

*Government Orders*

saying that the bottom line is really the same when one looks at clawback and deindexation. I would like a comment on that.

A number of my constituents, seniors, have said that the old age pension that they paid into was really an investment, the point that the member made, and that if they had paid it to a private company and that private company were trying to claw it back now, it would be sued. Is that a possibility? Also this clawback affects women more than men because there is certainly a larger proportion of women who are seniors today.

I have just one final point with respect to the unemployment insurance bill. You will recall that during the election campaign a certain minister, who is not present in the House right now, checked with the Prime Minister with respect to whether or not there would be any kind of changes that would negatively impact upon Canadian workers. Does the member recall that conversation?

Is this then not a very misleading bill as a result of what occurred during the election campaign?

**Ms. Clancy:** Madam Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague from St. Boniface. First, there is no question that seniors are again feeling absolutely betrayed. This did not work when it was tried by this government previous to 1988 because the seniors stood up and made it stop. But this time the government is coming at it through the back door and effectively, over time, unless this tide can be stemmed, it will achieve much the same result. Seniors are angry, upset, distressed. They know what the words "sacred trust" mean.

With regard to the question about the investment, suppose you put money in an RRSP at one of the chartered banks and then they said to you: "Hey, we are sorry, we told you that we would pay you 11 per cent interest but we have decided now we are only going to pay you 2 per cent interest". I think your cause of action, and I suggest the hon. Minister of Transport would agree with me, would be something that you would be fairly willing to take a run at.

The hon. member's third point was again on a question of trust, the fact of a minister, to whom he referred, checking with the Prime Minister about the UI bill in this particular case but about any changes that would go to the fabric of our universal social programs system. In response to that I can only say that Canadians sit back in holy horror and say: "How can we put our trust in people who say one thing and do another?"

**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.

**Some Hon. Members:** No.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some Hon. Members:** Yea.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some Hon. Members:** Nay.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion the yeas have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Call in the members.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 288)

## YEAS

## Members

Anderson	Andre
Atkinson	Beatty
Belsher	Bernier
Bertrand	Bird
Bjornson	Blais
Bouchard (Roberval)	Bourgault
Campbell (Vancouver Centre)	Cardiff
Champagne (Champlain)	Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Clifford	Cole
Collins	Cooper
Corbeil	Corbett
Côté	Couture
Crosby (Halifax West)	Danis
Darling	DeBlois
Desjardins	Dobbie
Domm	Dorin
Edwards	Epp
Fee	Ferland
Fretz	Friesen
Gibeau	Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Guilbault	Gustafson
Halliday	Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hawkes	Hicks
Hockin	Hogue
Horner	Horning
Hudon	Hughes
Johnson	Joncas
Kempling	Koury
Landry	Larivière
Leblanc (Longueuil)	Lewis
Littlechild	Loiselle
Lopez	MacDougall (Timiskaming)
MacKay	Malone
Marin	Martin (Lincoln)