

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, January 21, 1985

The House met at 11 a.m.

● (1105)

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### INVESTMENT CANADA ACT

#### MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed from Monday, December 17, 1984, consideration of the motion of Mr. Stevens that Bill C-15, an Act respecting investment in Canada, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Regional Development; and on the amendment of Mr. Gray (Windsor West) (p. 1302).

**Mr. George Baker (Gander-Twillingate):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Hnatyshyn:** I hope you had a good Christmas.

**Mr. Baker:** Mr. Speaker, I hope all Members had a good Christmas and I welcome them back to the House. I hope that our continued session will be very productive and that the Government of Canada will change its attitude toward the people of Canada and give them a break instead of introducing further cuts to two very important programs instituted by the former Liberal Government, a Government which had a feel for people. We can see now how this particular Government is preoccupied with the deficit and not really interested in the people of Canada.

I want to conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, on the amendment of the Opposition House Leader. The motion was made primarily for two reasons: one, that the Bill introduced to the House is rather hazy and does not meet the objectives stated by the Minister in its introduction; second, that the actions of this Government certainly do not bear out the intentions of the Bill as outlined by the Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion (Mr. Stevens).

We have seen the actions taken by this Government since the House adjourned for the Christmas break. We saw the federal Government meeting with the provincial Governments in a spirit of consultation and deciding to sock-it to small businessmen again by increasing the Canada Pension Plan rates for all businesses in Canada, all employers and all employees.

To consult with the provincial Governments on this action might seem strange to the general population of this country. Why would the Government of Canada consult with the provincial Governments on this measure? Surely it is not only because of the Government's stated intention to consult. To consult with the provincial Premiers about an increase in the CPP rates is like consulting with landlords on a rent increase. It is exactly the same. It was not explained by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) or the provincial Ministers of Finance that the CPP fund has been used since its inception to provide money to provincial Governments for their spending programs. In other words, since 1966 or 1967 there has been a drain on the fund surplus by provincial Governments based on what their businesses and workers contribute to the fund. However, Mr. Speaker, the provinces have yet to pay any money back to the fund. As I recall, the money was borrowed on the basis of 20-year debentures. In other words, every month the provincial governments borrow money from the CPP fund on a 20-year debenture and there have been no repayments to that fund since the provincial Governments starting borrowing. However, repayments are supposed to start in 1986.

What has not been explained, Mr. Speaker, by the Minister of Finance or his provincial counterparts, and certainly what Canadians want to know, is what will happen to those repayments in the hundreds of millions of dollars which will start in 1986. How will that jibe with the amount of money that is predicted to be required by the CPP fund in the year 2000? So to consult with the provincial Governments on this issue but not explain it to the Canadian people is, to say the least, completely misleading. It certainly does not jibe with the stated intentions of the Government. Or is it the intention of this Government to increase the amount of money loaned to the provincial Governments? In other words, are we getting these increases in order to give back to the provincial Governments the money they will have to start paying to the fund in 1986?

As I said, Mr. Speaker, it is because there have been so many actions by this Government which do not agree with the stated intentions of this Bill that the Opposition House Leader has had to introduce his amendment.

In introducing the Bill the Minister stated that the primary concern of the Government was job creation. In fact, he was so preoccupied with that thought that he jumped for glee when the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) and the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Miss MacDonald) were very pleased to state at the beginning of this month that they had created 96,000 jobs in the private sector since they came to power. I heard on the radio and saw on television the Prime Minister and the Minister of Employment and Immigration