

includes he and that her includes his. However, as it stands we are talking about these persons who stay home, and time after time we read that he stays home to look after his children although, as I said, in 90 per cent to 95 per cent of the time it is the woman we are talking about. I hope that that piece of grammar can somehow be straightened out. It is probably cause for an amendment to the Interpretation Act rather than an amendment to this act.

This bill does two main things, as I said. It splits the benefits or credits in the case of a marriage breakdown and it makes a slight concession to women who stay at home to raise their children. It also does a few other things that are quite acceptable to me. I refer to the retroactivity that is established for persons who apply for their Canada Pension Plan retirement benefit between the ages of 65 and 70. I refer also to the international agreements and various other details that are in the bill. So far as we are concerned, those things are acceptable and we go along with them.

Although the bill did not raise the matter, my friend the hon. member for Hamilton West did raise the whole question of the funding of pensions. He used some pretty broad language. He spoke about the whole nation being concerned, and about all segments of society worrying about the future of pensions. This, of course, was his answer to the reference that the parliamentary secretary made to the fact that the Ontario government has not yet agreed to one of these amendments. I regret that as well. I say, quite frankly, that I hope that when this House and the other place have passed this bill, Ontario will reconsider its position. I may say, in passing, that I was one of those back in 1965 who voted against the clause in the Canada Pension Plan that gave this power of veto to a province. We did not like the formula at all, and we said so at the time. We said, in effect, that this was writing some of the constitution into the Canada Pension Plan. I am sorry to see it being used at this time.

I see that it is almost five o'clock, Mr. Speaker. When I rose to my feet I wondered whether I might finish before five o'clock, but since I cannot do that, and since I want to deal with the points raised by the hon. member for Hamilton West about funding—he is worried about future generations being burdened with the cost of higher pensions—perhaps I might be permitted to do that when the House meets again this evening. So at this point may I ask that you call it five o'clock?

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of the adjourn-

Economic and Social Development

ment are as follows: the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald)—Transport—Date of decision on use of refrigerator cars to transport potatoes—Possibility of rate increase; the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Clarke)—Canadian Mint—Reason for accepting orders for coins from foreign countries; the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Roche)—Administration of Justice—Reported ineffective surveillance of therapeutic abortions—Government action to correct.

It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, notices of motions and public bills.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Notice of motion No. 16 in the name of the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. Martin).

Some hon. Members: Stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The motion stands at the request of the government.

Mr. Goodale: Mr. Speaker, I think we can expedite the work in private members' hour this afternoon by pointing out that there is general agreement to deal with notice of motion No. 22 standing in the name of the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Roche).

● (1700)

SUGGESTED ESTABLISHMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE
ON CANADA'S GOALS FOR THE 1980s

Mr. Douglas Roche (Edmonton-Strathcona): moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government ought to establish a special parliamentary committee on Canada's goals for the eighties, to enable the formulation of national objectives for the decade ahead, such committee to (a) receive briefs and representations from organizations and individuals suggesting priorities for economic and social development of Canada, and for Canada's role in international development (b) conduct hearings in every province to enable interested persons to communicate their views personally (c) publish a report on findings and recommendations to be debated in the House of Commons as a guide to the government in presenting its programme of economic and social legislation.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I wish to place my motion before the House this afternoon for general consideration, bearing in mind that it is fortuitous that we are debating this motion today when Mr. Justice Berger's report has just been tabled. The Berger report dramatically shows how deep are the feelings within the Canadian public about energy and environmental questions, and how much we politicians can be helped by a thorough examination of alternative routes into the future.

Put as concisely as possible, the future of Canada revolves around the nature of the growth of our society. Who will