

Measures Against Crime

The first armed Canadian meets the foreign invader. He tells him to stand and surrender. The foreign invader replies, "My good man, you cannot carry a loaded rifle." The Canadian soldier, who was not born yesterday, says, "By George, I can," and he points to clause 89 of the present Bill C-83 as set forth at page 7, which reads as follows:

Notwithstanding anything in this Act, (a) a member of the Canadian Forces or of the armed forces of a state other than Canada that are lawfully present in Canada . . . is not guilty of an offence under this Act by reason only that he has in his possession a weapon for the purpose of his duties or employment.

"So there," says our Canadian soldier, "I do have a right to carry this rifle." "Not so" says the invader, "have you checked clause 88 of the legislation?" Section 88 says:

Every one who, not being the holder of a licence under which he may lawfully have in his possession firearms or ammunition, knowingly has in his possession any firearm or ammunition . . .

"That," says the foreign invader, "is where you are caught, my Canadian friend." Indeed the Canadian soldier is caught. Under the bill he is certainly entitled to carry his rifle, but under the bill he is not entitled to carry any ammunition in it." And for that offence," says the foreign invader, "there will be two years to be served in one of Her Majesty's prisons."

That is only the first of at least four horrendous episodes which could happen to our brave Canadian soldier fighting on the beaches of Halifax against a foreign invader armed with a revised Criminal Code of Canada, and I will tell the rest of that story when the debate resumes tomorrow.

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order, and I will just be a moment. I wish to ask the parliamentary secretary to the government House leader if he would be kind enough to consult with his colleagues in the other place to see if they can rectify what I can only assume was a bad error in the drafting and passing of Bill C-92, an act to provide for compensation for former prisoners of war, in that it omits any mention of prisoners of war from World War I. There are still quite a number of these people around. They could be as young as 74 or 73. Surely it must be an omission or error that they were not included in Bill C-92, and I ask the parliamentary secretary to consult with his friends in the other place to see if this can still be rectified.

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, I will even talk to a couple of the hon. members' friends as well.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

[Mr. McCleave.]

SOCIAL SECURITY—SUGGESTED INQUIRY INTO PUBLIC AND PRIVATE PENSION SCHEMES

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, last Friday, April 2, as reported in *Hansard* at page 12407, I put the following question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde):

In view of the studies which have been made by the Canadian Council on Social Development with regard to public sector pensions and in view of the call which came recently from the Canada Pension Conference for an inquiry into what is happening in the private sector with regard to pensions, will the minister consider undertaking a thorough review or establishing a public inquiry into pension policy, both public and private, so that we can be sure that things will go well down the road?

If I may paraphrase the minister's reply, it was to the effect that high level studies are being conducted in his department and in the Department of Finance, and that therefore at that moment the minister did not feel that he needed to give me an affirmative answer to my question, but I am happy to say that he left the door open.

● (2200)

My question is obviously one that looks to the future, but it could be a future that is closer than we realize. Before I expand on my question let me just say in a sentence or two that I am sure the minister still knows I am deeply concerned about some immediate improvements that I believe ought to be made in pension policy. In particular, I think that now is the time for an increase in the basic amount of old age security. I also think, even though this is still the session in which the bill was passed providing for spouses' allowances, that the time has come when widows and spinsters, and widowers and bachelors, should be permitted to qualify for the benefit that is now available to spouses between 60 and 65 who have older partners drawing old age security. Discrimination against persons of single status should be ended. The minister knows that, but I do not want him to forget it.

Nevertheless I think it important that we consider the implications of my question of last Friday. The study that I had in mind by the Canadian Council on Social Development is the one entitled: "How Much Choice? Retirement Policies in Canada", published in November, 1975, which was followed up recently by a statement on retirement policies issued by the Canadian Council on Social Development itself.

This study looks very closely at public pension policy and goes into the question of whether in the future we should continue to have only a portion of our pension policy in the public sector, leaving a large element in the private sector, or whether there should be an increasing involvement of the public sector in pension policy.

The Canadian Pension Conference to which I also referred has gone into this matter and expressed some concern, almost alarm, about the future of private pension plans, and this raises the whole question of whether there should not be an expansion of what is being done in the public sector.

May I digress for a moment to say that studies and papers are being written and produced in the United States with regard to the situation down there which are even more alarming than the statements made in this country.