

world-wide terms as some of those on the government side try to make out. Some countries do better. It is good, but it is not good enough for us to take all these years to get firmly established a principle that was agreed to after the end of World War I, and agreed to again long after World War II, in 1972 and 1973.

Promises were made to those who went overseas in both those wars, and to those who went to serve Canada in other wars, that they would be looked after. In particular, they were told that for their disabilities they would receive compensation in the form of pensions related, as I say, not to consumer prices or some kind of allowance, but to the loss of their earning power. Unless the government puts these disability pensions back on that level I say, as my friend and as veterans' organizations across Canada are saying, the government is breaking faith.

I say to the government, why spoil a fairly good record? Why spoil a fairly good package of legislation that we have known for years as the Veterans Charter by breaking faith on this issue? Let us have action now.

Mr. Gilbert Parent (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the intervention of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). I am not going to quote the figures as to what a person with a 100 per cent pension should be receiving. Hon. members are as aware of these figures as I am.

These men have indeed paid the price that must be paid for our freedom and the freedom of our children. My colleagues and the minister share the quality of fairness and understanding. I can understand the point the hon. member brings forward that such an answer is not acceptable now.

Both hon. members were here when we together, and I do not say just on one side of the House or the other, but we as a House and as a committee—I was not here, but it was surely done by the person who held the position I now hold—helped to bring our veterans pensions up to where they were comparable with any pensions in the world.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Were comparable.

Mr. Parent: They were comparable until a very short time ago. What do you want me to say about a generous pension? What is generous and what is not generous? Can we put a price tag on the years that these men defended our country and all that we believe in? What is the price tag? What is the amount we should pay? Should the price tag be \$500 a month or \$5,000? I suggest that both of those figures are fair. How do we arrive at a figure?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Keep faith with what was promised.

● (1827)

Mr. Parent: I think we are keeping faith. The fact that we do not answer a problem right this minute does not mean we are breaking faith. Surely we can say "We are willing to keep

faith but we must take our time and see what other priority must be dealt with." Yes, the veterans are indeed a priority for this government. We have listened to the veterans. We have received the reports which have been mentioned, though I have no knowledge of one of the reports which has been mentioned. But when this goes to committee and when the facts are brought out there, and when we sit down and consider this together, I believe the solution will be acceptable to our veterans. I have been out to the coast and I have met with the veterans there—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Tell us what they told you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The motion to adjourn the House is deemed to have been withdrawn. I do now leave the chair until 8 p.m. tonight.

Motion withdrawn.

At 6.28 p.m. the House took recess.

● (2000)

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

TIME ALLOCATION FOR SECOND READING OF BILL C-11

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Cafik:

That in relation to Bill C-11, an act to amend the statute law relating to income tax and to provide other authority for the raising of funds, five hours shall be allotted to the further consideration in second reading stage of the bill; and

That, at the end of the fifth such hour, any proceeding before the house shall be interrupted, if required, for the purpose of this order and, in turn, every question then necessary in order to dispose of the second reading stage of the bill shall be put forthwith and successively, without further debate or amendment.

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, I can hardly believe, after the kind of debate that took place this afternoon, that we have already spent nine days on this bill, about 26 hours. With the day that the opposition took off for their national policy convention, the total is about 11 regular sitting days spent on this bill. This debate is a follow-up to the Speech from the Throne and the budget debate on this same legislation which took place last spring. Now we have to use a time allocation motion to get this bill simply past second reading. It is not as if when you pass second reading the bill is automatically through; we then go into committee of the whole for