issues separate cheques for its portion of the total pension. Only the pension payable by CN is included in this statement.

Also, since the passing of the Pension Benefits Standards Act by the federal Government on October 1, 1967, there are some employees who have terminated service with CN and are receiving rather small compulsory deferred pensions based on service performed only since October 1, 1967.

The balance of those receiving small pensions are employees who elected early retirement (before age 65) with reduced basic pensions (\$25) and employees who had very short service and very small contributions.

Among those receiving a pension under \$100 a month are those non-contributing members of CN's 1935 Pension Plan who receive a basic pension of \$25 a month.

Since 1971 CN has made ad hoc adjustments to pensions paid to those who retired before 1975. Since January 1, 1984, CN has been providing higher monthly payments at a cost of \$6.8 million in 1984 and an estimated total cost of \$47 million. Surviving spouses receive 75 per cent of the pensioners' additional 1984 allowance.

Listed hereunder are the monthly increases by year of retirement:

Year of Retirement or Death in Service		Monthly Increase Payable to Pensioner/Surviving Spouse	
1967 or prior	\$31.50	\$23.62	
1968	29.00	21.76	
1969	26.50	19.88	
1970	24.00	18.00	
1971	21.50	16.12	
1972	19.00	14.26	
1973	16.50	12.38	
1974	14.00	10.50	

In May 1984, CN will have updated pension data that will include the 1984 ad hoc adjustments. This information will be provided, on request, when available.

[Translation]

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker: The questions enumerated by the Parliamentary Secretary have been answered. Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

International Peace and Security

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CANADIAN INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

The House resumed from Wednesday, April 18, 1984, consideration of the motion of Mr. MacEachen that Bill C-32, an Act to establish the Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence.

Mr. David Kilgour (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, on April 18 when debate was interrupted on this Bill to establish our International Peace Institute, I was saying that on the basis of past government practice, the way the legislation was drafted and because of mistakes like the appointment to the various institutions, such as the Science Council and the Canadian Transport Commission, regrettably our new peace institute would, in all likelihood, start life as a partisan, politicized and therefore flawed institution.

The recent zeal to push the Bill through the House, with third reading by the end of June, has also suggested that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) wishes to use it, at least in part, as a job-creation project for a number of people in his office who will presumably soon be out of work.

Happily, discussions have taken place since April 18. The Government has indicated a genuine willingness to amend the Bill in a way that my Leader and our Party believe would guarantee that the institute is truly non-partisan and independent from the beginning. Some of these include, first, that Section 5(g) be deleted so as to remove the false impression that the institute would seek non-government funding, thereby perhaps undermining several voluntary organizations in the same field. Second, that Sections 25, 26 and 27 be deleted, as my Party has asked, so as to avoid the perception that the government of the day would use this authority over by-laws to control the institute. Third, that Section 28 be amended in committee to remove the word "shall" and replace it with the word "may". Fourth, that Section 29 be amended to include, in effect, a statutory appropriation with a longer commitment than one year.

• (1210)

Perhaps even more important, Mr. Speaker, my Party and Leader believe that democracy in the 1980s means more than just casting a vote every four to five years for the candidate of one's choice. Participatory democracy to us means that we must also listen to Canadians and must give them meaningful input on matters such as the appointment of people to this institute: in a word, an openness to new ways, new processes and new ways of doing things.

In essence, that is why so many of us on this side of the House are very enthusiastic about our Leader's proposed amendment that all the directors of the institute, other than