

*Canada Pension Plan*

expect. There was, no doubt, some misunderstanding somewhere. I am trying to reconcile this with an excellent speech that the Hon. Member made to defend something which, I must say, was very difficult to defend. Politics is not always easy. But when you are a bit of a fighter . . . and I know what I am talking about because I have been here for 22 or 23 years. About my question—

My colleague says that I should nonetheless put a question. I could have used up the ten minutes by making comments and prevented my hon. colleague and friend from replying. There is something I do not understand. I do not understand how he can reconcile what his party said and promised during the election campaign with everything it has done since which seems to affect almost all groups of society in Canada and mostly the less fortunate or those most in need. Of all the people in our society, the sick, the senior citizens and the young are the most important. Those three groups appear to be hit the hardest by this Government.

**Mr. Vincent:** Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not have the experience and style of the Hon. Member for Saint-Denis to return his compliments. I thank him for his good words. I am sure he will accept mine.

Yet, I should like to make a point. I think that the Hon. Member for Saint-Denis was not entirely right when he said that the federal Government has reduced its contribution to social services as well as transfer payments to the provinces. Without playing on words or arguing semantics, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that all we are trying to do with Bill C-96 is to reduce the growth of transfer payments to the provinces. It is quite different from a reduction of transfer payments. We are talking about the growth of the amounts made available every year to the provinces. What we mean to do is to reduce its growth and not the basic amount. The proof of the matter is that the provinces will get \$1 billion more per year over the next five years. The provinces will get \$1 billion more per year. I suggest that the Opposition should not talk about a cut. I want to ensure that the Hon. Member and I understand each other. I know that in addition to being my colleague, he is a member of our profession and knows that words are important.

In reply to the question raised by the Hon. Member for Saint-Denis concerning our mandate and his assessment that we had singled out the poor, the aged and the young, I suggest that he has failed, unintentionally I am sure, to mention that for a number of years, the Canadian people has been asking the Government to set up a minimum income tax system in Canada. He has failed to mention that we announced in 1985 an amendment, effective January 1, 1986, providing for a minimum income tax which will affect Canadians in higher tax brackets who could benefit from tax shelters created by the previous Liberal Government. He has certainly failed to mention that.

He surely forgot about the R&D tax credit which, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, had been established by a well-intentioned previous Government, but which benefitted unduly some

companies, and once again corrected that. He definitely forgot to talk about it. And I could go on and on like that.

So, to answer the Hon. Member's question, I think people of this country gave us a clear mandate, and that is to provide a sound management at all levels. To this day, Mr. Speaker, the results are there to see in terms of job creation, the dollar, the interest rates, and we have reasons to be pleased as a Government of the work being done, and we have to ask the Opposition to stop delaying the steady progress of the business of the House and hindering the work of the Government.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest):** A very brief question from the Hon. Member for Ottawa-Vanier (Mr. Gauthier).

**Mr. Gauthier:** Mr. Speaker, I want to come back to the growth of subsidies or payments and the accountability of the provinces not to the federal government but to their own constituents.

The Hon. Member surely knows that the Johnston Report indicated as one of the more important factors the fact that provinces had not followed the rate of increase in the federal government payments. Some provinces in fact receive more than they spend.

And when I speak of accountability I speak as a citizen of this country, like my colleague the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, and I mean this obligation Governments have to be accountable to their constituents. The provinces were expecting to get an increase already set by an agreement, but this Government is reducing the increase by 2 per cent, which affects—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest):** Order, please. I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier), but it being 6 o'clock, pursuant to the order of Wednesday, June 11, 1986, the House will now proceed to consideration of Private Members' Business as indicated in today's Order Paper.

● (1800)

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS--MOTIONS**

[English]

**CANADA PENSION PLAN****PAYMENT OF BENEFITS TO VOLUNTARY WORKERS**

**Mr. Ernie Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon) moved:**

That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should consider the advisability of paying Canada Pension Plan benefits to persons not making contributions to the Plan, and that such payment be in proportion to the time such persons dedicate to voluntary efforts in community social services.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation at the outset for this opportunity to speak to my motion for the recognition of volunteers. I am personally very happy that the motion was one which was drawn for early consideration in