

*Canada Pension Plan and Federal Court Act*

another job or somebody who can be employed in a sedentary job that comes only with education and further communication skills.

I would hope that flexibility, which I think has been good in the Canada Pension Plan, remains. I do not want to see us get into a situation where we simply look at the physiology or the etiology of the symptom, the presenting symptom as you would say, and force a lot of people into the situation which they sometimes face with compensation. They end up on welfare because they have been denied benefits that should rightfully be theirs.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Since there are no further questions or comments, we shall resume debate. The Hon. Member for the Beaches (Mr. Young).

**Mr. Neil Young (Beaches):** Mr. Speaker, my remarks on third reading will be extremely brief for the very reason I gave earlier at report stage. The case I have made at second reading and in committee on behalf of my Party is on the record. I do not see any need to take up the time of the House to restate it.

Let me refer to the cost of the increase in benefits, whether sufficient enough or not, and the 6 per cent reduction for each year of early retirement as a cost. When I asked the Minister in committee why 6 per cent and not 2 per cent or 3 per cent or 4 per cent, the response that I received was that according to the Government's actuaries it was a proper formula to be used with respect to the funding of the Canada Pension Plan. Also at second reading debate and in committee I pointed out to the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp) that under the provisions of the existing Act, I believe it is Section 116, when the Government proposes any Bill to the House of Commons to amend the Canada Pension Plan Act, the Government is also obliged to provide the House with actuarial information on what the impact of those amendments will be on the Canada Pension Plan. I have not seen the actuarial statements, even though I have requested them on several occasions. It places Members in the Opposition and on all sides of the House in some difficulty. We are faced with the Government negotiating amendments to the Canada Pension Plan with its provincial counterparts and then coming back to the House of Commons with a negotiated settlement and saying: "Here you are. Rubber stamp it. Unfortunately, if you make any amendments to the Plan it will require us to go back to the negotiating table with the provinces." If that were to happen, given the implementation time required to place those amendments into effect which, as I understand it, is a minimum of six months, and if we were to insist on proposing amendments and the Government accepted them, there would be a delay in the implementation of the improvements that we all want to see.

Here we are stuck in the situation where not only do we not have too much to say as to whether the amendments being brought forward by the Government are satisfactory from our point of view, but we will not be given the actual information required under the existing Act.

Let me simply state the case again. I have said to the Minister previously in committee, at second reading and privately that the process used is not satisfactory. I do not think it lends itself to the democratic process we are used to in Canada. The next time that we go into these kinds of negotiations, there has to be some process where Members on all sides of the House, particularly those in opposition Parties, are allowed to do their job in this place. We should be able to offer constructive criticism and to bring forward suggestions about legislation. We need to have a much more open exchange of information so that we can act in the best interests not only of our constituents but in the best interests of the people across the country whom we are trying to serve.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, it is our intention to support the Bill.

**Hon. Douglas C. Frith (Sudbury):** Mr. Speaker, my remarks will not be very long. I apologize to the House for being absent at the very beginning of the debate. I recognize that at this late stage in the debate the little that I can say will not make any difference to the Bill. That, however, will not prevent me from outlining two major points to the House.

First, we feel that the Bill does not go as far as we would have wanted it to go. We have two major areas of concern: one, disability and, two, that there is a reduction in dollars when one takes early retirement.

Last but not least, I welcome the remarks made by the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp) when he indicated that this is not the end of the reform but just part of the process and there will be forthcoming improvements to the Canada Pension Plan. In terms of social legislation, one approaches this step by step. The fact that we have reservations does not take away from the fact that we will support the Bill, however.

Having said that, I agree that the time is late and that there are other pieces of legislation before the House. I want personally to thank a number of people who have been actively involved in the area of pension reform over the last several years, including not only on my own staff, Nora Valantin, but in addition, Michael Hatfield who has done a tremendous amount of work at the committee level. They deserve a great deal of credit for getting the legislation to this stage, and I thank them.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some Hon. Members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the third time and passed.