

S.O. 21

This innovative system could be applied to numerous other sports, which in turn would help support amateur athletics in Canada while at the same time reducing the financial burden on the taxpayer.

* * *

INSOLVENCY ACT

DEMAND FOR EARLY PASSAGE

Mr. David Berger (Laurier): Mr. Speaker, recent events surrounding the Maislin bankruptcy settlement of unpaid employees' back salaries poignantly illustrate the immediate urgency for a new Bankruptcy Act providing wage protection for workers. When Parliament prorogued in December, 1983, the Finance Committee had started its hearings and there was an understanding that all Parties would move the Bill expeditiously to committee stage in the new Session. The Insolvency Act, now Bill C-17, has been ready and waiting for second reading, and the Finance Committee impatiently awaits its work.

Attempts have been made to accommodate our colleagues on the other side, and we have urged their continued co-operation. In response to their request, proposed amendments were submitted to them for study some four weeks ago. Ironically, it has been the New Democratic Party which has been obstructing all constructive efforts to move the Bill forward. In view of the vital significance of this Bill, and in view of its long and tortuous legislative history, I call upon members of the New Democratic Party and members of the Official Opposition to exert all possible efforts to bring the Bill to immediate second reading with speedy passage to committee stage.

* * *

RAILWAYS

FUTURE OF WINNIPEGOSIS SUBDIVISION

Mr. Laverne Lewycky (Dauphin-Swan River): Mr. Speaker, all those concerned with the importance of retaining the Winnipegosis subdivision welcomed the January 11, 1984, announcement made by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy), which indicated that he was recommending to Cabinet the retention of 10 miles of CN track between Sifton and Fork River, Manitoba. As the Minister stated: "Producers delivering to this point would face unreasonable extra hauls if their point was abandoned."

● (1410)

I welcome the Minister's letter of February 28 which stated that he was seeking to have this portion rehabilitated and added to the basic network. There is concern, however, over the fact that two months have elapsed and no Cabinet decision has been announced, possibly due to the present leadership race.

I would therefore urge the Government to act immediately to add the Winnipegosis subdivision to the permanent rail network. I also call upon the Minister of Transport to review the Oakland and Inwood subdivisions, for in those cases also there exists an urgent need for retention. The Amaranth Rail Retention Committee has documented the negative impact that rail line abandonment on the Oakland subdivision would have on that area. It is important that the Oakland subdivision be added to the permanent network. Similarly, the Inwood subdivision must be retained.

* * *

[Translation]

BUDGET

PROVISIONS CONCERNING ELDERLY

Mr. Carlo Rossi (Bourassa): Mr. Speaker, Canadians across this beautiful country of ours were very interested in what the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) had to say in his Budget on February 15 of this year.

Pensioners were particularly well served by the Minister's announcement that the guaranteed income supplement will be increased by \$25 as of July 1 and by another \$25 on December 25 of this year. This \$50 increase in the guaranteed income supplement means that the Government will be paying an additional \$460 million to help pensioners.

Mr. Speaker, although the Opposition has preferred to ignore the attractive provisions of the last Budget, I can assure you that all Canadians, and especially the people in my riding of Bourassa, applaud these new measures which are a way of expressing the gratitude we owe our elders.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ATTITUDE OF CIDA REGARDING SUCO FUNDS

Mr. David Kilgour (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of SUCO representatives, I got in touch with the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) to get answers to certain questions, including this one: How does he explain that the Canadian Organization for Solidarity and Development already receives funds from CIDA, although it has been in existence for only a few months and several of its administrators are directly responsible for SUCO's huge deficit of the last fiscal year?

Why does CIDA reject the position of the Canadian Council for International Cooperation, the Quebec Association of International Cooperation Organizations and many other non-government organizations in favour of negotiated solutions? And why does CIDA refuse to accept in the case of SUCO