

"Are you in favour of deleting from the *Criminal Code of Canada* the provisions relating to abortion?"

1) Yes

2) No

It seems to me that this is really not the proper way to put such a question. I think I am right in saying, and this probably applies throughout the country, that less than 10 per cent of the electors would understand the meaning of the question and, in all likelihood, wrong conclusions would be reached.

This type of question is obviously difficult to draft so that it is legally acceptable and clear and that it shows unequivocally the will of the people on the subject.

But I disagree entirely with the way it is presented and I think it should be put in more direct terms: "Are you for or against abortion?" Personally, I am against; I want this to be well understood by the hon. members and also by my constituents who sent me many letters expressing their feelings, their desires, their wishes as to the position which they thought I should take on this matter.

When issues as sensitive as this one are discussed, it must first be asked who has the responsibility to decide whether something has to be done or not.

The government is not there to lead the citizens of a country. They can do it in some cases and it is obvious that it has been done in the realm of regional economic expansion. The present government gives a very strong leadership in this area.

They are right to do so because they have the necessary financial resources to reach their predetermined aims. But on the individual level—and I want my wife to agree with me on this subject—, when we have to discuss such a serious matter as abortion, we want to discuss it and to take a decision together. This matter depends on the most intimate right of the family to protect itself and consequently also on the right of society to protect itself.

I regret that our children are submitted to a publicity which is really too noisy and which, in my opinion, is openly advocating free abortion, abortion in all circumstances, without any control and very often without any worry about the individual's health.

This kind of publicity is very often done in a sly way by leading people, for instance, who in the accomplishment of their job, do not openly favour abortion but who, in their private lives, make it known through the use of newspapers that they are for it.

When we see their faces on TV ... Mr. Speaker, may I call it six o'clock?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hour appointed for consideration of private members' business having expired, I do now leave the Chair.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Canada Pension Plan (No. 2) GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CANADA PENSION PLAN (No. 2)

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING ANNUAL INCREASES AND LEVEL OF INCOME ON WHICH CONTRIBUTIONS PAID

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Lalonde that Bill C-224, to amend the Canada Pension Plan, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words in the debate on Bill C-224 to amend the Canada Pension Plan. Let me add my words of congratulation to the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) to those he has received from both sides of the House on the introduction of this measure. There can be little question about this being a most significant bill to the benefit of a good portion of our Canadian population. I understand that in fact some 500,000 Canadians will receive increased benefits when the bill is passed, commencing January 1, 1974. These increased benefits are quite significant, ranging from 5 per cent to 20 per cent.

In addition to the immediate effect, there are significant changes proposed to the Canada Pension Plan which will have an impact on all generations of retired individuals who receive the benefits of this legislation. The minister is also to be congratulated in that he received full support from the provincial ministers of welfare during meetings held earlier this fall. This area of funded pension plans is shared by the federal government, and the provincial governments; it is an area of provincial as well as of federal responsibility. Indeed, the existing act requires the federal government to give the provincial governments two years' notice of changes, and that the provinces must support those proposed changes.

In this regard, I read an article in the *Ottawa Citizen* last night written by Don McGillivray under the heading "Pension changes could be illegal". Mr. McGillivray proposed that changes to the act may in fact be illegal. This is simply nonsense. All the provinces have agreed to the changes taking place as a result of amendments to the act which parliament previously passed. What parliament can do, it can undo. In this case, clause 8 of the bill before us sets aside the two years' notice which must be given to the provincial governments. This is simply changing or setting aside by legislation that provision for the purposes of this bill. Surely there is no foundation whatsoever, in a legal or parliamentary sense, for the type of suggestion made by Mr. McGillivray.

The minister is to be commended, as well, for the response he has received from members of this chamber, especially those on the other side of the House. I detected a note of support for the legislation he has brought forward in this bill.

The provisions of the Canada Pension Plan have many ramifications in that it involves retirement pensions, survivors pensions, disability pensions and provisions for