments are from the Annotated Standing Orders and refer to Standing Order 18(3): "What is acceptable depends largely on the circumstances, but personal attacks, insults, obscene language or words which question a Members' or a