

industry loses. This comes from the top spokesperson in this area.

We heard from Mr. Allan Aiken of the Canadian Semiconductor Design Association. He gave estimates in the committee which indicated that the cut-back in profitability as a result of these so-called retaliatory tariffs could end up putting some of these important semiconductor products right out of business. Mr. George Best, President of the Canadian Business Equipment Manufacturers Association, said that the previous tripartite agreement with the United States was a very good agreement which his members supported, but that they were dismayed at the reimposition of Canadian tariffs on computer parts and semiconductors. The witnesses from the industries said that this was a total lose situation.

● (1150)

When witnesses come before the committee and say those things, when everyone from the private sector who has spoken out on this Bill has said it is a disaster, when members of the Opposition stand in their places here and in committee and try to point out what the Bill is going to do to Canadian business, we listen very carefully to hear someone from the Government benches rise and explain how this is good for Canada. If it is going to hurt Canadian companies, lay off Canadian workers and knock us out of international markets, why are we doing it?

I plead with my friends opposite, with members of the Cabinet who are here today, to stop this nonsense. We have to rethink this Bill. Unless I hear a single person opposite rise and say this is a good idea, I just cannot imagine that later today we are going to vote on this Bill because it is in the best interests of Canada. I thought it was our job to pass legislation to assist Canadians, provide job opportunities and assist business. Yet this Bill does exactly the opposite. Not only does it damage Canadian business, it does very little to develop our trading relationships with Caribbean countries. It is for those reasons that we as New Democrats will certainly be voting against the Bill. I again plead with my friends in the Conservative Party to just take a few minutes and explain how this is going to do Canada, Canadians and Canadian industry any good.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the third time and passed.

Canada Pension Plan and Federal Court Act

CANADA PENSION PLAN AND THE FEDERAL COURT ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-116, an Act to amend the Canada Pension Plan and the Federal Court Act, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on National Health and Welfare.

Mr. Speaker: There are three motions set down for debate at report stage of Bill C-116. Motions numbered 1 and 3 will be grouped for debate but voted on separately. Motion No. 2 will be debated and voted on separately.

Mr. W. Paul McCrossan (York-Scarborough) moved:

Motion No. 1

That Bill C-116, be amended in Clause 23

(a) by striking out lines 12 to 15 at page 26 and substituting the following therefor:

"a judgment of nullity of a marriage on the Minister's being informed of the decree or judgment, as the case may be, and receiving the prescribed information".

(b) by striking out lines 5 and 6 at page 29 and substituting the following therefor:

"earnings under section 53.2 or 53.3,

(b) that provision of the spousal agreement is expressly permitted under the provincial law that governs the spousal agreement, and

(c) that provision of the spousal agree-".

Motion No. 3

That Bill C-116, be amended in Clause 33 by striking out lines 23 and 24 at page 45 and substituting the following therefor:

"under this section,

(b) that provision of the spousal agreement is expressly permitted under the provincial law that governs the spousal agreement, and

(c) that provision of the spousal agree-".

He said: Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. The purpose of the two amendments is to bring in mandatory credit-splitting along the lines agreed to in the federal-provincial agreement. We had extensive discussions with various interest groups, including the National Action Committee on the Status of Women. If I might just read a very short excerpt from their letter to me dated June 18, 1986, as follows:

—this is to confirm that the National Action Committee on the Status of Women supports your motions—to amend the credit-splitting and assignment clauses of Bill C-116.

We are satisfied that these amendments make Bill C-116 much fairer to women by making credit-splitting on divorce mandatory unless a province expressly legislates otherwise, and by restricting the conditions under which people can renounce their right to a share of their spouses' Canada Pension Plan credits upon retirement.

I think that letter is self-explanatory. I hope the motions will be supported.

Mr. Gauthier: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I asked the Table for a copy of Bill C-116. It was brought to me and then went for photocopying. Apparently the House is running short of these Bills. It is an important Bill and I just want to know