

previous Member, "Retired public servants are entitled to receive something they have paid for".

One of two things is true. Either there is contractual obligation to pay to retired public servants full indexation because it has in fact been paid for, in which case the Minister should honour his own word, or it has not been paid for. If it has not been paid for, then surely it is the plan itself which should be amended on its own merits, not as part of some nonsense about fighting inflation. The amendment makes that clear. If people have paid for something, then they are entitled to get it.

● (1700)

What the Government is proposing to do to civil servants and to retiring employees of the Canadian public is wrong. It is clearly the reason the Government is using closure. I sense that there is a growing recognition that what it is proposing to do is wrong. It is much easier for the Government to close debate now than to allow time for others to find out about it. But if those retired public servants have paid for something, as the Government and everyone around Ottawa has claimed for years they have, then they are entitled to it. Surely that is a principle of justice that every Canadian understands.

To put the matter in context for those who are not civil servants, if the Government of Canada had sold Canada Savings Bonds, as it did this year with interest at roughly 12.5 per cent and last year as it did with interest at roughly 19.5 per cent, and it felt that it needed to obtain some revenue with which to fight inflation, which is a peculiar concept in itself, it would now say to all Canada Savings Bond holders, notwithstanding the fact that the Government had a contract with them and it agreed to pay a rate of interest, it now deems it in the public interest, to break the contract unilaterally, through closure, in Parliament and to change the rate of interest. That is exactly as I understand what the Government of Canada is doing to its pensioners, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton):** Precisely.

**Mr. Bosley:** That, I think, every Canadian would find immoral. That is precisely why Members on this side of the House find the Bill so odious. Equally, when what is being done is odious, it must be even more odious to do it through the most reprehensible parliamentary means available to the Government, that is, allocation of time in order to close off debate on such a matter.

I want to say just one other thing. As I sat in this House today, I was absolutely stunned to discover Members of the New Democratic Party, having moved a motion to adjourn, which is their legitimate parliamentary right, refuse to come in and vote on the matter.

**Mr. Beatty:** They boycotted their own vote.

**Mr. Bosley:** That in itself is an unbelievable procedure. As far as I know, Mr. Speaker, it is unprecedented. It may even have been out of order to vote on a motion when the mover and the seconder were not here. The defence being used by the

### *Time Allocation*

NDP of that decision is itself odious. The argument is being made that it is somehow the same as the ringing of the bells on the energy omnibus bill.

**Mr. Deans:** This is much more important. This is not the protection of oil company profits.

**Mr. Bosley:** Members of the NDP have spent the day trying to tell others that they are defending the rights of Parliament. What I found with NDP Members on city council in Toronto is that any end justifies any means, including obviating their obligation to vote in the House of Commons. I find that offensive to the House. To try to link that with the defence of Mother Parliament, which was involved in preventing the House of Commons from dealing with the energy omnibus bill, an offence to the House, I find even more odious.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Bosley:** I know, and I think Members of this House know, why many Canadians believed in the beginning that there might have been some logic to the original Bill, that is because many Canadians believed that some civil servants have an unfair pension arrangement. I do not know whether they do. I continue to hope that there will, at some time, be a full evaluation on an actuarial basis of the civil servants' plan so that Members of the House will be able to deal with that matter on its merits. On its merits, Mr. Speaker.

What is offensive in this proposal on which closure is being applied is that a principle of ancient justice is being violated. I am not a lawyer, but I had to come to learn the principle in my days on city council. Other Members, including the Hon. Member from Scarborough, will remember, in terms of the municipal plan, that you may not do indirectly what you cannot do directly. That is an ancient principle of justice in law. Some sectors of the public support that argument because they believe the civil service pension plan is unfair. But the Government is not doing it for that reason. The Government is bringing in a Bill which it hopes will be politically popular and, as a consequence, expedient. The Government is riding this Bill over the backs of the civil servants. One can only hope that the civil servants of this nation and the pensioners understand finally that they would be wise to take away from the Government the right to manage their pension funds and get them back under their own control so that they will never have to face this odious treatment again.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier):** Mr. Speaker, I am taking part in this debate in an attempt to clarify a few points which have been raised more or less haphazardly in the House today. First of all, I would like to point out that the question regarding Standing Order 82 which is being applied at this stage of the debate has no connection with closure nor with the provisions of Standing Order 37. For the information of my hon. colleagues, I would like to point out that when we refer to closure, notice, and time limit on speeches, these are points covered by Standing Order 37. The present debate is