

future role of Crown corporations in Canada as an important instrument of developing an independent and socially responsible Canadian economy.

Two days after that they tied up the whole House on the issue of Canagrex, which would be a Crown corporation with a budget of some \$4 million.

Now you tell me, Mr. Speaker, who is playing games around here. Over here they are so desperate not to vote with the Liberal Government that they will vote for anything.

**Mr. Clarke:** Mr. Speaker, I have the distinct recollection from my memory of Standing Orders that reflecting on past votes is not in order when one is debating, even an amendment. I would respectfully request the Chair to call the Member for Winnipeg-Birds Hill (Mr. Blaikie) to order.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Birds Hill (Mr. Blaikie) has been taking a broad range of an argument concerning the position of one of the Opposition Parties. The Chair has been following the argument, but the Chair cannot in all honesty rule remarks out of order at this point.

**Mr. Blaikie:** Mr. Speaker, I have some understanding of the Standing Orders and I understand that it would be unparliamentary to reflect on the motive of an individual, but to reflect on the reasons why a whole Party might vote the way they do seems to me to be fair ball, and exactly what I was trying to do.

I was talking about the six and five program, one Bill of which we have before us today, and how the Progressive Conservative position on the six and five is illustrative of a general malaise, a general sickness, which afflicts that particular Party at this point, and that is that they cannot make up their minds, it seems, on anything, except when it comes to a Crown corporation. Then they really go right off the wall to try to stop it.

Would it not be wonderful if members of this Party on my right, who, because they are the Official Opposition, have so much more ability to pressure the Government in many respects, procedurally and in other ways as well, could get as excited about protesting the Cruise missile as they do about Canagrex. When we were asking the other day when the umbrella agreement and the agreement on the Cruise missile was going to be signed, were they tying up Parliament, demanding to see the nature of that agreement? No, instead they were tying up Parliament on Canagrex.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** With all due respect, I think the Member is straying from the subject of the amendment to the motion before us.

**Mr. Blaikie:** Mr. Speaker, I prefaced every paragraph with the following, that in speaking of six and five, I was trying to show how their position on this Bill which we are debating tonight is illustrative of a general problem. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that as much as you can you will bear with me. What I am trying to do is to draw certain analogies with the position that my colleagues on the right are taking on this particular Bill.

Where do they finally come down on this? I think in the final analysis it will have to be for the Canadian people to

judge whether they want to vote for this gaggle of voices, this "Tower of Babel" that has come to be known as the Progressive Conservative Party, which holds every position in the book, from one end of the spectrum to the other, and allows different people to go traipsing about the country saying whatever they like. Something is wrong there, no leadership or something, because they cannot seem to get their act together. One person says one thing and another person says another. But enough of the Tories, Mr. Speaker.

We are opposed to this Bill C-132 because it does erode universality, in spite of many of the arguments that have been advanced by the Government and advanced by Members of the Government who probably really genuinely believe in universality. I think they have convinced themselves that this does not erode universality, but it does. Whenever you act in such a way as to cause the Canadian people to perceive a universal program as something which has to be curtailed in order to solve the economic problems of the day, you are in effect eroding the concept of universality. This is because you are eroding the confidence which Canadian people rightly have in universal programs, as part of the larger social and economic fabric of the country. That is why we are opposed to the capping of the indexing at a political and a conceptual level, apart from the fact that, as many have said, we are opposed to it because of the needless, negative economic impact it will have on families.

We hope, as the Hon. Member for Saskatoon East (Mr. Ogle) said earlier this afternoon, that there might yet be hope, as in the story of Tiny Tim and Scrooge, when at the end Scrooge was converted.

I have not been around here long enough to give up hope entirely. I was going to say, in the combined efforts of the Opposition, but it is really not a combined effort any more, because the Tories are not even here tonight. In fact, there are only two Tories in the Chamber. Let that show on the record. I hope that others will take up where I have left off.

• (2030)

**Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill):** Mr. Speaker, tonight we are speaking on a report stage amendment to Bill C-132, an Act to amend the Family Allowances Act, 1973. This Government Bill will in fact limit Family Allowances to a 6 per cent increase this year and a 5 per cent increase the year after that. We have spoken against this Bill. It is consistent with what we have spoken against with regard to the other six and five Bills.

We fought Bill C-124. We kept the House here in July and August to fight Bill C-124. We fought Bill C-131 which would restrict old age pensions to 6 per cent next year and 5 per cent the following year. We continue to fight to prevent the passage of Bill C-133 which will limit pensions of retired civil servants to 6 and 5 per cent increases.

When I say we are continuing to fight, I mean exactly that. Since day one we have been the only ones fighting this legislation. We fought Bill C-124, the original six and five Bill which