

Government Orders

We put timetables in for all sorts of agencies and all sorts of individuals. People who do not like an unemployment insurance ruling have 30 days to appeal, which is not very much time for an individual to collect the information that he or she may need before appearing before a quasi-judicial board. Labour legislation often has a timetable or a deadline in it for an arbitrator to rule.

Consider the length of time that has been involved. It has been seven years that we referred to without a collective agreement and two years since the company sought its first injunction to try to get around the Canada Labour Code. There is also the fact that these people have been on strike for 60 days now because their employer is legally prohibited from negotiating.

I think in this particular case it would have been reasonable and sensible to have a clause in this legislation that said in this specific case that should there be any appeals that the board would hear the case and rule within the next 60 days. I think that would have been a very good clause to make sure that the legislation was ironclad and that the workers were not going to be facing the potential of another long drawn out mess.

With those comments, Madam Speaker, we will not delay the legislation. I sincerely regret that the Senate cannot be ordered back to work itself to deal with this legislation later today.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.

* * *

CANADA PENSION PLAN ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed from Thursday, November 28, consideration of the motion of Mr. Bouchard (Roberval) that Bill C-39, an act to amend the Canada Pension Plan, the Family Allowances Act and the Old Age Security Act, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre): Madam Speaker, let me start by congratulating the Minister of National Health and Welfare on his bill. Certainly it is never too late. One would suggest we should have seen the problem with our pension plans that we are trying to deal with in the bill today. We should have seen that a while back. Unfortunately through a miscalculation it was not the case.

The bill in fact was introduced in order to ensure the future viability of the Canada Pension Plan. I think in my view that is the thrust of the bill. Along with that there are a number of accessories that come with it such as the proposal to increase the Canada Pension Plan benefit for dependant children of disabled and deceased contributors by approximately 30 per cent. This means that if you want to look at it in terms of dollars and cents that will increase the benefit from about \$113 to approximately \$148 a month.

• (1230)

As a result of that there are close to 170,000 children across Canada who would receive those benefits at an approximate cost of \$75 million to the government.

There are also some other changes that were introduced as a part of the bill. In a way there were some minor amendments such as amending the legislation to protect the benefit eligibility of Canada Pension Plan benefit contributors who are unable to apply in time because of incapacity. Also it extends benefits to children who come under the custody or control of an individual who is already receiving disability benefits.

This is more or less the main structure of what we are dealing with today. Under the new legislation, in order to adjust the misfortune, what we are going to see is the combined employee-employer contribution rate increasing gradually in steps starting in 1991. It will go from 4.6 per cent and will move up until the year 2011 where we will see approximately a 9.1 per cent increase. Compare that to what we have presently. If we were not increasing those contributions, then by the year 2011 an employee and an employer would only contribute about 7.6 per cent.

This is as a result of the fact that department officials or those who were involved with the calculation made the assumption that the birth rate in Canada in the 1970s was going to be at a certain level. Unfortunately those forecasts and figures were not accurate. At that time it was estimated there would be six workers that would be available to provide benefits for each retired worker in the future. But because of the decline in the birth rate we are seeing now that there are only three workers in