



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 135 • NUMBER 013 • 1st SESSION • 36th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Wednesday, October 8, 1997

Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent

CONTENTS

(Table of Contents appears at back of this issue.)

The House of Commons Debates are also available on the
Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:

<http://www.parl.gc.ca>

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, October 8, 1997

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

• (1400)

The Speaker: As is our practice on Wednesday we will now sing *O Canada*, and we will be led by the hon. member for Winnipeg—Transcona.

[*Editor's Note: Members sang the national anthem*]

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

BETTY TRAINOR

Mr. Ted McWhinney (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Gwendolyn Elizabeth, Betty, Trainor who died in Vancouver on September 22 was a graduate of the Montreal General Hospital School of Nursing and of the Sloane Hospital in the Columbia Medical Centre in New York.

During her active practice of nursing in the Yukon Territory she also founded the Yukon Native Arts, a lifeskills program for native youth. Later in Ottawa she was cofounder of the Tweedsmuir Centre, which pioneered the use of megavitamins in the treatment of mental and behavioural disorders.

She and her husband, the late Justice William Joseph Trainor of the Supreme Court of B.C., were leaders in Vancouver in community affairs activities relating to handicapped persons and in church welfare organizations.

* * *

KINGSTON PENITENTIARY

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, as we speak, guards at Kingston Penitentiary are on the picket lines. They are saying the institution is out of control and ready to blow.

Kingston Pen was previously designated a multilevel institution dealing primarily with protective custody inmates. It now houses a

greater percentage of non-protective custody offenders who are defiant, aggressive and organized. Past incidents reflect this aggression with numerous staff assaults, two hostage takings and two riots since August 27.

Unfortunately the physical layout and the daily operations at Kingston Pen are not conducive to managing these maximum security offenders. Staff now work in extremely hazardous situations.

The guards want action from management and have come up with their own cost effective solutions. Once again it is the frontline workers who can predict what is going to happen if these changes are not forthcoming.

Mark my words. If management does not act now, we are going to see destruction, both physical and human, that will put the \$3.1 million Headingley riot to shame.

* * *

NEWMARKET YOUTH CENTRE

Mrs. Karen Kraft Sloan (York North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Pat McIntosh and Janice McLaughlin have worked tirelessly with the Newmarket area youth in an equal and full participatory partnership to make a longtime dream reality. The Newmarket Youth Centre opens its doors next week.

Young people were hired through a Canada youth service corps project to complete renovations for the centre. The local Canada HRD office, the town of Newmarket and local business and community service partners should be commended for their contribution to and support of Newmarket area youth.

Surrounding communities have shown interest in replicating the unique Newmarket Youth Centre model as it has proven to be an effective and successful way to empower and engage youth with community partners.

* * *

TOURISM

Mr. Paul Bonwick (Simcoe—Grey, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for my first S.O. 31 statement I would like to concentrate on the importance of the tourism industry and the role it is playing in my riding.

The riding of Simcoe—Grey is one of the most beautiful areas in Canada. It offers the majestic Niagara escarpment rolling down into the pristine waters of Georgian Bay. With areas like Wasaga

S. O. 31

Beach, home of the world's largest freshwater beach, and Collingwood's beautiful turn of the century main street, it is a tourist's dream.

• (1405)

Tourism is a significant and vital component of the Simcoe—Grey economy. It is a major job creator and a great many small businesses depend on tourism for their livelihood.

I am proud of the initiatives brought forward by the government to assist in the continued development of the tourism industry. I am proud of the great strides made within the tourism industry within our riding.

I encourage all Canadians to come and visit my riding and see the many splendours it has to offer.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PROVINCIAL RIDING OF DUPLESSIS

Mr. Ghislain Fournier (Manicouagan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. member for Bourassa exhibited the pettiness and partisan narrow-mindedness for which he is already legendary, by omitting congratulations to the newly elected PQ member for Duplessis, Normand Duguay, a native of the village of Rivière-au-Tonnerre in my riding.

The population of this fine North Shore riding, the country of Gilles Vigneault, which is known for its vast spaces and its people's joie de vivre, has staunchly and proudly supported the sovereignist option.

The people of Duplessis withstood the Liberals' blackmail and threats during this campaign.

In the context of cuts Quebec has been forced into by the federal government, this election of October 6 is a great victory, and a tie between the parties.

People of the North Shore—

The Speaker: I regret having to interrupt the hon. member. The hon. member for Scarborough Centre now has the floor.

* * *

[*English*]

BERG CHILLING SYSTEMS

Mr. John Cannis (Scarborough Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I recognize a company in my riding of Scarborough Centre that has had major successes in the international trade community.

Berg Chilling Systems is a family owned business employing 81 people which manufactures industrial refrigeration systems. Its systems are exported to 29 countries around the world, and in 1996 exports accounted for 68% of its total sales.

On Monday of this week the company was awarded the 1997 Canada Export Award by the Minister for International Trade at a ceremony in Quebec City. This award recognizes outstanding performance by a smaller exporter in the global forum.

I congratulate Berg's chairman Lorne Berggren and its president Don Berggren on their achievements. I wish them and the company continued success.

* * *

BCE INC.

Mr. Jim Pankiw (Saskatoon—Humboldt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, monopoly giant BCE wants it all and this Liberal government is giving it to them on a silver platter. Despite the Liberals' commitment to competition and growing small businesses, here are the facts.

BCE's Teleglobe was just licensed by the CRTC to operate a wireless cable system in Ontario. BCE's Bell Canada has been licensed to operate the Expressvu direct to home satellite system.

Now the Liberals have created team Canada to assist small business with exports, and who have the Liberals named as chief of team Canada? Why, BCE chairman Lynton Wilson. Surprise. Surprise. And who has contributed over \$70,000 to the Liberals in the past two years? BCE. Surprise. Surprise.

So listen up small business. Here is how to get preferential treatment from the Liberals. Become a subsidiary of BCE and donate liberally to the Liberal Party of Canada.

It should not have to be that way. The Liberal Party is an affront to small business.

* * *

BREAST CANCER

Mr. David Pratt (Nepean—Carleton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, many members have spoken recently on the subject of breast cancer, a devastating disease that has become the leading cause of death among women 35 to 55 years of age.

Breast cancer has had a profound effect on my own family. My grandmother had breast cancer 35 years ago and survived. While, I lost my mother to breast cancer five years ago, I am very proud to say that one of my sisters is now doing leading edge research at the University of Ottawa.

Every 30 minutes another Canadian woman is diagnosed with breast cancer and more than 5,400 women die of the disease every year. While these statistics are alarming, we have made great strides in the fight against this disease. The benefits of extensive awareness programs and early detection screening are starting to be felt as mortality rates for breast cancer in Canada have begun to decline.

October is breast cancer awareness month. Let us all wear the pink ribbon and show our support for women confronting this dreaded disease.

* * *

[Translation]

PUBLIC FINANCES

Mr. Paul Mercier (Terrebonne—Blainville, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister trumpets in his Speech from the Throne “We have put our public finances in order”. Patting himself on the back like that makes one wonder, when one knows that these same Liberals are the ones who left behind a \$38 billion deficit when they were booted out of office in 1984.

• (1410)

Let us remember the performance of the present Prime Minister when he was Minister of Finance from 1977 to 1979. He doubled the deficit. He increased the federal government’s debt by 50%.

But that impudence changes to cynicism when one realizes that the Liberals are reducing the deficit with provincial funds for health and education, as well as with funds hijacked from employment insurance.

They are tickled pink to announce that they will soon be able to put out a fire which they themselves started. The Liberal pyromaniac turns into a firefighter, and then uses the neighbour’s well to extinguish the fire he has started. Really now!

* * *

SAGUENAY AND MANITOBA FLOODS

Mr. Claude Drouin (Beauce, Lib.): I am honoured to be able to pay tribute to the extraordinary efforts of the thousands of courageous and determined men and women volunteers and Canadian military personnel who fought the Saguenay floods in Quebec and the Red River floods in Manitoba.

A mere mention of these two events is sufficient to remind us of the immensity of the disasters which struck these areas and the immensity of the needs they created. These unprecedented natural disasters led to the greatest expression of generosity and solidarity modern-day Canada has ever known.

The Saguenay and Manitoba floods have not only left their mark on the geography of those regions. They have also left their mark on the hearts of all Canadians, with an undying memory of a people standing up against adversity and reaching out to help those in need.

[English]

S. O. 31

CANADA PENSION PLAN

Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, once again under these Liberals we see the voices of Canadians being trampled under the hooves of a government that clearly prefers dictatorship to democracy.

By the introduction of closure on Bill C-2, the Liberals are saying one of two things: that the Liberals just do not care if the Canadian people are concerned about the biggest tax grab in the history of this country; or that the Liberals just do not want the Canadian people to find out exactly how destructive these new pension proposals are.

Whatever their agenda, the bottom line is that these Liberals are refusing to allow enough informed and constructive debate to clearly show Canadians what this is all about. The last time I checked, this was a democratic country. It is obvious today that those Liberals do not believe that.

* * *

MANITOBA FLOOD

Mr. David Iftody (Provencher, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba flood has changed us forever. Today in the riding of Provencher many families are still in the process of returning to a normal life. However the generosity expressed from across Canada was remarkable and will never be forgotten.

Thousands of donations and boxes full of food and clothing arrived to help fellow Canadians. Thousands of volunteers selflessly gave their time, skill and energy to ensure the safety of their fellow citizens. Our communities will never forget the francophone armed forces and reserve members from Quebec who fought alongside Mennonite families to save their homes.

These demonstrations of unity from across Canada express who we really are as a people. Today I am most proud to be here in the House of Commons to recognize these great Canadians.

* * *

CANADA PENSION PLAN

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, many members would agree, I am sure all, that this Parliament is off to a good start. We face difficulties with five official parties but the general feeling is that we are off to a good start.

In that context I would like to say how much we in the NDP regret that the government has fouled that good start by moving to closure on a major national policy issue after only one day of debate. One day of debate. The Liberals cannot even tolerate a day

Oral Questions

and a half of debate before they move to closure on CPP reform, a major policy issue.

Shame on the Liberals. Shame on the Liberals. Shame on the Liberals. This is a travesty when it comes to parliamentary democracy and they should be ashamed of themselves. Was it the NDP amendment they were ashamed of? They did not want to vote for it, they did not want to discuss it. What is going on?

* * *

• (1415)

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: My colleagues before we begin oral questions, I would like to draw your attention to the presence in the gallery of Mr. Arthur Donahoe, Secretary General of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

AIRBUS

Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt about it, Irish eyes are smiling today. Brian Mulroney's legal team will now cash a cheque from the taxpayers of Canada for more than \$2 million. This is what the government had to pay out for the bungled Airbus investigation. Libel lawyers across the country are calling this payout immense, astonishing and stunning.

My question for the prime minister is will he apologize to Canadian taxpayers for this fiasco and in particular for the huge payout to former Prime Minister Mulroney?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there was an inquiry by the RCMP and there were some problems that arose during that inquiry. This led to a case which would have taken the government to court and the case was settled out of court.

There was an arbitrator, Mr. Justice Gold, who asked the government to pay the bills which were submitted by the lawyers and the public relations people working for Mr. Mulroney. It was agreed between the Minister of Justice at the time and the lawyers at the moment of settlement that the bills would be presented and those that were justified were to be paid and they have been paid.

Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in January the justice minister at the time swore that the government would never pay Mulroney's legal team a cent. That is what he said. Now they have cut a cheque so big that Dennis

Rodman would blush. This cheque includes \$600,000 for Luc Lavoie, the PR man hired to polish Mulroney's image.

Why would the government pay Brian Mulroney's bills including his huge PR tab but it will not pick up the \$30,000 legal bill for the government's fall—

The Speaker: The hon. solicitor general.

• (1420)

Hon. Andy Scott (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the amount of the settlement was decided by former Chief Justice Gold.

It was determined in that settlement that he would determine what were reasonable expenses. It has been done. It is binding. Case closed.

Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, this whole problem started when the current health minister was the justice minister. In pursuing this politically motivated goose chase he embarrassed himself, embarrassed the justice department, embarrassed the RCMP, embarrassed the House and cost taxpayers millions of dollars.

My question is for the Prime Minister. Will there be any disciplinary consequences for the current Minister of Health, or will the government spend another \$600,000 rehabilitating his image?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as is the custom, investigations by the RCMP are always made at arm's length from the government. It is always like that.

We do not intervene in investigations by the RCMP. They decide when there will be an investigation. They decide when to launch actions against individuals and they decide when to settle out of court.

It is the practice in Canada that the government does not dictate to the police.

* * *

RCMP INVESTIGATIONS

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, a senior Liberal Party official, Luc Desbiens, said that there is absolutely nothing unusual about the RCMP raiding Liberal Party offices.

I want to tell the prime minister that I will not put up or shut up until the prime minister coughs up whose offices—cabinet ministers, MPs, the prime minister or any departmental official—have been raided by the RCMP in this ongoing Shawinigan shemozzle.

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I hope the hon. member will start to use the truth once in a while.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien: Yesterday she accused somebody who made a statement that money had been given on a project

Oral Questions

being built in my riding. The person who was dealing with the department of manpower, a Mr. Thibault, has never given a cent to the Liberal Party.

The hon. member mixed up a company from Winnipeg with a company from Montreal. She should have her facts before getting up in the House of Commons.

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it would be funny if it were not so sad that the Liberal Party initiated the investigation a long time before the campaign started in late April. This was only made public five days after the election campaign was over.

We have a real problem with that, even if the minister and prime minister do not happen to have a problem with that.

Who was it over on that side? I want them to stand and say "We told the RCMP to hold off until after the election" because it would be an embarrassment.

Hon. Andy Scott (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope the hon. member realizes it would be absolutely inappropriate to suggest that anybody would tell the RCMP to hold off on an investigation.

* * *

[Translation]

RCMP INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Human Resources Development said not only that the Société québécoise du développement de la main-d'oeuvre had lists of people waiting for grants, but that the political minister responsible for the region was aware of the contents of this list.

• (1425)

Under what pretext is the Minister of Human Resources Development providing confidential lists of people waiting for grants to the political ministers responsible for the regions, and who instructed him to do so?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased to remind the House that the very strength of this system of consultations in connection with the transitional job creation fund is that my department checks with Ms. Harel, based on our government's spending commitments to the Société québécoise de la main-d'oeuvre, the regional minister and socio-economic organizations. Opposition members are consulted in their own ridings about each of the proposals.

I think that this kind of checking is what makes our system so strong.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the minister is well aware that opposition members are consulted only after his department has made its recommendation, not before.

Given his code of conduct, how can the Prime Minister allow confidential information about people waiting for grants to be released to political ministers responsible for the regions, and what is his motive?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we check with people well informed about their ridings. I assume members know their ridings, and the businesses in them, well.

We check out the reliability of businesses. We want to find out whether they are businesses that will create jobs meeting the riding's socio-economic needs. If I consult the Government of Quebec, I can certainly consult the Government of Canada's minister responsible for the region.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Guy Gendron reported on CBC radio that Jacques Roy, who works in the office of the President of the Treasury Board, is allegedly under investigation in this matter of influence peddling.

My question is for the Prime Minister. Under the government's code of ethics, should an employee working in a minister's office, who is under investigation by the RCMP for influence peddling, not be immediately suspended until the matter he or she is involved in has been resolved?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think we have to be very careful here, because I myself am not aware that someone in my office may be under investigation.

Questions put by the opposition parties may sully the reputation of innocent people. I think it would be advisable for my hon. colleagues to wait for an investigation to be completed, for charges to be laid and for guilt to be established before taking general information—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Roberval.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, there are very serious allegations of influence peddling currently sully the government.

Is the President of the Treasury Board telling us that, after the revelations made yesterday on CBC radio, he did not bother to check with his employee, a member of his political staff, if indeed he was implicated in this matter?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Again, Mr. Speaker, this is an investigation in which no charges have been laid so far.

Oral Questions

The investigation is under way. I think the opposition should be very careful not to create a situation of injustice where it could drag in the mud someone who may end up not being charged with anything. Let the investigation take its course.

* * *

[English]

CANADA PENSION PLAN

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the prime minister.

Millions and millions of Canadians under the age of 60 will be affected by the government changes to the Canada pension plan and yet, after only a few hours in second reading, the government is choking off parliamentary debate, shutting down on democracy.

● (1430)

Is it the prime minister's intention to govern parliament by closure? What is it he is trying to hide?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is the reference of legislation to a committee. There were two motions by the opposition refusing to send the legislation to committee to be studied by members of Parliament. They were just trying to delay debate rather than having a real debate.

It is in committee where members and people will be able to appear and make representations, but your members do not want to have a debate on it.

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, when did the government become afraid of the 301 members elected to represent—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Ms. Alexa McDonough: The government has provided no information on the adequacy of retirement incomes for Canadians as a result of these changes. Yet it is determined to ram the legislation through.

Why will the prime minister not permit more debate before he makes mistakes that Canadians will have to live with for the rest of their lives?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is opposition members who are refusing to have a real debate. They want to postpone. They want to have a vote, to have no debate.

The government is absolutely committed—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: I am sure we are interested in both the questions and the answers. I know all hon. members would want to hear the answer. I know I would.

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, if they want to have a debate they should withdraw their tactics not to have a debate.

There will be a debate but we want to refer it to a committee so that it will be studied. It is an agreement that the Minister of Finance made with all provincial governments. All provincial governments agreed to the legislation and this government is committed, along with the provincial governments, to having the legislation passed by Christmas.

* * *

[Translation]

RCMP INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. André Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska, PC): Mr. Speaker, on Monday I asked the President of the Treasury Board whether one or more employees in his office had given confidential information to Pierre Gobeil, who is currently under investigation by the RCMP. The minister's response was no.

Can the minister reaffirm in this House that Jacques Roy, an employee in his Montreal office who is paid by Treasury Board and who receives his orders directly from the minister, never had any contact with Pierre Gobeil or shared with him confidential information connecting the government with influence peddling?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again, the opposition party is naming people who, so far as I know, have not been charged with anything. An investigation is under way to determine just what happened and whether charges should be laid.

The opposition should refrain from tarnishing the reputation of people who may be innocent and should wait for the investigation to be completed.

[English]

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, we now know for a fact that the RCMP visited the Liberal Party headquarters. We know for a fact that there is an individual currently working in the minister's office under investigation by the RCMP.

● (1435)

My question is for the President of the Treasury Board. Could he confirm for us that Mr. Jacques Roy was under the direct orders of his executive assistance, Mr. Marcel Proulx?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again we hear innuendoes and accusations from the other side that are not based on fact.

The proper and equitable course to follow is to wait until the RCMP investigation has taken place to see if they will lay charges and what happens if they do. That is the proper way, and not to start affecting the reputations of a number of people who must be held to be innocent until otherwise proven.

*Oral Questions***CANADA PENSION PLAN**

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, what do the letters CPP stand for? The Liberals will say that they stand for Canada pension plan, but young Canadians do not believe they will collect this pension. They say it stands for crazy political promises.

Now the Liberals are cutting off debate after only seven hours. They are shutting down the democratic process.

My question is for the Prime Minister. Does CPP really stand for cowardly parliamentary procedure?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, CPP stands for a basic pension for all working Canadians.

CPP stands for a disability pension for Canadians when they need it, which the Reform Party refuses to offer.

CPP stands for maternity benefits, which the Reform Party refuses to offer.

CPP stands for the Canadian government standing behind the Canadian people, which the Reform Party refuses to do.

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals want to cut short the debate because they do not want Canadian employers to find out that their payroll taxes are about to jump sky high.

They do not want employees to know that their take home pay is about to shrink. They do not want self-employed entrepreneurs to know that they will soon be paying a tenth of their earnings straight into the finance minister's slush fund.

The Tories gave us the hated GST. Are the Liberals not just the same, by pushing through a bigger pension tax?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for over two years consultation on the CPP took place right across the country, not only by the federal government but every provincial government had discussions in their houses.

There will be a legislative committee which will deal with it. Hearings will be held.

The issue is why the Reform Party is trying to crush this debate.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

The Speaker: I am having a difficult time hearing the questions and answers.

[Translation]

RCMP INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in the light of the very serious allegations in the matter of influence peddling, how does the Prime Minister explain the government's ethics section not ordering an immediate internal inquiry in the offices of ministers who may be involved and the fact that it has taken over seven months, questions from the opposition and from journalists and a report by the CBC pointing the finger at an employee of the minister to discover that the minister still has not found out what was going on in his office?

• (1440)

Is there some rule in the Liberal code of ethics providing that, in the case of this government, "if nobody can see you, nobody can catch you"?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the proof of this government's integrity lies in the fact that the person who requested an investigation by the RCMP was our colleague the Minister of Human Resources Development. He asked for an investigation as soon as he learned of the allegations.

I do not think anyone, especially the Bloc Québécois, is in a position to point the finger on the subject of taking the appropriate action in such a case.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I think the minister was saved by the bell. He was in the process of telling us something he could never finish.

This minister learned last night on the CBC that one of his assistants may be directly involved in the worst affair to hit the government in three years and here he is saying he did not know, he did not check.

We want to know whether or not he checked with his executive assistant—

The Speaker: The President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure has the floor.

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again, no charges have been laid in this investigation. An investigation is underway, and the Bloc is busy sullyng the reputation of people who have not yet had a chance to defend themselves.

The right thing to do is to ignore the gossip mongers who are tarnishing people's reputations. Right now, we just have to let the investigation take its course.

Oral Questions

[English]

CANADA PENSION PLAN

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the finance minister's massive CPP rip-off is a little bit like a dead fish. The longer it sits in public the more it stinks. Cutting off debate after one and a half days is a massive insult to Canadians.

Why will the finance minister not admit that he is ramming through this tax to avoid the stink of this bad deal sticking to his own political ambitions?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is very clear that debate will be extensive. There will be debate in committee and debate in this House.

The real issue is why is Reform trying to frustrate that debate? Is Reform worried that there will be an examination of its own alternative? Is Reform afraid that the Canadian people will see how the Reform plan will leave the poor and the middle class unattended? Is Reform afraid that we will see how much its plan will gouge the Canadian people? What is Reform afraid of?

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, this is the largest single tax grab in Canadian history: \$10 billion a year by the time the government is done hiking premiums; a 73% increase.

When is the minister going to change the name from 24 Sussex Drive to 24 Sucks us Dry?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member had all night to think about that and if that is the best that he can come up with it is pretty pathetic.

There is only one issue here. We support the Canada pension plan. Reform would destroy it.

* * *

[Translation]

RCMP INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Human Resources Development informed us that he forwarded lists of grant applicants to the ministers responsible for the regions, including the President of Treasury Board.

• (1445)

I would like to know whether the President of Treasury Board, as the minister responsible for the Quebec region, receives such lists from other ministers. I am thinking of the Minister of Industry, the Minister of Public Works and Government Services, the Minister of Health and the Minister of Transport. Does he receive such lists from other departments or only from the Minister of Human Resources Development?

The Speaker: Dear colleagues, in my opinion, this question is out of order.

[English]

Once again, we are not talking about a political responsibility. The question must go to the administrative responsibility of a member of the government or the government. I will permit a second question. The first one is not in order.

[Translation]

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Human Resources Development is telling us how his department operates and that the minister responsible for the Quebec region is consulted by the Department of Human Resources Development.

It seems to me that it would be natural to want to know whether he is consulted as part of the overall government procedure, not just that for one department. We have been told about the procedure for one department. I would like to know whether it is the same for other departments.

These are not just political, but administrative responsibilities, as part of the administrative procedure.

The Speaker: In his question, the hon. member mentioned the Minister of Human Resources Development and what he did. If the Minister of Human Resources Development wishes to reply to this question, he may do so.

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will avail myself of your kind invitation to clarify what I said a bit earlier. It was not lists but proposals that I forwarded to ministers and individual members. The consultations are about proposals, not lists. They are based on proposals.

* * *

[English]

CANADA PENSION PLAN

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the House is now debating the single largest tax increase in Canadian history, a \$10 billion tax grab that will take 10% off the paycheques of every Canadian and will forever make the future of young Canadians poorer.

My question is for the Prime Minister. Why is he shutting down debate on the single largest tax increase ever considered by Parliament after only seven hours of debate? Why?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member refers, as have his colleagues, to the 9.9%. He says that this is a very large increase and it is. It is however substantially lower than the 13% increase that would arise from the alternative plan.

Oral Questions

Since the hon. member will have the opportunity to ask a supplementary question, will he stand in the House now and tell us how much the Reform cost premiums will be? Will they be 13% or will they be higher?

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I want to do just that, which is why I am furious that this government is trying to gag Parliament on this issue.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Jason Kenney: This closure “displays the utter disdain with which the government treats the Canadian people”. That was said by the Minister of Foreign Affairs in 1993 when the Tories did the same thing. “I am shocked—This is just terrible. Shame on the government”. That is what the House leader said in 1991.

My question is for the Prime Minister. When the Mulroney Tories tried to invoke closure on the GST, the Liberals cried bloody murder. Why is he doing the same thing? Why is acting like a hypocrite? Why is he—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Finance.

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that is sheer bunk. There will be debate in committee. There will be debate at report stage. There will be debate in the House at third reading. There will be plenty of opportunity for debate.

• (1450)

The Reform Party is afraid to state that its plan does not hold water. Reformers are afraid that Canadians are going to understand the degree to which they are going to let the Canadian citizenry fall.

* * *

[*Translation*]

RCMP INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister responsible for Public Works and Government Services.

I would like to know from this minister whether, in awarding contracts, project by project, file by file, his procedure is as his colleague at human resources development has indicated, to transmit the lists to the President of Treasury Board, to the minister responsible for the Quebec region?

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once contracts have been

awarded, we have a policy of issuing a press release on the contracts awarded. Therefore, they are available to everyone.

* * *

[*English*]

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

Ms. Marlene Jennings (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to know, inquiring Canadians across this country would like to know, what the minister responsible for consumer affairs plans to do to protect Canadian consumers from the kind of unscrupulous business practices in long term vehicle leasing that was reported in today's and yesterday's media.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure I can maintain the level of excitement at this point.

Regulating leasing is the responsibility of the provincial governments. However, the Automobile Protection Association study which was funded in part by my ministry and which was reported in the media over the last two days we had hoped would reveal a widespread use by automobile dealers of the new plain language, full disclosure lease agreement that we introduced with much fanfare with my colleague from Ontario a few months ago.

Unfortunately—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Fraser Valley.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the foreign affairs minister said in 1993 that limiting debate brings this House into disgrace. Then the Deputy Speaker, the member for Kingston and the Islands, said “What we have here is an absolute scandal in terms of the government's unwillingness to listen to the representatives of the people in the House. Never before has the government been so reluctant to engage in public debate”.

What is the matter over there? Why do you not want to have public debate on the floor of the House of Commons?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we wanted to have a debate. It is the opposition that moved a motion to make sure that there would be no debate.

They said “Let's postpone the debate”. They do not want to debate for six months so the government cannot respect the agreement that we made with the provinces. We want a debate. They do not want a debate so we are going to send it to committee and there will be a debate there.

Oral Questions

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we have been waiting to debate the CPP thing all summer. We were elected by the people of this country to come to the floor of the House of Commons and debate the issues of the day.

This government is restricting our privileges as members of Parliament to debate the most important tax issue of this Parliament.

Why does the government restrict the debate for ordinary members of the House of Commons when it is the most important tax issue in this entire Parliament?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): I will be very calm, Mr. Speaker. It is very difficult to be more ridiculous than that because they moved a motion that says "This House declines to give second reading to Bill C-2". They declined to have a debate. They are afraid to debate. They want to postpone it for six months.

We want a debate. We want to hear witnesses. We will have a debate and witnesses will come. We will have a CPP that will protect Canadian pensioners in the 21st century.

* * *

• (1455)

CANADA PENSION PLAN

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

In his previous answers the Prime Minister, I am sure, made an honest mistake when he implied that all the provinces had agreed to the CPP changes. The fact is that the NDP governments of B.C., Saskatchewan and the Yukon did not agree, precisely because they shared our concerns about the effects of the changes on women, the disabled, survivors, etc. It is precisely because of those concerns that we moved an amendment to make debate on this possible.

Surely the Prime Minister has not forgotten when he was in opposition these motions are inclined to provoke debate?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is very clear what has happened. I mentioned this in the House the other day.

There are two ways to destroy the Canada pension plan. One is to confront it like the Reform. The other way is to do what the NDP is doing, which is to refuse to recognize the absolute need for change.

The only issue before the House now is why is the NDP walking arm and arm toward the sunset and out of the CPP?

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the finance minister knows that it is intellectually dishonest in the extreme to suggest that we want to destroy the Canada pension

plan. It is precisely because we want to strengthen it that we want a debate.

My question is for the Prime Minister. He said it was the amendments that caused him to move closure. Is he saying or will he say now that in the absence of such amendments on future legislation there will be no closure, there will be no time allocation and we will be able to debate legislation until such time as the matter is confirmed or dismissed?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the NDP members want to preserve the Canada pension plan then why will they not let it go to committee where there can be debate?

Why will they not let the Canada pension plan pass so that we can get on to track two where we can deal with mandatory credit splitting, where we can deal with a number of issues that were raised by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance? Why will the NDP not attempt for once to be constructive as we head into the 21st century?

* * *

GRAIN TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. It is on an issue close and dear to the hearts of western Canadian farmers.

The CTA inquiry into the grain transportation delays that occurred last winter were supposed to start in August. It was then delayed to November and now it is delayed until April. Agricultural stakeholders have said repeatedly that they want immediate action taken on this issue and will no longer accept political juggling acts. Producers want to hear solutions now before more problems arise.

My question: Is your department prepared to immediately conduct—

The Speaker: The hon. member should always address his question to the Chair. I will permit the hon. Minister of Transport to reply the preamble.

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in terms of grain transportation we have been preoccupied with the fast movement of grain since we came into office. We have had a number of meetings with stakeholders across the country attended by my colleagues in agriculture and the minister responsible for the wheat board.

The CTA appeal does cause us some problem but it is not stopping us from doing the preparatory work, such as the terms of reference, going over lists of individuals who could conduct the review. Even though recruitment has not started we are working toward an early start.

Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is for the Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board.

Producers are sick and tired of hearing who is to blame for the grain delays of last winter. What producers want is a government that is not going to hide behind the CTA hearing in an effort to prolong the initiative. Producers want answers now.

The minister has the authority but will he have the political will? Will he walk out of the House, call the chief commissioner of the CWB, cancel the CTA hearing and get a review under way right now?

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the legal delay is certainly frustrating for everyone. The hon. member knows that what he is asking the government to do is to intervene in a quasi-judicial process and that would be improper.

He is also asking me to exercise a directive power under the existing Canadian Wheat Board Act to which the opposition is unalterably opposed.

• (1500)

Maybe the most advisable thing to modernize procedures is to pass Bill C-4 at the earliest possible moment and put farmers in charge.

* * *

PRESENCE IN THE GALLERY

The Speaker: Today is a rather special day for us in the House for a reason other than question period.

We have with us today a large group of very distinguished Canadians. Canadians will not soon forget the Saguenay floods or those of the Red River Valley. They have become part of our history because of the extent of the disaster but mostly because in a time of crisis a remarkable spirit of co-operation emerged that left no one indifferent and brought all Canadians together in Quebec and in Manitoba.

Canadian military personnel led rescue and relief efforts working alongside civilian volunteers in difficult and dangerous conditions.

Humanitarian agencies, municipal, provincial and federal officials together came to the aid of families and communities. Canadians from every part of the country responded generously to appeals for assistance.

It was a remarkable show of Canadian solidarity. It was the finest possible example of team Canada at work.

[Translation]

Sometimes, it is the most difficult of times that show what it is that unites a community. In the Saguenay, and in Manitoba, thousands of Canadians battled together to save homes and lives, to help their neighbours and to rebuild communities.

Tributes

There are so many of them, these volunteers, these heroes and heroines, that it would be impossible to receive them all here in the House of Commons. But what an honour it is for us to receive 30 Canadian military personnel and 40 civilians who brought assistance to the disaster victims.

Those of you who are here before me today represent all of the men and women who took part in that effort of Canadian solidarity. Through you, we salute their extraordinary work, their courage, their spirit of co-operation, and their readiness to lend a helping hand.

[English]

We, the collective members of the House of Commons and the representatives of us, the 30 million Canadians, thank you and all those you represent for showing us that there is a powerful sense of community in Canada and for reminding us that when it really counts we are there for each other.

To the heroes and heroines du Saguenay et de la rivière Rouge, please stand.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

The Speaker: My colleagues, in your name and on your behalf I will be receiving these distinguished Canadian in room 216 for a reception.

I formally invite all of you to meet them and to speak with them right after question period.

* * *

• (1505)

THE LATE CLAUDE ELLIS

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Qu'Appelle, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise to say a few words in tribute to Mr. Claude Ellis who was a member of Parliament elected for the CCF in the city of Regina in 1953 and again in 1957.

Unfortunately Mr. Ellis passed away on October 1 of this year at the age of 77. He served two terms in the House. He was well known as a dedicated member of Parliament who served his constituents very well. He was also a superb educator and teacher. As a matter of fact, he was one of my professors when I first attended university back in the mid-1960s.

Mr. Ellis was also one of the founders of the CCF in Saskatchewan in the 1930s, 1940s and 1950s. He was very active in the educational movement, in the trade union movement and in the formation of the CCF both provincially and federally.

At this stage I pay tribute to his wife Bessie who has been an activist for many years, to his three sons and his daughter and to their spouses, to his grandchildren and great-grandchildren, and to his friends.

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, like the member for Qu'Appelle I was saddened to hear of

Tributes

the passing of Mr. Claude Ellis, a former member of Parliament for Regina City from 1952 to 1958 representing the CCF.

Mr. Ellis' interest in politics started very early in life. As a youth he served on his party's provincial council in Saskatchewan and as youth president in the late 1930s. His political involvement continued through his university years at the University of Saskatchewan. Mr. Ellis also showed his aspirations to serve very early on in life, being elected prime minister of the university parliamentary forum for two years running.

During that time Mr. Ellis was very well served by his excellent speaking ability, an ability for which he won both oratory prizes and debating trophies, culminating in a trip to Guelph, Ontario, where he walked away with the Canadian debating championship.

In the House of Commons Mr. Ellis was an advocate for the less well off in society, in particular in the areas of housing and health care, helping to form the caring society that Canada has become, a tradition that all of us from Regina would aspire to continue.

Mr. Ellis is survived by his wife Bessie, three sons and one daughter. On behalf of the Government of Canada I would like to offer our sincere condolences to the Ellis family.

• (1510)

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the official opposition I would like to pay tribute to Claude Ellis and the work he did in the Canadian parliament.

The minister mentioned that he was involved at a very young age. He was involved at 16 years old. How many of us were thinking and breathing politics at that age? He had a pretty remarkable career. Think of the thrill he must have felt as a young man when he appeared on the same stage as J. S. Woodsworth, one of the founders of the CCF, and Mr. J. Coldwell, the national leader at that time. What a thrill it must have been for that young man.

He was elected in 1953 and again in 1957. On a personal note, my great-grandfather, Ted Applewhait, was in the 1953 to 1957 parliament. He was the Liberal member for Skeena.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Miss Deborah Grey: It was amazing that my great-grandfather and Claude Ellis were colleagues. I am sure they had some friendly discussions. They may have disagreed politically, but that does not matter. They served in the House. They were parliamentarians during that parliament.

On behalf of my family and the official opposition I wish his family well and thank them for the public service they and their family shared through Claude Ellis.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I did not have the honour of knowing Mr. Ellis, to whom tribute is being paid today, personally. But I want to say that when someone has sat in the House for two terms of office and worked hard for his constituents, we cannot but express our admiration and note that this was truly someone who put himself out for those he represented.

He was a CCF member, someone who undoubtedly did some very useful work in the Parliament of Canada and who spared no effort in serving his fellow citizens in the Regina area.

On behalf of Bloc Quebecois members, I would therefore like to express our deepest condolences to his entire family and to tell them that we are keenly aware that there were lengthy periods during which they had to manage without Mr. Ellis, because he had to be here in Ottawa to serve his constituents. They have our sympathy and our deepest respect for the sacrifices they were willing to make so that he could do his work in the House.

[English]

Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today in tribute to Claude Ellis, former CCF member of Parliament for the city of Regina. While I did not have the privilege of knowing Mr. Ellis, I have to say the tale of his 77 years is quite unique as lives of MPs go.

Although he was a long time resident of Regina, the city he represented in the House of Commons, Mr. Ellis was born in Weyburn, Saskatchewan, the son of Bill Ellis and Peggy Dawson Gibson. He was educated at public schools and Scott Collegiate in Regina, moving on to teachers college. From this Claude Ellis enjoyed a lengthy career as an educator, teaching in Manor, Saskatchewan, and at his alma mater of Scott Collegiate.

Mr. Ellis' impressive career came to an end at the University of Regina where he was awarded the title of professor emeritus.

Claude Ellis did take some time from teaching to represent the city of Regina in the House of Commons. He was first elected in 1953 and re-elected in 1957, during which time he actively articulated the needs and concerns of his constituents. Even when he did not serve as an elected MP, Mr. Ellis remained a strong supporter of the CCF movement and later the New Democratic Party.

He formed a vibrant partnership with his beautiful wife Bessie, who for many years has been a tireless worker in the community. Together they raised three sons and one daughter, who in turn blessed Claude and Bessie Ellis with five grandchildren and two great-grandchildren.

When Claude Ellis passed away on October 1, parliament lost a former member, Saskatchewan lost a distinguished educator, but

Tributes

most important the Ellis family lost a husband, a father, a brother, a grandfather and a great-grandfather. We could only hope that they find solace in the wonderful life he lived and the contributions he made to education and to the public service.

On behalf of the Progressive Conservative caucus I offer my condolences to members of the Ellis family on their loss.

• (1515)

Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I too would like to join with colleagues in the House of Commons to pay tribute to Claude Ellis.

I had the honour and privilege of knowing Claude Ellis for the last 24 years. I represented him and his wife Bessie in the 1993 to 1997 term. Throughout that period Bessie and Claude were advisors to me. They sat on my executive and were very wise counsel on many issues, in particular when in the last parliament the New Democratic Party did not have a lot of resources. Their experience and counsel were very important to us.

I had occasion to have supper with Mr. Ellis about 18 months ago when he was in Ottawa with his wife Bessie and we talked about a lot of important issues affecting our country. Even during the last couple of months in Regina he was always very keen on ensuring that New Democrats represented citizens well in parliament. He was very keen on ensuring that issues such as pensions were a priority and he asked us to ensure that the principles and fundamental issues which are important to all Canadians remain on the agenda of parliament.

I want to join with members in acknowledging Mr. Ellis' contribution to the city of Regina, the province of Saskatchewan and to our country. As citizens we have suffered a great loss as a result of his passing. I appreciate the opportunity to extend my condolences to his widow Bessie and their family.

The Speaker: We also have tributes to Mr. J. Chester MacRae a former member of the Progressive Conservative Party.

* * *

THE LATE MR. J. CHESTER MACRAE

Mr. Greg Thompson (Charlotte, PC): Mr. Speaker, the citizens of New Brunswick and the constituents of the former federal riding of York—Sunbury are mourning the death of long-time resident and friend, John Chester MacRae. The former member of Parliament and D-Day veteran died this past Sunday after a brief illness.

John Chester MacRae was born in Hope-Town, Quebec, received his education at Campbellton High School and the provincial Normal School in Fredericton. He taught in the public school

system until 1940 when his regiment was called out to active service. He served in Britain and France, going into France on D-Day. For service in France he was awarded the Military Cross and after his return to Canada received the Efficiency Decoration.

J. Chester MacRae continued his interest in the military after the war and throughout his life with his final appointment being honorary Colonel of the First Battalion, the Royal New Brunswick Regiment (Carleton and York).

J. Chester MacRae was elected to the House of Commons in 1957, won five subsequent elections and retired undefeated in 1972.

Former New Brunswick Premier Hugh John Flemming once described Chester MacRae as being a man who it was a privilege and pleasure to know, stating that "he was a great Canadian, distinguished in everything he's ever undertaken".

People from the Fredericton area will always remember Chester MacRae for his dry wit. He once said "My relationship with the Conservative Party was a happy and cordial one, although elections to me were agony."

As a long-time member of the Royal Canadian Legion he served as branch president, provincial president, grand patron and a life member of the St. Machar Masonic Lodge, Aberdeen, Scotland.

In one of his final speeches in the House 31 years ago, he reflected on a wide range of matters, some of which are very relevant today. He spoke on the issue of the population explosion, of the need for peace in the world, on the equality of all races, and the matter dearest to his heart, the veterans of Canada and, indeed, the veterans of all countries. He stated in this Chamber that those veterans who were prisoners of war underwent greater hardships than perhaps any of the rest of us who were privileged to serve in World War II.

The people of Fredericton and the people of New Brunswick will long remember J. Chester MacRae for his dedication, his service, his kindness and that rare quality, his heroism.

Chet MacRae is survived by his wife of 64 years, Mina Catherine Gerrard MacRae, one daughter Marjory Ann and her husband Jack Patterson of Vancouver, one daughter-in-law Darlene MacRae of Saint John, 10 grandchildren and six great grandchildren.

• (1520)

Chet MacRae would want to be remembered as an ordinary Canadian who served his country well. This he did.

Hon. Andy Scott (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured, humbled and saddened to pay tribute to Chester MacRae. He was a friend of my father's although I did not

Privilege

meet him until I was going door to door during the 1993 election campaign. He brought the futility of my exercise to my attention.

Being the wonderful gentleman that he was, after the election he came to visit me. We spent a wonderful afternoon discussing the difference between being a member of Parliament in 1993 and being a member of Parliament in the late fifties and early sixties. He spoke of travelling to Ottawa on the train and being away from home so much of the time. It was remarkable for me as a brand new member who had not yet been to Ottawa to have that kind of discussion.

I had the good fortune two years later on Remembrance Day as a member of Parliament to lay wreaths on behalf of the government in our communities, often in many places at the same time. I asked Chester to represent the Government of Canada and to lay the wreath in Fredericton. This was the last Remembrance Day before the onset of his illness.

During the campaign I had the opportunity to drop in and visit Chester at the DVA in Fredericton. He was very alert. He advised me that my success in 1993 was surely a fluke. I will remember him fondly for the rest of my life.

The people of the community of Fredericton know what a contribution Chester MacRae made in war, in peace, as an educator. They remember what he did for the Legion, for veterans and for his community. He will be missed. All his family and his friends in Fredericton have our condolences.

Mr. Randy White (Langley—Abbotsford, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise in this House privileged to pay tribute to Chester MacRae. Chester MacRae was the finest example of a dedicated parliamentarian, having won six federal elections and retired undefeated after 15 years of service.

The dedication one puts toward the goal of improving one's country is the mark of a great person. Chester MacRae worked tirelessly toward the improvement of Canada for future generations.

Not only did Chester MacRae serve Canada and Parliament but he was a decorated war veteran who served in both England and France, having participated in the D-Day invasion of France. For his service he was awarded the Military Cross.

Just yesterday I walked through the visitor's welcome centre to see Chester's name on a plaque that commemorates those who preceded us in this House. In addition to his honoured name we all remember his qualities of integrity, compassion and devotion, in particular toward the interests of Canada's veterans.

Chester MacRae will be sorely missed but never forgotten in this House. We offer our condolences to the members of his family, to his friends and colleagues and our sincere regrets in his passing.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we were saddened yesterday to learn of the death of Chester MacRae, who, for 15 years, from 1957 to 1972, was a Conservative member of this House.

I did not know Mr. MacRae personally, but everyone I talked to described him as a devoted individual and member of the Conservative Party for 15 years, and especially as a devoted officer in the Canadian army. Mr. MacRae was considered a hero in the second world war. He even took part in the landing in France.

Although a Conservative, Mr. MacRae was known as an ambassador of peace, mutual assistance between peoples, and equality. It was more likely the vision of Lester B. Pearson that he carried abroad than the Conservative vision of things.

• (1525)

All those I spoke with remembered this man clearly. He was devoted, good-natured, upstanding, courageous and a man of conviction.

On behalf of myself and my party, the Bloc Québécois, I offer my sincere condolences to Mr. MacRae's family.

[*English*]

Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues in the New Democratic Party, I would like to pay my respects to the memory of J. Chester MacRae.

Mr. MacRae was a Progressive Conservative member of Parliament from 1957 to 1972. He was a decorated war veteran who served in both England and France.

As a fellow New Brunswicker, Mr. MacRae served the people of New Brunswick well. I did not have the pleasure to sit in the House with him, but he was known in Parliament as a devoted and tireless advocate for veterans' interests.

My colleagues and I in the New Democratic Party extend our sincere condolences to Mr. MacRae's family, especially to his wife Mina Catherine, his daughter Marjory Ann and his two sisters.

His contribution to Canadian and New Brunswick political life will remain with us for the years to come.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

TIME ALLOCATION

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question of privilege arises out of the motion that the govern-

ment intends to move with respect to time allocation on Bill C-2. It has to do with what I regard to be the responsibilities of the Chair to protect the rights and privileges of members of this House of Commons to engage in adequate debate on matters of national importance.

The Chair will know that the time allocation motion has to do with the amendments to the Canada pension plan. This is a national social program, an income security plan which is very rarely before the House, very rarely debated, very rarely amended. This is one of those occasions when it is being amended, therefore, it is a unique opportunity for members of the House of Commons to put their views on the record on what our national pension plan system should look like. We will disagree with each other about that. The Reform Party will have its position, as will the NDP. The government will have its position, as reflected in the legislation.

My concern is that the Chair consider, before seeing whoever it is who will be moving the motion on behalf of the government—we have notice that the motion will be moved—not seeing the mover of the motion as a way of using the power of the Chair to intervene on behalf of members of Parliament, both collectively and individually, in a situation where our right to adequate debate is being violated by the government's rush to judgment on the appropriateness of time allocation.

Others have said in the course of comments during question period that somehow the amendments that were moved by the opposition were an attempt to close off debate. Quite the contrary. We know these motions are procedurally designed in such a way, whether a six-month hoist or whatever, and are often moved in order to create the possibility of more debate so that the government cannot move to the question on the main motion.

It is a bit disingenuous for the government to say that this was an attempt to close off debate. It was, rather, to prevent or to act in a preventive way against the government moving to the question right away by not putting up speakers.

An amendment was moved, a subamendment was moved and right after the subamendment was moved the government gave notice of closure. How long did we debate this motion? We debated it for one day. We did not debate it the next day in the morning because we were debating Bill C-4. Then we moved to Bill C-2 and we were hardly into the second or third hour and the government moved closure.

• (1530)

Mr. Speaker, I know that for you to do something about this would be to break with Canadian precedent. I am aware of the significance of what I am asking you to do. I have only asked a Speaker to do this once before and it was Speaker Fraser in the context of the North American Free Trade Agreement. But you will

Privilege

know that at Westminster and in other Parliaments, Speakers have sometimes taken upon themselves the responsibility of ensuring that the rights of Parliament collectively are not abused by a government which moves too quickly to closure or to time allocation.

It is precisely what I am asking you to consider here today, that this is an occasion where very early in this Parliament there is no reason to believe that the debate would have gone on and on. All we wanted was an opportunity to have our amendments considered, to have a full airing of the subject, which is what second reading used to be before we got the kind of rule changes that we got in a previous Parliament in 1991 and which this government having condemned these changes now uses to the full.

I think it is the wrong way to start off this Parliament. We were doing just fine. We were getting along even though we disagree with each other politically. For the government to move at this time as I suggested earlier is a very unfortunate thing. But it is an unfortunate thing that could be remedied by the Chair taking, admittedly, new responsibilities but not responsibilities that are totally out of character with what Speakers have done in other Parliaments, to intervene on behalf of the collective rights of parliamentarians to adequate debate on a matter of obvious national importance.

Mr. Speaker, I rest my case and I ask you to consider the matter and to consider it urgently because obviously if you were to intervene you would have to do it when the motion was about to be moved. Sometimes Speakers can be given to a judicious blindness when it comes to motions being moved or to breaking new ground by actually arriving at a judgment on this in time to prevent this very unfortunate reaction on the part of the government to the fact that there was lively, informed and concerned debate about CPP reform and it moved to choke it off in the way that it did.

Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak briefly in support of this member's point of privilege and lay before you two additional pieces of information which may assist you in responding to this.

First I refer to Beauchesne's sixth edition, citation 3 which outlines some elements of the Constitution Act:

Without further elaboration, Canada thus was ensured a responsible cabinet system with the assumption that there will always be a recognizable government with a legislative program. If the electorate so wishes, the system also presupposes an opposition ready and willing to attack the government in an attempt to have its legislation altered or rejected—. More tentative are such traditional features as respect for the rights of the minority, which precludes a government from using to excess the extensive powers that it has to limit debate or to proceed in what the public and the opposition might interpret as unorthodox ways.

I suggest that is what we have happening here today. The government is closing off debate on the bill that the opposition and the public honestly feel is a tax increase and a massive rip-off of

Privilege

young Canadians. We need to express those views and the views of Canadians on this issue before the principle of the bill is adopted.

To limit that debate is to permit in effect taxation without effective and adequate representation. One of the fundamental functions for which Parliament was created was specifically to constrain arbitrary taxation and actions by the executive.

One further piece of reference for your consideration was referred to by the hon. member. On April 14, 1987 Speaker Fraser felt it necessary to make this comment to the House on this very same issue:

It is essential to our democratic system that controversial issues should be debated at reasonable length so that every reasonable opportunity shall be available to hear the arguments pro and con and that reasonable delaying tactics should be permissible to enable opponents of a measure to enlist public support for their point of view.

• (1535)

Speaker Fraser felt that the Speaker had a role to play in these matters. He made this statement as a result of protest from the opposition. Ironically one of the most vocal opponents to this abuse at that time was the very minister who has given notice and intends to close off debate on Bill C-2 after only eight hours of debate on the very first bill to hit this floor, a bill that is over 100 pages long and extremely technical and a bill that happens to have attached to it a schedule which imposes a payroll tax rise of 73% on millions of Canadians and employers.

The debate has only just begun and we are confident that a reasonable debate will enlist public support for our point of view and that of taxpayers and young Canadians who have little or no voice in this debate.

As Speaker Fraser said, it is essential to our democratic system, and therefore essential for you, Mr. Speaker, to protect the opposition and delay even for one day the government from moving to close off debate in this manner.

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, I would also like to add a few words with respect to the point of privilege raised by the member from the New Democratic Party.

The very first principle of parliamentary law as set out in Beauchesne's states:

The principles of Canadian parliamentary law are: to protect a minority and restrain the improvidence or tyranny of a majority; to secure the transaction of public business in an orderly manner; to enable every member to express opinions within limits necessary to preserve decorum and prevent an unnecessary waste of time; to give abundant opportunity for the consideration of every measure, and to prevent any legislative action being taken upon sudden impulse.

These are very telling words used in this very first section of parliamentary procedure. This is not an untimely debate in any

way, shape or form. There are important issues that have to be considered and discussed.

I would also bring to the Speaker's attention the fact that the government House leader has brought forward a motion pursuant to Standing Order 78(3) which is, as you know, predicated on the House leader's not being able to reach an agreement for the allocation of time for a stage of a bill.

I want to bring to the Chair's attention that at no time did the government House leader raise the subject of a time allocation agreement at our meetings. There was no consultation. He did ask if a number of our members were prepared to debate further, but there was no consideration given to the fact that there was going to be further debate.

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 78, I would ask you, in your capacity as Speaker, to rule on the motion and rule it out of order, keeping in mind that there were no actual attempts to reach agreement between the House leaders. That may or may not be possible but the government House leader has an obligation to ask the question to the other House leaders and permit consultation.

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond briefly to the question of privilege raised by the House leader of the New Democratic Party and supported by two other members of this House earlier this day.

I think the Chair will need to consider two issues. One, is the House leader of the New Democratic Party correct about what he has alleged this afternoon? Two, is he also correct in the purpose of the amendment that he has offered to the House along with other members?

Let me take the points in reverse. The amendments that are before us today, just to remind the Chair, are as follows. The amendment offered in the name of the member for Calgary Southwest reads "that this House declines to give second reading to Bill C-2" and so on. That amendment is further amended by a subamendment in the name of the hon. member for Halifax West.

In his presentation, the hon. member from the New Democratic Party conceded to the fact that the purpose of the amendment was to prevent the bill from proceeding. He said it in this House some moments ago. In other words, the amendment is specifically designed to prevent us from having the committee study of the bill. That is what he admitted to on the floor of this House.

• (1540)

Having established that the opposition has admitted today and possibly in its speeches over the last couple of days that the purpose of what it is doing is to prevent the bill from proceeding to

Privilege

the next stage, I believe that any reasonable person would claim that the government has an equal right to propose measures to ensure that the bill does proceed in good and proper form.

Hon. members across are heckling, very rudely I might add, at this moment but they should be listening in particular to the judgment that Mr. Speaker will no doubt be giving in a few moments.

It has been alleged that there was no consultation. Let me remind the Speaker of the rules of the House to that effect. Standing Order 78(1) refers to the procedure as follows: "When a minister of the crown, from his or her place in the House, states that there is agreement" and so on. Standing Order 78(2) states, "When a minister of the crown, from his or her place in the House, states that a majority of the representatives—have come to an agreement—" and finally, Standing Order 78(3) is the procedure when an agreement cannot be reached.

Yesterday afternoon at 3.30 there was a meeting in which I asked all members present, and all parties were present, whether or not they intended to put more speakers. Only one of the four opposition parties, I believe it was the Bloc Quebecois, indicated a definite number of speakers that it wanted to put up.

Shortly afterward after having held the consultation in which I did not get a commitment from all parties represented pursuant to Standing Order 78(1) and (2), then on the floor of the House moments later, a further dilatory motion was produced within minutes of the end of our meeting, this time proposed by an NDP member, the purpose of which was again to further delay proceeding on the bill. That was after the consultation was held.

Finally, later yesterday afternoon before I proposed a motion on the floor of this House I even informed my counterpart in the official opposition which I believe was the good and proper thing to do so a motion would not be introduced behind his back. That was done in good and proper form at a meeting at which Your Honour was present.

Mr. Speaker, you must judge whether an amendment that you will be receiving later is in order. Of course the House has not been seized of that motion yet, which could come later this day. Once you receive such an amendment, if one is forthcoming, the Chair will have to decide whether the amendment is in order and acceptable to this House.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that on the third day of debating this bill, the purpose of which is to refer it to committee after years of consultation in the public generally, to move it to committee so we can hear witnesses on this federal-provincial agreement is not wrong. To send it to committee for detailed study is not wrong. It is the good and appropriate thing to do.

For the opposition to produce two different amendments, the purpose of which is dilatory as admitted on the floor of this House today, and the purpose of which is only to make the same hon. members speak not once, not twice but even three times on the same bill at second reading is nothing short of a dilatory measure. It is quite legitimate for the government and for this House to want to listen to ordinary Canadians, people from the private sector and the provinces as to why this measure is necessary in order to ensure a pension plan for our children and grandchildren.

• (1545)

Mr. Randy White (Langley—Abbotsford, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, there are two points which must be clarified in the House.

The government House leader is incorrect in his assertion that the amendments may be an avenue to limit debate. The fact of the matter is that our amendment in and of itself is debatable, and that is what we want to do in the House. We want to debate the merits of the bill through our amendments.

Our amendment reflects a difference of opinion in the House, an alternative to be debated. I question the point of sending the bill to committee if the government is already showing its indifference to any other opinion but its own by shutting down debate.

Furthermore, the government House leader indicated today that adequate and reasonable notice was given to me in the House. As it happened, yesterday I was at a meeting of the Board of Internal Economy. I was called outside the door and given notice that he was on his way downstairs to give notice to the House. I hardly call that adequate and reasonable notice in this day and age of democracy.

Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same question of privilege to provide some clarity. In my view the government House leader has partially misinformed parliament.

The government House leader and all members know that it is standard procedure for the opposition, and maybe another opposition party or two, to move amendments and subamendments on important bills. This is not out of the ordinary. The purpose is to provide fuller debate.

When I was at a meeting yesterday with the government House leader, other House leaders and whips, they asked us how many more speakers we had and we said about five. The government House leader has forgotten that number.

He also said that the motions we have passed with respect to the amendments would allow each member of Parliament to speak three times. The majority of New Democratic Party members have not had an occasion to speak once on the bill, never mind three times. I have not spoken on the bill and I want to speak on the bill. I

Points of Order

stepped aside for members of Parliament who have not had an opportunity to speak yet. I would like to do that at some point.

The final point I want to make is quite outrageous. It deals with what the government House leader said. He failed to give New Democrats notice of this motion. That is absolutely incredulous in view of our co-operative parliament and the way we have made progress in the first three weeks of parliament as five official parties.

He has failed his unofficial pact, denied the pact, or abandoned the pact to provide some co-operation to deal with issues of a substantive nature.

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have new and relevant information on this issue. I am vice-chair of the House of Commons finance committee. The government's premise that it is important to get this legislation to committee for debate is simply false.

Not only has this not been discussed, but the House of Commons finance committee strikes out next week to go on a tour across the country to hear from Canadians on completely different issues.

The clerk and chairman of the committee made it very clear in the discussions we had that in the nine days after that when we will be sitting up until the middle of November we will be hearing witnesses on a completely different issue, the pre-budget hearings.

When the House leader opposite says this legislation is being pushed into committee, I can assure that is absolutely false.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have one piece of information of which I would like you to be aware. I have not spoken to the bill and I want to speak to the bill.

• (1550)

The Speaker: Members have asked me to rule on a specific question of privilege. I want to thank all hon. members who have taken part in giving me the information I have before me now.

With regard to what the member for Winnipeg—Transcona said, I am aware and I understand full well the serious nature of this request and the rather innovative way that he suggests it might be resolved.

At this point, unless I have more direction from the entire House and in view of the fact that Speakers have consistently ruled since 1968 that they would not intervene in the quality of whatever discussions took place on either matter, I am left to decide this on what is in the standing orders.

At this point I hesitate to go down the road where you would put this kind of discretionary power into the hands of your Speaker. Therefore I would rule at this time that there is no question of privilege.

POINTS OF ORDER

DECORUM IN CHAMBER

Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC): Mr. Speaker, today when we were making tributes today to Chester MacRae and to Claude Ellis, the House leader for the Liberal Party was screaming across the floor to those who were sitting here. It was not the Liberal who is sitting over here now. God bless him; he is a nice young man. Nevertheless he was.

When we are giving tributes, and I know that you, Sir, have brought this matter to our attention before, I think we should all sit and show respect for the families of those to whom we are paying tribute.

I bring it to your attention, Mr. Speaker, and ask that it be brought to the attention of the House leaders.

• (1555)

The Speaker: I did not hear those conversations. At times when we are paying tribute and at other times in the debates, I would hope we would take the time to listen to what we all have to say in the House.

I do not want to go into a debate on this issue. It is just a normal thing that we accept. I ask my colleagues once again, when we are making tributes, when we are asking or answering questions, or when we are debating in the House, that we give each other the respect that is due a member of the Canadian Parliament.

I say this to no specific member, but I say it to all of us so that we will be apprised of the situation.

Hon. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if you will allow me a very brief moment to respond, I do not know whether or not I responded to heckling from another member.

One knows of the debate that was occurring only moments ago in the House. If I did, there was no intention on my part to be disrespectful to anyone.

I came to the House 31 years ago, I guess it will be in a few days. I started as a busboy in the parliamentary restaurant with nothing but respect for this great institution.

The day I leave here—and I hope it is not soon—I hope it is after having had nothing but respect not only for the House but for everyone who served here.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Orders 104 and 114 and pursuant to the order adopted by the House on Wednesday, October 1, 1997, I have the honour to present the second report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs regarding the membership of various committees, and I should like to move concurrence at this time.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

PETITIONS

SNOWMOBILE SAFETY

Mr. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 I would like to present a petition that has been signed by over 1,500 individuals from across Canada.

The petition was initiated to confront the problem with snowmobile safety, the cause of many winter deaths.

The petitioners would like to see the establishment of a national snowmobile safe association that would deal with the issues of licences, registration, insurance, driving age, speed limits and regulations pertaining to the design of snowmobiles.

FAMILY LIFE

Mr. Pat O'Brien (London—Fanshawe, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 I am very pleased today to present a petition in the House from a number of my constituents and other people in the London area.

They call on the government to take various steps to strengthen family life in Canadian society.

* * *

● (1600)

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

The Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

S. O. 52

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Notices of Motions for the Production of Papers be allowed to stand.

The Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

REQUEST FOR EMERGENCY DEBATE

FISHING INDUSTRY

Mr. Bill Matthews (Burin—St. George's, PC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask for leave to put forward a motion for a special debate, pursuant to Standing Order 52, to discuss the critical situation facing the fishing industry on the Pacific coast and in Atlantic Canada and recent events which are causing the government to revise its policies.

Just yesterday the auditor general reported his findings to the House. He drew attention to the fact that he could not find anywhere a clearly defined national fisheries policy on sustainable fisheries.

Furthermore, in the past few weeks there have been suggestions and allegations of interference with DFO science, the twisting and manipulation of scientific data. The ability of the department has been called into question as to whether the Department of Fisheries and Oceans can effectively manage the fisheries resource. Of course, that is a matter of debate right across the country.

The government's handling and its management of the fishery has given rise to confrontation and civil disorder in British Columbia. Relationships between the federal government and the Government of British Columbia have reached such a stage of disharmony that other federal-provincial matters are threatened and the federal-provincial relationship between Ottawa and British Columbia is at an all-time low.

As well, the auditor general stated the obvious yesterday when he said that fish stocks in Atlantic Canada are not regenerating. There are not enough fish in the water to sustain a viable fishing industry. He also stated the very obvious, in particular to those of us from Atlantic Canada, that there are very few jobs and employment opportunities in the hundreds of rural communities in Atlantic Canada.

What is more compelling is that even since the moratorium was announced in July 1992, this government, being in power now for four years, has not developed or implemented a strategy or a plan to deal with 35,000 to 40,000 Atlantic Canadians after May 1998.

We have had an historic day today. My submission to you, Mr. Speaker, is that if we as elected members of Parliament to this

Government Orders

House of Commons are going to have ample opportunity to debate the fisheries crisis on both coasts of our country, we are going to need to do it soon. It is a matter of urgent public interest.

Before the anticipated, hopefully, national policy on fisheries I think every member of this House should have an opportunity to debate the present fisheries crisis on the west and east coasts. They should be heard. The government can undertake to listen to all members and to hopefully consider and incorporate some of the ideas that might flow from my proposed debate into a national fisheries policy, especially as it pertains to sustainable fisheries and the difficulties that are being faced by fishers on the west coast, in particular because of the salmon dispute and in the Atlantic because of the decline in our fish stocks.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit to you that this matter in my estimation is very urgent and is of great public significance and importance.

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: The hon. member for Burin—St. George's was kind enough to apprise me that he was going to rise and ask for an emergency debate at this time.

I know the issue of the fisheries is of concern to all hon. members in the House. However, in my view it does not fulfil the requirements for an emergency debate at this time.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1605)

[*Translation*]

CANADA PENSION PLAN INVESTMENT BOARD ACT

BILL C-2—MOTION FOR TIME ALLOCATION

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I move:

That, in relation to Bill C-2, An Act to establish the Canada Pension Plan Investment Board and to amend the Canada Pension Plan and the Old Age Security Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts, not more than one further sitting day shall be allotted to the consideration of the second reading stage of the Bill; and that, fifteen minutes before the expiry of the time provided for Government Business on the day allotted to the consideration of the second reading stage of the said Bill, any proceedings before the House shall be interrupted, if required for the purpose of this Order, and, in turn, every question necessary for the disposal of the said stage of the Bill shall be put forthwith and successively, without further debate or amendment.

Some hon. members: Shame, shame.

[*English*]

Mr. Chuck Strahl: I don't think you can move that on a point of order.

The Speaker: When I stood, I asked if it was a point of order and I was told it was not. I said it was not on a point of order.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Speaker: Call in the members.

• (1650)

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 6*)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Bélair	Bélanger
Bellemare	Bennett
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Caplan
Carroll	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clouthier
Coderre	Cohen
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Easter
Eggleton	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Grose	Harb
Harvard	Hubbard
Iftody	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Lincoln	Longfield
MacAulay	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Marchi	Marleau

Government Orders

Martin (LaSalle—Énard)
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Mifflin
Minna
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Proud
Redman
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Vanclief
Wappel
Wilfert—141

Massé
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney
Milliken
Mitchell
Myers
Normand
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Patry
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Provenzano
Reed
Robillard
Saada
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Julien
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Whelan

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

CANADA PENSION PLAN INVESTMENT BOARD ACT

The House resumed from October 7 consideration of the motion that Bill C-2, an act to establish the Canada Pension Plan Investment Board and to amend the Canada Pension Plan and the Old Age Security Act and to make consequential amendments to other acts, be read the second time and referred to a committee; of the amendment; and of the amendment to the amendment.

● (1655)

The Deputy Speaker: When the House last considered the matter, the hon. member for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke had the floor. He has four minutes remaining in his speech.

Mr. Hec Clouthier (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to be in this hallowed House participating in this debate.

It is rather interesting to note that the party opposite has a void in its argument on the Canada pension plan debate and it was evinced by their void in not being here for the democratic vote. Hopefully we will not be indulging in this vituperative political rhetoric but I guess they will persist. It reminds me of last night when I left this hallowed Chamber and thought of the viciousness of their attack. It made me think that this is the last refuge for the vaguely talented on the opposite side.

Having said this I notice that one of their main points of contention in the debate is that this is a payroll tax. That is utter rubbish and nonsense. It is a pension plan. It is a contribution to a pension plan. It is not in any way shape or form a payroll tax.

We do have an employment insurance tax but we are doing everything we possibly can, and have done so since we were elected, to reduce the employment insurance tax not once, not twice but thrice. We will continue to reduce the employment insurance tax whenever we have the opportunity and the fiscal responsibility to do so.

One thing that we will not reduce is our commitment to Bill C-2. Why? Because this has not been a cursory commitment. This has not been a commitment just in the last week, the last month, the last year or the last five years. This has been a commitment for about 40 years. One of the great icons of Canadian political history and it certainly endeared myself to him to know that he was also one of the great icons of the Liberal Party, the late Paul Martin Sr., was part and parcel of the genesis of this wonderful bill.

NAYS

Members

Alarie
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras
Brien
Canuel
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye
Desjarlais
Dockrill
Dubé (Lévis)
Duceppe
Earle
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay)
Guimond
Harvey
Jones
Laurin
Lefebvre
Loubier
Mancini
Marchand
Matthews
Ménard
Muisé
Perron
Price
Riis
Sauvageau
St-Hilaire
Thompson (Charlotte)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Vautour
Wayne—76

Asselin
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Tobique—Mactaquac)
Borotsik
Brison
Charest
Crête
Davies
Debien
Desrochers
Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Dumas
Fournier
Gauthier
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Guay
Hardy
Herron
Lalonde
Lebel
Lill
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marceau
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough
Mercier
Nystrom
Picard (Drummond)
Proctor
Rocheleau
Solomon
St-Jacques
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp
Wasylcia-Leis

PAIRED MEMBERS

Nil/aucun

Government Orders

It is rather remarkable to know that a very close relative of Paul Martin Sr., our current finance minister, continues that strong legacy. I am sure that Paul Martin Sr., being up in the hallowed house in the celestial heavens with the other saints of political history such as Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mackenzie King and Lester Pearson, would be smiling broadly knowing that his legacy has lasted with the truly great finance minister in this Liberal Party.

I notice that members of the Reform Party used an acronym, CPP. We know it stands for Canada pension plan, but they cared to indulge in some kind of fanatical rhetoric. I do not remember it because it is not worthwhile remembering what that acronym stood for. I would say to hon. members that perhaps CPP stands for a commitment to Paul's plan. We are committed to the duty of government and we most certainly recognize the fact that the challenge of any government is to build a road for its citizens that will lead to a sense of self-satisfaction, a sense of self-esteem and a sense of fulfilment.

This coruscating Bill C-2 most certainly rises to that challenge. May I even be so bold as to say that this is a bodacious bill. Hon. members can look up that word.

I notice I have one minute left, Mr. Speaker. One further minute to expound upon the great magnanimous qualities of Bill C-2. This bill not only rises to the challenge, it supersedes it. It eclipses the challenge not only for today, not only for tomorrow, but for weeks and possibly decades to come.

• (1700)

The Deputy Speaker: I should remind hon. members that it is contrary to the rules to refer to the absence of members from the Chamber. I would ask hon. members to bear that in mind in the course of their remarks.

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the last member gave us a history lesson. Let us just review very quickly some of the history since 1993. We nearly lost Canada in a Quebec referendum. We are \$100 billion deeper in debt. There are \$26 billion in increased taxes. Youth unemployment stands at 17%. Patronage appointments abound everywhere. We have job equity. The deception is that somehow our financial problems have been fixed although we have a \$50 billion interest payment. Now comes the most severe tax grab that we have ever had where the tax will be raised from 5.6% to 9.9% of a person's income.

To show the total disrespect for democracy, we now have closure being used on this bill that affects almost all Canadians.

Let us go back in history to 1966 when this experiment in socialism was started. We were told that deductions would never go

above 5.5%. However, with mismanagement we now have a pension plan that is underfunded by \$560 billion.

Let us talk about the pension plan as hon. members across the way want to keep talking about it. Let us talk about young people. They are the people who are going to be affected by this the most but let us also include seniors who have children and grandchildren.

We are going to destroy the incentive of these young people. We are going to rob them of their jobs because of these payroll tax deductions. The small businessman is going to be put further down the line and his chances of survival are that much less.

During the last election I made up a little card. This little card refers to exactly what this plan is all about. I talked to many young people, particularly, in the workforce at their places of work. I said to them "Let us think about what this plan is really about. In the next six years you are going to go from a \$935 maximum deduction if your income is \$35,000 to a point where you are paying \$1,645. Your employer will have to match it. This is roughly \$3,300. If you are 30 years old you are going to paying that \$3,300 for 35 years until you are 65. At the end of that time you will get \$8,800 provided you don't have too high an income. If you have too high an income the government is going to claw it back from you. Maybe what you are doing is really investing \$3,300 a year for 35 or more years to get nothing".

What would be a better way? Obviously, a better way would be to take that \$3,300 and invest it in almost any kind of securities or program if it was compulsory. If it was at only 6%, at age 65 that very same person would have a \$275,000 nest egg and would have an annuity that would pay \$26,000 until death.

What kind of investment are we asking our young people to make? We are asking them to be robbed. We are asking them to be part of this deceptive scheme that will take six years to implement.

Let us come to the present. The government is saying "We are very early in our mandate and so let us get the dirty things done quickly and then maybe people will forget about it. Maybe the electorate will forget about it". All of us in this House had better dedicate ourselves to making sure that the electorate knows what kind of robbery this is for our young people.

I would like to read some quotes. I really think these are fitting. Mr. Axworthy, who was a member of Parliament, was quoted on April 1, 1993 as saying "It displays the utter disdain with which this government treats the Canadian people," when he talked about closure. The House leader said on November 16, 1992 as quoted in *Hansard* "I am shocked. This is just terrible. This time we are talking about a major piece of legislation. Shame on those Tories across the way for using closure".

Government Orders

• (1705)

Mr. Speaker, with all respect I must quote you on April 23, 1993 from *Hansard* when you said "This is not the way to run Parliament. This is an abuse of the process of this House". I say to the government, it is a disgrace what it has just done, using closure on a piece of important legislation. Mr. Speaker, we agree with you totally. I tell you, they should go up in our caucus room because you are right.

We know that you are close to the people of your riding and to the people of Canada, Mr. Speaker. That is what the people are saying about this charade that we saw taking place today.

The government will continue to move closure. That is the sad part about it. This is just the beginning. In the last House the government used closure 29 times, the most in the whole history of Parliament.

The last member said "Hey, this is an honourable place". This place has lost its democratic reason to exist. This place is a disgrace because of those people across the way.

I trust that all of us are going back to our ridings and I trust that the people in those ridings are going to say "How can you shut down debate? How can you not listen to us telling you about this robbery that is going to take place of every Canadian?"

What are the options? The government would like us to think that there are none. But let us just quickly talk about those. There are many options. Within six years I believe the government will admit it was wrong. Of course it will not be the government at that point but when the government members are sitting across here they will say "That was probably the worst mistake we made in this House".

What are the options? The options are obvious. Let young people set up a private plan. Let us take a look at what Britain is going to be doing. It is going to that sort of a plan. The U.S. is pretty much committed to going to that plan within the next two years. Australia and New Zealand have already done it. Chile has been on that plan for 16 years. Let us examine those. Let us see what other countries are doing so that we can do the same for the people of Canada. There are options out there.

So that the hon. finance minister cannot continue to misquote the Reform position, let us tell people today that all of those people who have paid into the CPP will be paid out in a credit system whereby they will get a prorated pension plan for the years of contribution.

It will take time to phase in this plan but we have to start it now. All of us know that in time if we stay with the plan we have we will be going back for more contributions, more money, more tax grabs.

We have to look at these options. We have to present them in the House. They need to be debated here, but the government has closed down that option. As we heard from the finance committee they do not even have it in their schedule to discuss this.

As we know from the last Parliament, the government will think nothing of using closure in committee, using closure at third reading and ramming this legislation through because it has a deadline of January 1. When the workers start to realize that their contributions have gone from \$935 to \$1,645, we had better believe they are going to let people know and we better believe they will let the members across the way know. Four years from now it should be time and it should have moved well enough along that the results will be at the ballot box.

In conclusion, today has been a dark day for our country. It has been a dark day for young people. It is up to us to communicate that across the country. All of us on this side of the House had better dedicate ourselves to that job.

• (1710)

Mr. Dan McTeague (Pickering—Ajax—Uxbridge, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, most in the House, indeed most Canadians, will understand very clearly the commitment that the government made to ensure that down the road we have a pension system that is not only fair to people today, but is fair to those who will need it later.

It is not news to members, certainly on this side of the House, of the wisdom that was shown by the hon. Minister of Finance in providing a new regime that will ensure sustainability of the pension system. Most of us here campaigned on this. It was an issue we discussed in the last Parliament.

It is very clear at least from the perspective of many members, certainly from Ontario and right across the country, that what we said is what we are about to do. I have no trepidation in saying that in years to come I will be glad and so will many of my constituents that the benefits and fruits of this nation will be shared for generations to come.

I do not think one has to go too far to understand how we wound up in a situation where the initiative of this government and of several provincial governments who agreed to this formula came about.

The reality is that over the years this was a situation that we allowed to happen. We simply allowed it to transpire. We knew that the demographics of this country were changing.

With the benefits of a health care system brought by, in many respects, the father of the hon. member and finance minister, and as a result of the medicare system which this party introduced many years ago, people are living longer. The standard of living is high, very much as a result of the progress and the initiatives taken by the Liberal Party of which I am a proud member.

Government Orders

In order to sustain that program, in order to ensure that we have a viable pension system, someone had to take the bull by the horns.

[*Translation*]

I am therefore rather proud of the initiatives taken by this government to ensure the survival of our pension program.

[*English*]

No one in the House will be surprised to know that if nothing had been done by the government in Bill C-2, it is conceivable that in a few years the pension system, the program that helps our seniors, the disability benefits, the maternity leave which many, including my wife, take, would not be there. It would not be there in our time, in our generation, and perhaps even within the life of this Parliament.

I have heard hon. members opposite lamenting and saying "This could have better invested. We could have done a lot of other things differently," but the reality is that I do not think we walk around with a crystal ball in our hands anticipating what the problems are in the future.

When we strip away the politics of all of this, when we take away the partisanship that often clouds a decision that has to be taken, we find that what is being done is necessary.

As members know, I did not take my MP pension. Yet I believe it is very important to understand that most people of our generation would appreciate and would applaud what this government is doing today.

I am pleased to speak to the issue. I am pleased to speak to the very necessary changes that are about to take place over the next little while.

[*Translation*]

We are in a period of transition. It must be clearly understood that, if we want to move into the new decade, the new millennium that is approaching, it is absolutely vital that we recognize problems before they arise.

[*English*]

The provinces that were involved in the negotiations dealing with the changes to CPP earlier this year also recognize and gave approval to the need to move ahead. I do not think that what we are doing here is extraordinary.

• (1715)

I know there are those who believe that we should be doing other things, that there are all sorts of wonderful proposals out there. It is far different to be sitting in the opposition knowing that you do not have to take seriously the reality of government than it is to be in a position where you are governing and you have to make decisions

that will count, decisions that will stick and decisions that will sustain themselves over the years to come.

We have one of the youngest communities, myself and the hon. member for Whitby—Ajax who I am very pleased to say has done a spectacular job as a member of Parliament and previously as a councillor. I know we share in the common view that short term pain sometimes means long term gain, but in this instance we are not talking about gain for some. I think that is what separates us from the opposition, the Reform Party.

We are here to ensure there is a modicum, a standard and a benchmark by which Canadians at the lower end of the economic spectrum will never be let down. That is a commitment that goes to the core of the Liberal Party.

It is one of the reasons that we also understand that we cannot get mired down in some of the wacky ideas that we can somehow spend our way out of these problems. We understand people. We understand the economics of the country in the 1990s as we go into the new millennium. We also understand that if we want to sustain and we want to maintain programs that help people in a way that ensures equality, we have to take decisions that are sometimes tough decisions.

I am prepared to say today as a member who is often very outspoken on a number of issues that this is an initiative that I can support. I support it because, and it may be trite to say, it is the right thing to do. Members from across this country in years to come, in particular some of the members on the other side who are a little lighter in age as I am—well, I do have until next week at which point the age of wisdom kicks in—will appreciate that colleagues of their own, friends of theirs and neighbours will be taken care of and the initiatives taken by this government at this time in our lives helped. They helped to bring people together, they helped to make sure those people had the very basics.

I noticed a smile from my hon. colleague in the New Democratic Party. I can say that it is very very good to see so many shining beaming faces. It is great not to be a rookie. I know that hon. members in the short term will be very happy after the next election because I am sure that a pension will not be too far away for them. There will be an opportunity for them to enjoy the very things we are putting forth today.

The economy is growing. There is no doubt the result of the decisions taken by the Minister of Finance with respect to bringing down interest rates is giving the engine of the economy the kind of drive that is taking place. In communities where we once saw many closed shops and people out of work, we are now seeing a full recovery in bloom. That did not just happen by accident.

We could also compare ourselves with what happened provincially with our counterparts in the province of Ontario who believe that to slash and burn is the way to go about things and at the same time wind up at the end of the day continuing to perpetuate a deficit. We chose the balanced approach and we found lo and

Government Orders

behold after our commitments in 1993 and 1997 that the balanced approach does indeed work.

There will no doubt be much controversy surrounding any decision taken by a government that dares to lead and dares to challenge the wisdom of those who would like to say "Let us leave things the way they are, let us maintain the status quo", but this is a government that is prepared to move ahead. This is a government and a minister that are prepared to seize the agenda for the future and to seize an agenda that puts in its first instance all the interests of Canadians, particularly those who are the most vulnerable in our society.

I was just told by the member for Whitby—Ajax that that is the Liberal way. I could not put it more eloquently and I terminate on that. Let us move ahead with this bill.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphan Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak on this bill, an act to establish the Canada Pension Plan Investment board and to amend the Canada Pension Plan and the Old Age Security Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts.

• (1720)

In February of this year, the Minister of Finance introduced in this House the first version of the legislation on the Canada pension plan. Its provisions were improved through the observations and comments made.

The changes put forward by the federal government were approved, as the act provides, by at least two thirds of the provinces representing two thirds of the population of Canada. In all, eight provinces, including Quebec, approved the proposed changes. Only British Columbia and Saskatchewan abstained.

Bill C-2, which the Minister of Finance introduced on September 25, provides for a reform of the Canada pension plan, among other things. There are three main thrusts to the reform. The first is to increase funding of the system, to take it from two to five years, as proposed by the minister.

The second thrust is to maximize the rate of return through the establishment of a Canada pension plan investment board.

Finally, the bill will change certain benefits, such as disability benefits.

Bill C-2 must follow the parliamentary process and be passed by Parliament in order to come into force. Next the supporting orders in council must be approved by two thirds of the provinces

representing two thirds of Canada's population. The Minister of Finance expects all these changes to take effect on January 1, 1998.

In order to assess this reform, let us take a brief look at the history of the Canada pension plan. It was established in 1966, and nine provinces joined, Quebec having its own retirement pension plan, the Quebec pension plan, commonly known as the QPP, which, incidentally, is also under review.

The Canada pension plan pays out approximately \$17 billion a year in benefits. This amount includes survivor and disability benefits. The value of the pension fund is equivalent to 2 years benefits, or roughly \$39 billion. Of course, this reform will have far-reaching effects on the premiums paid by those contributing to the Canada pension plan.

Employer-employee premiums will increase over the next six years to reach 9.9%, while the maximum contribution will rise from \$975 to \$1,635. Nevertheless, the actuarial report on which the government based its reform shows that, at this rate, the fund may be depleted by the year 2015 and contribution levels should be 14% instead of the current 5.85%. That is a 240% increase. You will understand that, between a 240% increase and the proposed 73% increase, I definitely prefer the latter.

While being strongly in favour of this legislation, I must say that the reform affects Canadians more than Quebecers, since very few Quebecers get CPP. As of last August, there were between 12,000 and 13,000 Quebecers in this situation. These beneficiaries are Quebec residents who worked all their lives in another province and who only contributed to the CPP, such as a person living in Hull but who worked in Ontario and paid contributions in that province; members of the Canadian Armed Forces and the RCMP who reside in Quebec but paid contributions to the Canada pension plan, to the extent that they only contributed to that plan; and those people who receive CPP benefits but have settled in Quebec.

As the critic on youth issues, I took a close look at the first two points I mentioned earlier, namely the funding of the plan and its optimal rate of return. The latter will be easier to achieve through the Canada pension plan investment board. This board is essentially similar to Quebec's Caisse de dépôt et placement, except that it will not have any economic mandate.

Its primary responsibility will be to achieve the best possible rate of return, so that today's young people stand a better chance of enjoying a retirement pension.

Moreover, having a reserve equivalent to five years of benefits instead of just two will provide a major fund with more money than is currently the case, thus ensuring that Canadians, and particularly people of my generation, will receive retirement benefits when the time comes.

Government Orders

• (1725)

Although our party is in favour of this reform, I would like to mention a few observations and questions that will have to be addressed at the committee stage.

To begin with, we all agree that premiums will increase under this plan. These increases will be absorbed in part by my generation. Will young people also see a decrease in their pension benefits? Given comparable premiums in constant dollars, will the pensions young people receive on retiring be comparable to those of people now receiving benefits under the plan? I would like these questions to be addressed, for there is a cloud hanging over intergenerational equity.

As party critic, and as a young person myself, I find it interesting that the focus is on the future to ensure that future generations will have the same rights as today's generation.

To give a better idea of where I am coming from, I would like to describe briefly the situation facing this country's youth. Each year the rate of unemployment is somewhere between 16 and 17% and the activity rate for young people between the ages of 15 and 24 is dropping. All the Liberal promises to create jobs for young people are slow to materialize, as is very clear from the rate of unemployment and the decreasing activity rate among young people since this government came to power. The Bloc Québécois is strongly in favour of responsibility for youth employment programs being returned to Quebec and will do everything in its power to bring this about.

I have said this over and over again, and I will keep saying it for the rest of this Parliament.

Because of the Conservatives' successive restrictions on unemployment insurance and the Liberals' employment insurance reform, fewer young people are able to take advantage of this program. This is yet another reform that served present generations in the past, but that will be inaccessible to my generation in the future.

Employment insurance, as it is now known, is a measure that is almost completely inaccessible. There are, of course, certain interesting adjustments, but for seasonal workers or young people graduating from university, this reform is completely inaccessible.

In addition, the principle followed by the Liberals with regard to premiums is simple: hold the line on premiums but cut back on accessibility. Increases in tuition fees are the result of cuts to provincial transfer payments for post-secondary education that were imposed by this government. Finally, poverty is an ever-increasing problem.

I am greatly concerned about the future, about environmental questions, about a lot of issues, but one in particular which this House must discuss, namely the widening gap between the rich and poor.

For some years now, since 1980, in fact since the fall of the Berlin Wall, we have seen that capitalism is growing by leaps and bounds. The rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer, with the government across the way and its reforms, particularly the employment insurance reform, which is impoverishing the poor still further. I think this is cause for concern.

I recently saw statistics indicating that the number of millionaires in the world has doubled. This is cause for concern. This is probably one of the consequences of the notion of the global village, the world market, which makes it easier for the rich to get richer, and more easily.

Markets are opening up increasingly toward Asia. The world is becoming one huge global market. Will this accentuate the difference between the rich and the poor? I am sounding an alarm, and I believe that considerable thought must be given to this. I think we shall be able to find a way out, but at what price? Tenacity and perseverance will be needed.

What I wanted to show with my speech is that the Bloc Québécois is not here to oppose anything that moves, everything the government does. On the contrary, we are delighted with the pension reform. As a member of the Standing Committee on Human Resources Development, I shall make it my duty, along with my colleagues, to ensure that all the reforms will apply equally to the coming generations and that everyone will be able to benefit from these services.

• (1730)

[English]

Mrs. Jean Augustine (Etobicoke—Lakeshore, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the debate to amend the Canada pension plan.

In Etobicoke—Lakeshore there are many seniors who have written, who have spoken with me and who have attended consultation meetings where we discussed the changes and the need for changes to the Canada pension plan. The plan is a primary source of income on which many Canadians rely in retirement.

Indeed, Canadians are greatly concerned about any changes to the plan which might have an adverse effect on their economic stability.

As members of Parliament, it is our duty to ensure that the financial future of all Canadians is secure and that Canadians will continue to have confidence in the Canada pension plan. The Liberal government is taking the responsibility for the future direction of the plan seriously by initiating the proposed changes. The changes are reflective of the Liberal government's belief in assisting, providing and protecting those in need.

I support Bill C-2, the legislation to amend the plan because that legislation will ensure that we have an improved and effective public pension plan that protects individuals in retirement. In an age where a wide variety of financial instruments are available to

Government Orders

Canadians to prepare for retirement, not all Canadians can afford or have the protection of RRSPs.

Experts on CPP have drawn the government's attention to the fact that in light of national realities such as an aging population, the decline in population growth, that the plan needs to be tailored to match the demographic realities of our country. We are facing up to the demographic realities by securing the future of the CPP.

The proposed changes were the result of a lengthy consultation process with provincial and territorial governments, professionals in the actuarial and insurance professions, representatives of social planning organizations, seniors, young people and other Canadians.

From this process, one thing was clear: Canadians want a national pension plan even if changes are necessary to ensure its viability in the future.

It has been established by repeated government studies that payouts lagged behind the contributions. We need to have payouts and contributions in line so that Canadians can have a plan beyond the year 2015. This means that in order to maintain the current benefit structure, contribution rates need to increase by 14% of income by the year 2030.

It is interesting that the consultation which I held in Etobicoke—Lakeshore, individuals were talking about 15%. A 14% increase in CPP premiums is a rate that most Canadians would find difficult to manage. There needs to be a middle ground in relation to what Canadians are willing to pay into and receive from the plan.

Under the legislation, marginal increases to contribution rates will be slowly phased in over a seven-year period. Contributions will be increased by .4% of income this year and will go to 9.9% of income by the year 2003 as compared with the current rate of 5.85%.

As evidenced, the increase in contribution rates will not be dramatic and therefore Canadians can have a secure CPP that is affordable.

I would like to reiterate the facts of the proposed changes that the hon. Minister of Finance has given on numerous occasions in the last Parliament and which are echoed in this Parliament by many colleagues. My constituents would like to hear that current benefits such as CPP retirement pensions, disability benefits, survivor benefits or combined benefits are not affected by the amendments in Bill C-2. Any Canadian over age 65 as of December 31, 1997 who elects to receive CPP as of this date their pension will not be affected. Likewise all benefits under the CPP except death benefits will be fully indexed to inflation. If Canadians choose to retire at age 60 or 65 or up to age 70, these ages of eligibility for retirement will remain unchanged.

• (1735)

These are the principal tenets of the CPP that will remain intact. As the government embarks on rebuilding a sound CPP plan, Canadians who are not now in receipt of CPP need to know that there will be future changes. Future beneficiaries who will be in receipt of retirement pensions will see a change in benefits because calculations will be based on five years of pensionable earnings instead of the current three years.

The disability component of CPP will be affected by the proposed changes. An applicant who is eligible to receive disability benefits would have to contribute to the CPP in four of the last six years instead of two of the last three years or five of the last ten years which is the current contribution requirement. Benefits for these applicants will be calculated based on the applicant's maximum pensionable earnings at the time of disablement instead of at age 65. I know that these are issues that many of us deal with in our constituency offices.

Changes will be made to payments of death benefits. CPP contributors will continue to receive death benefit payments under the plan, but again the benefit will continue to be based on six months of retirement benefits. They will see a decrease and this decrease is due to the fact that we want to address the problem of income disparity by ensuring that low income Canadians are not adversely impacted by the proposed changes.

These proposed changes to the CPP will ensure that Canadians will continue to have an economically viable and stable pension plan that meets their future retirement needs. The intent of these changes is to give us better options and to ensure the viability of the plan.

I call on all members at this point in time to support this initiative for the benefit of all Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you on your appointment as deputy chairman of the committees of the whole House.

I would also like to take the opportunity to thank the people in my riding of Acadie—Bathurst for their support and their trust in the June 2 federal election. Their support underscores their belief in the government management and the importance of an open democracy, and I will certainly not discuss this today.

Acadie—Bathurst has a population of nearly 100,000 people of all ages and interests. Its linguistic attributes, with anglophone and francophone populations, mark it as a particular spot in Canada.

Mining, forestry and the fisheries are very active and the main driving force of the local economy. Natural resources are however very unstable. The pulp and paper industry has experienced certain

Government Orders

difficulties. Nevertheless, things in this industry are on a better footing these days.

The fishing industry is not so well off. Since 1984, fishing has produced little, and this situation has had an alarming effect on communities.

As things currently stand in my region, the future looks vulnerable and difficult. This is why I wish to react to the changes proposed to the Canada pension plan. Bill C-2 proposes increased contributions, the creation of an independent agency to administer the plan and a reduction in benefits to those least well off in our society.

In his press release on the new bill, the Minister of Finance said that the changes would ensure the plan's long term viability, while making it fairer and more affordable for future generations of Canadians.

The Minister of Finance has an odd sense of fairness. He is targeting Canada's most vulnerable people—older women and people with a disability—in favour of his friends on Bay Street in Toronto.

● (1740)

The New Democratic Party finds this option unacceptable. We will not go for the Liberal and Reform Party position, which would increase inequity within Canadian society. The NDP believes that the voters must be consulted before any changes are made to the pension system.

The people of Canada are the ones who will have to live with these changes. They must be given an opportunity to express their views. When one is elected to this House, one is supposed to be able to participate in the debates, and I am really ashamed of what has happened here today.

The changes proposed in this bill hurt Canadians. First, Bill C-2 reduces benefits in several ways. It makes it more difficult to qualify for disability benefits and imposes stricter rules for combining disability and survivor benefits.

Under the existing legislation, one must have worked during at least four out of the past six years to be eligible for CPP disability benefits. If this bill is passed, one will be required to have worked during two of the past three years or five of the past six to be eligible for disability benefits. With the proposed changes, some people who are currently eligible would no longer be eligible.

Another problem is the whole issue of survivor and death benefits. At present, the maximum is set at \$3,580 for a person receiving survivor benefits. These have been reduced to \$2,500 with the maximum being frozen, and this will be especially harmful to widows and separated women who live alone for a longer time.

[*English*]

Bill C-2 also freezes the low level of earnings that is exempt from CPP contributions. This back door increase of CPP contribu-

tions is regressive because it affects people with low levels of earnings the most. The year's basic exemptions, the first \$3,500 of earnings, is no longer indexed to inflation which means that the low income workers, many of whom are women, would have to pay more in contributions.

[*Translation*]

The bill also includes amendments to the CPP's financial provisions and changes the plan into an additional tax and a make-work project for bankers, who are good friends of the Liberals.

Bill C-2 speeds up the planned increase in the contribution rate to the CPP. The rate, which is currently set at 5.85%, will rise to 9.9% by the year 2003, a 73% increase over a six year period. This rapid increase in the contribution rate is a concern for several reasons.

First, the CPP will be refinanced at the expense of low income people, particularly women. To shift responsibility for refinancing the CPP to those who are least able to do so, as our Liberal friends are proposing, is irresponsible and will have a harmful impact on future generations.

This tax will also have to be paid by small businesses, many of which will have a hard time meeting a 73% increase. It will prompt some of them to go underground when it comes to managing their business or hiring employees. Creating an environment that makes the underground economy more attractive is harmful to all Canadians, and this concerns me a great deal.

In addition to their ill-conceived idea of increasing contributions at the expense of the poor, the Liberals will establish the Canada pension plan investment board, whose role will be to manage the reserve fund so as to maximize revenue. However, the Liberals are not telling us that the board will not have the mandate to promote investments in our domestic economy. I support job creation programs, but I have a serious problem when I see that friends of the Liberals, namely bankers, are the ones who will benefit, while ordinary Canadians are still waiting for the Liberals to fulfill their commitments and create jobs for them.

This government keeps promising jobs for all Canadians, but its proposed changes to the CPP's financial provisions mean more power for the big wigs and more hardship for ordinary people.

Let me give an example. Why does the government accept that, when an accident occurs in the workplace, the CPP provides benefits for the injured worker, instead of the workers compensation board? It is a way of abusing the system and still keeping an eye out for their friends.

● (1745)

We must also come to the defence of the universal public pension system. An older population does not mean we must adopt an individualized approach or that we must privatize our public pension system. On the contrary, our European friends offer good

Government Orders

examples of societies with older populations that now have public pension plans.

The Liberals have manufactured a crisis around the CPP in order to be able to attack the concept of the universality of our pensions and to save money on the backs of society's weakest members.

[*English*]

The Canadian public pension system is a crucial part of the Canadian social security net. The CPP and the OAS have been particularly important for lower and middle income seniors. It embodies the values Canadians share and ensures a fair redistribution of wealth.

Thanks to public pensions Canada has made tremendous gains in overcoming poverty among senior citizens and has provided much better prospects for retirement with dignity. In the three decades since the CPP was adopted, the poverty rate among Canadians 65 and older fell to 10.9% in 1995 from 33.5% in 1980.

The battle against poverty among seniors is far from over. Today one of every five elderly persons still lives in poverty. In 1993 the poverty rate for seniors increased over the previous year in almost every province. Scaling back CPP and OAS benefits will hurt low and middle income seniors. We have a responsibility to present and future senior citizens to oppose this legislation and protect our public pension plan.

[*Translation*]

The health of the CPP is directly tied to the rate of economic growth and a good level of employment, which increases the government's revenues. This government's many cuts, high interest rates, the present high rate of unemployment, and modest incomes have done more damage to the CPP than the aging of the population.

It is terrible to see a government that calls itself democratic refusing to let the debate continue, in this House, to get to the bottom of things. It is unacceptable. We were elected to this House to debate legislation. The CPP is of real importance to all Canadians, and the Liberal government turned its back on them today by refusing to allow the debate to continue. That is regrettable. What the Government of Canada has done today is truly shameful.

[*English*]

Mr. John Maloney (Erie—Lincoln, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to join in the debate on the Canada pension plan.

In February of this year the Liberal government acting with the provinces took the lead to place the Canada pension plan on a solid financial footing. The recent changes to the Canada pension plan

will do two important things. It will secure its sustainability and will stabilize the contribution rates.

We should not forget that the plan is jointly managed by the federal and provincial governments, and changes can only be made to it if approved by two-thirds of the provinces representing two-thirds of the population. All provinces, with the exception of British Columbia and Saskatchewan, support the reforms. Yes, let us look at it. The reforms are supported by Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba and Alberta.

The consultation process was very extensive. During the 33 sessions held in 18 cities throughout the country, more than 270 formal presentations were held to find out what Canadians thought should happen to their plan. Canadians had no hesitation. They asked to have the plan preserved, its finances strengthened and its investment practices improved.

Those who advocate scrapping the CPP and moving to a privatized system with mandatory retirement savings plans do not understand two things. First, Canadians want the CPP to remain. Second, the CPP provides protection not available through private RRSPs, such as disability benefits, provision for women of child-bearing age and survivor and death benefits.

The CPP premiums are insurance premiums paid by working Canadians into a public pension plan from which they draw benefits when they retire. To insinuate otherwise by calling the rate increase in contributions a tax grab is misleading and confusing. The CPP revenues are not revenues of the Government of Canada. The fund is jointly administered by the federal and provincial governments for the benefit of citizens, not for the benefit of governments.

• (1750)

Critics who maintain that the CPP is an insufficient public pension plan conveniently forget that it is only one of three pillars of our retirement system. The old age security and guaranteed income supplement system and private retirement savings plans such as RRSPs are the other two pillars. Action has already been taken by this government to consolidate the OAS and GIS into what we call the proposed seniors benefit which is designed to help those most in need. Taken together, these systems provide a good balance of government and individual responsibility for retirement income security.

These changes in the CPP reflect the long held Liberal values of providing stability for and protecting those in need. It is a balanced approach.

Today the 5.85% legislated CPP contribution rate is shared equally between employees and employers. Contributions are levied on earnings between \$3,500 and \$35,800. Under the existing legislation, rates were to rise to 10.1% by the year 2016. Yes they were to rise to 10.1%, although people forget that. However the

Government Orders

chief actuary of the CPP indicated that without these changes the CPP fund would be depleted by the year 2015 and contribution rates would have to increase to 14.2% by the year 2030 to cover escalating costs. Clearly the CPP was not sustainable and something had to be done.

The federal and provincial ministers agreed on a three part approach to restore the financial sustainability of the CPP and make it fair and affordable for future generations. They did this by moving to fuller funding by accelerating contribution rate increases now so they will not have to exceed 10% for future generations. We have come in at 9.9% They are improving the rate of return for the CPP fund by investing it prudently and by having a diversified portfolio of securities at an arm's length from the government. They are slowing the growth in costs by tightening the administration of benefits and changing the way some are calculated.

Speaking about fuller funding, when the CPP was introduced in 1966 it was financed as a pay as you go system. The prospects of rapid growth in real wages and labour force participation promised that the CPP could be sustained and remain affordable. As well, building up large reserves in a world of real low interest rates would not have been much help. The pay as you go CPP system made sense given those circumstances.

Since then however the slowdown in wages and workforce growth and higher real interest rates have completely changed the circumstances in which the CPP must be financed. The pay as you go financing is no longer fair, appropriate and possible. Building up a larger fund, fuller funding, and earning a higher rate of return through investment in the market will help pay for the rapidly growing cost that will occur once baby boomers begin to retire. Accordingly the CPP will move from a pay as you go financing system to fuller funding to build up substantially larger reserve of funds. The fund will grow in value from about two years of benefits currently to about four or five years of benefits.

Indeed contribution rates will rise in steps over the next six years from the current rate of 5.85% to 9.9% of contributory earnings and then remain steady, instead of rising to 14.2% by the year 2030 as projected by the chief actuary. In dollar terms an employee earning \$35,800 a year now pays about \$945 in annual contributions. In 2003 that employee will contribute about \$1,635. This is \$450 more than what is currently legislated for that year. However by 2030 an employee would be paying \$565 less a year than if we had not acted now.

Increasing rates more rapidly now will cover the cost of each contributor's own benefits plus a uniform share of the unfunded burden that has built up. These costs will not be passed on to future generations.

At present the CPP has a fund equal to about two years of benefits. Funds not required immediately to pay benefits are invested in non-marketable provincial government securities. Provinces pay interest at the federal long term bond rate when the bonds are purchased.

Fuller funding of the CPP means that the fund will grow substantially from about two years of benefits to about four or five over the next two decades. A new investment policy is required to secure the best possible return for contributors. A higher investment return on the fund will keep contribution rates down.

• (1755)

Thus our ministers have agreed that the CPP funds will be invested in a diversified portfolio of securities in the best interests of contributors and beneficiaries, much like private sector plans. The fund will be managed professionally at arm's length from government by an investment board accountable to both the public and government through regular reports. The board will be subject to investment rules similar to other pension plan funds in Canada. The foreign property limits of the pension funds will also apply to the CPP fund.

When the provinces now borrow from the CPP, they will pay the same rate of interest that they do on their market borrowings. This is a very welcome step.

Let us review some of the changes to the benefits and their administration I indicated earlier. The formula for adjusting previous earnings in calculating retirement benefits will be based on the average of the year's maximum pensionable earnings over the last five years instead of the three currently, prior to starting the pension. The amount of the pension will continue to depend on how much and for how long a person contributes to that plan.

To be eligible for disability benefits, workers must show greater attachment to the labour force. They must have made CPP contributions on earnings over \$3,500 in four of the last six years prior to becoming disabled. Prior to 1987 disabled coverage was available to those who had contributed for at least five of the last 10 years.

Retirement pensions for disability beneficiaries will be based on the maximum pensionable earnings at the time of disability and then fully price indexed to age 65. This measure is consistent with how other CPP benefits are calculated and will apply only to the people not yet over the age of 65.

The death benefit will be equal to six months of retirement benefits, up to a maximum of \$2,500. Currently the maximum is set at 10%, \$3,508 in 1997. The option of eliminating the benefit was rejected.

Stewardship and accountability was a concern that has been responded to. To improve stewardship for the CPP and provide for more accountability so that the sustainability of the CPP will no longer be at risk has been accomplished as follows. Federal-provincial reviews will be required every three years instead of every five. Any future improvements will be fully funded.

There have been criticisms to which I would like to respond. Some say these payroll taxes are job killers and why are we planning on increasing the CPP contributions by almost 70% over the next six years.

Governing is about making choices and sometimes these choices are difficult. If the CPP is going to be there for young generations, we have no choice but to start paying our way for the CPP now rather than passing on an insupportable burden to our children. As I pointed out, if we did nothing, CPP contributions would rise to 14.2% by the year 2030. We have held them to 9.9%. The increase in the contribution rate is being phased in over six years to minimize the impact on the labour market.

Unlike the CPP contributions that are a savings toward pensions, EI premiums are an additional payroll tax that finance current expenditures. We have also said that we will bring down the EI premiums as soon as and as fast as it makes sense, and we are doing that as well.

This legislation represents a significant step forward to fulfilling our commitment to a secure Canadian retirement income system. These changes will strengthen our pension system so it will continue to give Canadians the opportunity to build sufficient incomes for their retirement.

Mr. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, PC): Mr. Speaker, my party is profoundly disappointed with the lack of vision demonstrated by the government with Bill C-2.

With Bill C-2 the government had an opportunity to demonstrate courage and vision for Canadians. The government had an opportunity to stop taxing, especially payroll taxes which are killing jobs in Canada. They have been demonstrated around the world as being the single biggest impediment to the growth of jobs not just in the Canadian economy, but in the U.S. and the U.K. economies.

Even the Netherlands in 1983 had an unemployment rate in excess of 13%. In 1983 the Government of the Netherlands recognized that high taxes kill jobs. As such the government reduced payroll taxes, reduced general taxation and reduced regulations on small business. It has achieved a reduction of 15% to the extent that now in the Netherlands the unemployment rate is less than 7%.

• (1800)

This demonstrates what vision and leadership can provide to Canadians and what we need to do to ensure the sustainable growth of the Canadian economy.

I come from a small business background. Most of my family has been in small business for the last three generations. One thing we recognize in small business is when we only have so much coming in, in terms of general revenue, we can only afford to do so

Government Orders

much with that amount. It is not a limitless pit as the government might feel.

It stands to reason when payroll taxes are increased small businesses will not be able to hire as many people as they would otherwise want to hire.

Subsidies designed by the government to entice people toward particular actions and to move them in particular directions are the exact opposite of taxes. This in itself should demonstrate to the government that reducing payroll taxes would help stimulate growth in the Canadian economy.

Bill C-2 and the \$11 billion tax grab on ordinary Canadians without reducing employment insurance premiums will create further impediments to job growth. This is unacceptable to Canadians, especially to young Canadians.

When I speak to the students with whom I went to university and hear their stories of graduating with degrees and significant student loan debts, my heart goes out to them. I feel very badly for their circumstances. While the government through words says that it shares this pain and wants to do something about it, when given the opportunity to act decisively it consistently fails to demonstrate the vision these young people need.

Trade is a tenet of our party's policy. It is something that we have been consistent on in terms of supporting the values of free trade. We have consistently recognized the importance and the opportunity that trade provides to Canadians. In a country where trade provides 40% of our GDP we should recognize that when we overtax Canadian companies and individuals we create a significant impediment to our ability to help companies to be competitive internationally. This will create a further disincentive to the creation of jobs.

We are a trading nation, yet we have higher payroll taxes than our major trading partners. Perhaps this explains why we in Canada have over twice the unemployment rate of the U.S. We have a significantly higher unemployment rate than that of the U.K. We have three times the unemployment rate of Japan.

How will young Canadians move forward with a government that continues to hold them back?

Bill C-2 is another example of a government that does not trust its own people to make decisions with its own money. When government takes money from people through taxation, it is essentially saying that it is in a better position to determine what to do with that money than the individuals. The government has demonstrated unequivocally that they have not earned the right to make those decisions.

Consistent with that lack of trust in the Canadian people, the government continues to fail to give them an opportunity where they invest their RRSP savings. To limit Canadians opportunities to

Government Orders

invest internationally and to maximize their returns to provide for their families for their futures is unconscionable.

In this day and age we have an opportunity through history to learn the lessons of economics, especially the economics over the last 30 years. It demonstrates without hesitation or equivocation how taxation or any barrier placed by government on small and medium size business, especially in a trading environment, prevents jobs.

● (1805)

This government cannot claim ignorance to these facts. I find it unacceptable that this government continues to move in this direction without recognizing this. My constituents and in particular the small business community have expressed this to me. I come from Atlantic Canada where many small businesses are struggling to survive. They would very much like to expand and hire more people but this government continues to put barriers in their way to this type of job growth.

Flexibility of the workforce is very important. As we enter the 21st century it is critical that governments understand that people and businesses need more flexibility in hiring practices and the transferability of benefits, all the things that economists agree on. We have not yet been able to convince this government and instead of listening and responding to the needs of Canadians and to basic economic truths, it is going to ram Bill C-2 through this House and continue to force Canadians to endure longer sustained high unemployment in this country.

We do believe in ensuring a sustainable future for the Canada pension plan. There are some members of this House who do not think it is important to protect 225,000 disabled Canadians through the Canada pension plan. However we recognize that the Canada pension plan is an important vehicle for those people in our society who need us to provide a level of support for them because they cannot provide that for themselves.

For many Canadians the single biggest difficulty that lies in front of them is a government that refuses to allow them access to the tools of job growth. Small business, especially a small business that is involved in international trade, is going to be and should be the engine of job growth in this country. Why this government insists on preventing small business people and young people from taking their rightful place in the international business community instead of providing them with opportunities to succeed and to ensure that future generations of Canadians are successful, we do not understand.

It takes courage sometimes to make the right decision. It takes vision and it takes a level of understanding and intelligence. We sincerely hope that the Canadian people in the next election will try to seek the type of leadership that will provide Canadians with this type of government.

Ms. Elinor Caplan (Thornhill, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour and a privilege to rise in this House and speak to an issue that I believe was of concern to all of the residents of Thornhill, the young and the old.

As I begin, I would like to tell this House a little bit about the riding of Thornhill. Thornhill is a newly created riding, created by redistribution. For the very first time since the 1970s, we see Thornhill put back together again. The provincial government had divided Thornhill.

If one visits the riding one will find that old Thornhill straddles both sides of Yonge Street, part of it in the town of Vaughan and part of it in Markham. Now for the very first time with the creation of the new federal riding of Thornhill, Markham, Vaughan, Concord and all of the wonderful communities within those entities have come together under the name of Thornhill.

Thornhill is a vibrant riding with many businesses. I have to say that the businesses are very aware of the need for fixing the Canada pension plan and the problems that have plagued the Canada pension plan for many years. Each one who works in a business or who owns a business understands the importance of the Canada pension plan to Canadians and to Canadian values.

● (1810)

Within Thornhill is a very young community. As I knocked on doors and met people from all over the world, one of the things that was clear was that people in Thornhill are concerned about whether or not we will have in place in the future programs and plans like the Canada pension plan to protect them when they get sick and need disability insurance. Many were aware of the problems that have existed for some time with Canada pension plan. Many were aware of the need for the plan to be fixed.

I approached Bill C-2 from the following perspective. The first question I asked was, is there a problem? The answer to that question is yes, there is a problem. The problem is not a new one. It has existed for a long time. We could stand, we could point fingers and we could say "During the years of the Conservative government it did nothing to fix the plan". That would not be productive, although it would be true.

The response of the government has been that there is a problem. What did it do about that? It did two things. The first thing it did was consult Canadians to make them aware of the problem. The people of Thornhill are very aware that there are problems with the Canada pension plan. They are aware that if it is left untouched and unchanged, the plan will implode. It will not be there for future generations.

I do not think that many of the young people in Thornhill believed that the Canada pension plan would ever be there for

them. The seniors in Thornhill were very concerned because they said "How will changes to this plan impact me?"

It is important that these questions be answered. Not only did the government consult widely with Canadians, it also sat down with the provinces. While the Canada pension plan is a federal pension plan in the eyes of the people, the reality is that it is a federal-provincial plan. Changes can only occur if a majority of the provinces approve and recognize that a significant majority of the people of this country approve the changes. In other words the federal government could not unilaterally make these changes.

To those constituents in Thornhill who, when I knocked on their doors, said "Isn't it possible for governments to work together," I say to them and to everyone in the House that Bill C-2 is an example of governments working together.

Was it unanimous? Absolutely not. Did they get a national consensus? Yes, I believe the governments did. A majority of the provinces, including Ontario, representing a significant majority of the population of Canada, have signed an agreement to make changes to the Canada pension plan that will solve the problem. The plan will be fixed and I will be able to say to the next generation, to the young people of Thornhill and to the young people of Canada, that the Canada pension plan will be there for them in future generations.

That is the commitment of the government and that is what Bill C-2 accomplishes. It fixes a problem that has been identified and it ensures that the plan is viable into the future.

The next test and the next question that I asked on behalf of the people of Thornhill was "Is this done fairly? Is it done with accountability to the people who rely on this plan and want to know that it is there?"

• (1815)

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but as it is now 6:15 p.m. Pursuant to order made earlier this day, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the second reading stage of the bill now before the House.

The question is on the subamendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the subamendment?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the subamendment will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

Government Orders

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

• (1845)

(The House divided on the amendment to the amendment, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 7)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Bailey
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Cadman	Casson
Chatters	Cummins
Davies	Desjarlais
Dockrill	Earle
Epp	Forseth
Gilmour	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goldring	Gouk
Grewal	Grey (Edmonton North)
Hardy	Harris
Hart	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Hoepfner	Jaffer
Johnston	Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)
Konrad	Lill
Lowther	Lunn
Mancini	Manning
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Mayfield
McDonough	McNally
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Nystrom
Obhrai	Pankiw
Penson	Proctor
Ramsay	Reynolds
Riis	Ritz
Schmidt	Scott (Skeena)
Solberg	Solomon
Stinson	Stoffer
Strahl	Thompson (Wild Rose)
Vautour	Vellacott
Wasylcia-Leis	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
White (North Vancouver)	Williams—70

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alarie
Alcock	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Asselin	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Bélair	Bélanger
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Bennett	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bertrand
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bigras
Bevilacqua	Bonin
Blondin-Andrew	Borotsik
Bonwick	Bradshaw
Boudria	Brown
Brison	Bulte
Bryden	Caccia
Byrne	
Calder	

Government Orders

Cannis	Canuel
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Charest
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Crête	Cullen
de Savoye	Desrochers
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Doyle	Dromisky
Drouin	Dubé (Lévis)
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duceppe
Duhamel	Dumas
Easter	Eggleton
Finlay	Folco
Fontana	Fournier
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon	Galloway
Gauthier	Girard-Bujold
Godfrey	Godin (Châteauguay)
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guay	Guimond
Harb	Harvard
Harvey	Herron
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Jackson
Jennings	Jones
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Keddy (South Shore)	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lalonde	Lastewka
Laurin	Lavigne
Lebel	Lee
Lefebvre	Leung
Lincoln	Longfield
Loubier	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Marceau	Marchand
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
Matthews	McCormick
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague
McWhinney	Ménard
Mercier	Mifflin
Milliken	Minna
Mitchell	Muise
Murray	Myers
Nault	Normand
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Patry
Peric	Perron
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Kent—Essex)	Pillitteri
Power	Price
Proud	Provenzano
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Robillard
Rocheleau	Rock
Saada	Sauvageau
Scott (Fredericton)	Shepherd
Speller	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	St-Hilaire
St-Jacques	St-Julien
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Thompson (Charlotte)
Torsney	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Turp
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Volpe
Wappel	Wayne
Whelan	Wilfert—202

PAIRED MEMBERS

Brien	Dalphond-Guiral
Debien	Karygiannis
Manley	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Parrish	Piampodon
Venne	Wood

The Speaker: I declare the subamendment lost.

The next question is on the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (1855)

(The House divided on the amendment, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 8)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Bailey	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Cadman
Casson	Chatters
Cummins	Epp
Forseth	Gilmour
Goldring	Gouk
Grewal	Grey (Edmonton North)
Harris	Hart
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hoepfner
Jaffer	Johnston
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)	Konrad
Lowther	Lunn
Manning	Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Mayfield
McNally	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Obhrai	Pankiw
Penson	Ramsay
Reynolds	Ritz
Schmidt	Scott (Skeena)
Solberg	Stinson
Strahl	Thompson (Wild Rose)
Vellacott	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
White (North Vancouver)	Williams—52

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alarie
Alcock	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian

Asselin
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker
Barnes
Bélangier
Bellemare
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bertrand
Bigras
Bonin
Borotsik
Bradshaw
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Cannis
Caplan
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Clouthier
Cohen
Comuzzi
Crête
Davies
Desjarlais
DeVillers
Dion
Dockrill
Dromisky
Dubé (Lévis)
Duceppe
Dumas
Easter
Finlay
Fontana
Fry
Gagnon
Gauthier
Godfrey
Godin (Châteauguay)
Graham
Grose
Guimond
Hardy
Harvey
Hubbard
Iftody
Jennings
Jordan
Keddy (South Shore)
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Knutson
Lalonde
Laurin
Lebel
Lefebvre
Lill
Longfield
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Marceau
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Énard)
Massé
McCormick
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney
Mercier
Milliken
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
Nystrom
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan

Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bakopanos
Bélaïr
Bellehumeur
Bennett
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Boudria
Brison
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Canuel
Carroll
Cauchon
Chan
Charest
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Collenette
Coppes
Cullen
de Savoye
Desrochers
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Doyle
Drouin
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duhamel
Earle
Eggleton
Folco
Fournier
Gagliano
Galloway
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guay
Harb
Harvard
Herron
Ianno
Jackson
Jones
Karetak-Lindell
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lastewka
Lavigne
Lee
Leung
Lincoln
Loubier
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Mancini
Marchand
Marleau
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Matthews
McDonough
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Ménard
Mifflin
Minna
Muise
Myers
Normand
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly

Paradis
Peric
Peterson
Phinney
Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Power
Proctor
Provenzano
Reed
Riis
Rocheleau
Saada
Scott (Fredericton)
Solomon
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Hilaire
St-Julien
Szabo
Thibeault
Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Wasylcia-Leis
Whelan

Patry
Perron
Pettigrew
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Price
Proud
Redman
Richardson
Robillard
Rock
Sauvageau
Shepherd
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Jacques
Stoffer
Telegdi
Thompson (Charlotte)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp
Valeri
Vautour
Wappel
Wayne
Wilfert —220

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Brien	Dalphond-Guiral
Debien	Karygiannis
Manley	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Parrish	Plamondon
Venne	Wood

The Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

The next question is on the main motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

● (1905)

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 9)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alarie
Alcock	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Asselin	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Bélaïr	Bélangier
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Bennett	Bergeron

Government Orders

Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
 Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
 Bevilacqua
 Blondin-Andrew
 Bonwick
 Boudria
 Brison
 Bryden
 Byrne
 Calder
 Canuel
 Carroll
 Cauchon
 Chan
 Charest
 Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
 Coderre
 Collette
 Copps
 Cullen
 Desrochers
 Dhaliwal
 Discepola
 Dromisky
 Dubé (Lévis)
 Duceppe
 Dumas
 Eggleton
 Folco
 Fournier
 Gagliano
 Gallaway
 Girard-Bujold
 Godin (Châteauguay)
 Graham
 Grose
 Guimond
 Harvard
 Herron
 Ianno
 Jackson
 Jones
 Karetak-Lindell
 Keyes
 Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
 Kraft Sloan
 Lastewka
 Lavigne
 Lee
 Leung
 Longfield
 MacAulay
 Mahoney
 Maloney
 Marchand
 Marleau
 Massé
 McCormick
 McKay (Scarborough East)
 McTeague
 Ménard
 Mifflin
 Minna
 Muise
 Myers
 Normand
 O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
 Pagtakhan
 Patry
 Perron
 Pettigrew
 Picard (Drummond)
 Pillitteri
 Price
 Provenzano
 Reed
 Robillard
 Rock
 Sauvageau
 Shepherd
 St. Denis

Bertrand
 Bigras
 Bonin
 Borotsik
 Bradshaw
 Brown
 Bulte
 Caccia
 Cannis
 Caplan
 Catterall
 Chamberlain
 Charbonneau
 Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
 Clouthier
 Cohen
 Comuzzi
 Crête
 de Savoye
 DeVillers
 Dion
 Doyle
 Drouin
 Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
 Duhamel
 Easter
 Finlay
 Fontana
 Fry
 Gagnon
 Gauthier
 Godfrey
 Goodale
 Gray (Windsor West)
 Guay
 Harb
 Harvey
 Hubbard
 Ifody
 Jennings
 Jordan
 Keddy (South Shore)
 Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
 Knutson
 Lalonde
 Laurin
 Lebel
 Lefebvre
 Lincoln
 Loubier
 MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
 Malhi
 Marceau
 Marchi
 Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
 Matthews
 McGuire
 McLellan (Edmonton West)
 McWhinney
 Mercier
 Milliken
 Mitchell
 Murray
 Nault
 O'Brien (Labrador)
 O'Reilly
 Paradis
 Peric
 Peterson
 Phinney
 Pickard (Kent—Essex)
 Power
 Proud
 Redman
 Richardson
 Rocheleau
 Saada
 Scott (Fredericton)
 Speller

Steckle
 Stewart (Northumberland)
 St-Jacques
 Szabo
 Thibeault
 Torsney
 Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
 Ur
 Vanclief
 Wappel
 Whelan

Stewart (Brant)
 St-Hilaire
 St-Julien
 Telegdi
 Thompson (Charlotte)
 Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
 Turp
 Valeri
 Volpe
 Wayne
 Wilfert—202

NAYS**Members**

Abbott
 Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)
 Breitreuz (Yellowhead)
 Cadman
 Chatters
 Davies
 Dockrill
 Epp
 Gilmour
 Goldring
 Grewal
 Hardy
 Hart
 Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
 Hoepfner
 Johnston
 Lill
 Lunn
 Manning
 Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
 Mayfield
 McNally
 Mills (Red Deer)
 Nystrom
 Pankiw
 Proctor
 Reynolds
 Ritz
 Scott (Skeena)
 Solomon
 Stoffer
 Thompson (Wild Rose)
 Vellacott
 White (Langley—Abbotsford)
 Williams—69

Ablonczy
 Bailey
 Breitreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
 Casson
 Cummins
 Desjarlais
 Earle
 Forseth
 Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
 Gouk
 Grey (Edmonton North)
 Harris
 Hill (Macleod)
 Hilstrom
 Jaffer
 Konrad
 Lowther
 Mancini
 Mark
 Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
 McDonough
 Meredith
 Morrison
 Obhrai
 Penson
 Ramsay
 Riis
 Schmidt
 Solberg
 Stinson
 Strahl
 Vautour
 Wasylcia-Leis
 White (North Vancouver)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Brien
 Debieu
 Manley
 Parrish
 Venne

Dalphond-Guiral
 Karygiannis
 Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
 Plamondon
 Wood

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee)

* * *

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD ACT

The House resumed from October 7 consideration of the motion.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the referral to committee before second reading of Bill C-4.

The question is on the motion.

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If the House agrees, I propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting yea.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: No.

• (1915)

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 10)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alarie
Alcock	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Asselin	Augustine
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Bélair
Bélanger	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Bennett
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé)
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Bigras	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Borotsik	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brisson
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Canuel
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Charest
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Crête	Cullen
Davies	de Savoye
Desjarlais	Desrochers
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Dockrill	Doyle
Dromiskiy	Drouin
Dubé (Lévis)	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duceppe	Duhamel
Dumas	Earle
Easter	Eggleton
Finlay	Folco
Fontana	Fournier
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon	Galloway
Gauthier	Girard-Bujold
Godfrey	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Godin (Châteauguay)	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Guay
Guimond	Harb
Hardy	Harvard
Harvey	Herron
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Jackson
Jennings	Jones
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Keddy (South Shore)	

Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lalonde
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne	Lebel
Lee	Lefebvre
Leung	Lill
Lincoln	Longfield
Loubier	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Mancini	Marceau
Marchand	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Massé
Matthews	McCormick
McDonough	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague	McWhinney
Ménard	Mercier
Mifflin	Milliken
Minna	Mitchell
Muise	Murray
Myers	Nault
Normand	Nystrom
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Patry
Peric	Perron
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Kent—Essex)	Pillitteri
Power	Price
Proctor	Proud
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Riis	Robillard
Rocheleau	Rock
Saada	Sauvageau
Scott (Fredericton)	Shepherd
Solomon	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Hilaire	St-Jacques
St-Julien	Stoffer
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Thompson (Charlotte)
Torsney	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Turp
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Vautour
Volpe	Wappel
Wasylcia-Leis	Wayne
Whelan	Wilfert —220

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Bailey	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Cadman
Casson	Chatters
Cummins	Epp
Forseth	Gilmour
Gouk	Grewal
Grey (Edmonton North)	Harris
Hart	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Hoepfner	Jaffer
Johnston	Konrad
Lowther	Lunn
Manning	Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Mayfield
McNally	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Obhrai	Pankiw

Government Orders

Penson
Reynolds
Schmidt
Solberg
Strahl
Vellacott
White (North Vancouver)

Ramsay
Ritz
Scott (Skeena)
Stinson
Thompson (Wild Rose)
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams—50

Parrish
Venne

Plamondon
Wood

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill referred to a committee)

The Speaker: It being 7.18 p.m., the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 7.18 p.m.)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Brien
Debien
Manley

Dalphond-Guiral
Karygiannis
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)

CONTENTS

Wednesday, October 8, 1997

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Betty Trainor			
Mr. McWhinney	649	Mr. Massé	653
Kingston Penitentiary		Mr. Gauthier	653
Mr. Thompson (Wild Rose)	649	Mr. Massé	653
Newmarket Youth Centre		Canada Pension Plan	
Mrs. Kraft Sloan	649	Ms. McDonough	654
Tourism		Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	654
Mr. Bonwick	649	Ms. McDonough	654
Provincial Riding of Duplessis		Ms. McDonough	654
Mr. Fournier	650	Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	654
Berg Chilling Systems		Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	654
Mr. Cannis	650	RCMP Investigations	
BCE Inc.		Mr. Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	654
Mr. Pankiw	650	Mr. Massé	654
Breast Cancer		Mr. MacKay	654
Mr. Pratt	650	Mr. Massé	654
Public Finances		Canada Pension Plan	
Mr. Mercier	651	Mrs. Ablonczy	655
Saguenay and Manitoba Floods		Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	655
Mr. Drouin	651	Mrs. Ablonczy	655
Canada Pension Plan		Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	655
Mr. Harris	651	RCMP Investigations	
Manitoba Flood		Mr. Gauthier	655
Mr. Iftody	651	Mr. Massé	655
Canada Pension Plan		Mr. Gauthier	655
Mr. Blaikie	651	Mr. Massé	655
Presence in Gallery		Canada Pension Plan	
The Speaker	652	Mr. Solberg	656
		Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	656
		Mr. Solberg	656
		Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	656
		RCMP Investigations	
		Mr. Duceppe	656
		Mr. Duceppe	656
		Mr. Pettigrew	656
		Canada Pension Plan	
		Mr. Kenney	656
		Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	656
		Mr. Kenney	657
		Mr. Kenney	657
		Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	657
		RCMP Investigations	
		Mr. Gauthier	657
		Mr. Gagliano	657
		Consumer Affairs	
		Ms. Jennings	657
		Mr. Manley	657
		House of Commons	
		Mr. Strahl	657
		Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	657
		Mr. Strahl	658
		Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	658
		Canada Pension Plan	
		Mr. Blaikie	658

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation/Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste – lettre

03159442

Ottawa

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Canadian Government Publishing,
45 Sacré-Coeur Boulevard,
Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à:

Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada,
45 boulevard Sacré-Coeur,
Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes

Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:

Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique «Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire» à l'adresse suivante :
<http://www.parl.gc.ca>

The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

**Additional copies may be obtained from Canadian Government Publishing,
Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9, at \$1.75 per copy or \$286 per year.**

Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.

**On peut obtenir la version française de cette publication en écrivant à Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada,
Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9, à 1.75 \$ l'exemplaire ou 286 \$ par année.**