much the remaining quarter of an inch. Sometimes you have to vote in favour of the majority of what is contained in a Bill, while at the same time accepting something you may not really like that much.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): The Member for Hamilton Mountain is rising on a brief supplementary question.

Mr. Deans: Following directly on his answer, the Member says that frequently a Bill is complex and covers a variety of things and that in general you may disagree with certain of them but on balance you support the majority of things. Let me put to the Member that what I am talking about is the following: let me read it to the House. I am reading from the record. It was moved by the Hon. Member for Churchill (Mr. Murphy) and seconded by the Hon. Member for Vancouver East (Mrs. Mitchell) that:

> For the purpose of calculating pension benefits payable under any Act of Parliament to employees to whom this part applies, subsection (1) shall be deemed to increase wage rates proportionally to increases in the Consumer Price Index for the calendar years corresponding most nearly to the periods referred to therein.

Now what it did was to make sure there would be no reduction in pension, and we pointed that out to the Conservatives as they stood to vote. Why did the Hon. Member for Nepean-Carleton (Mr. Baker) and why did the other Members of the Conservative Party rise on August 3 and support the reduction in pensioners' incomes, and now why are they standing up and pretending that somehow they are defending pensioners?

Mr. Nickerson: My memory has been refreshed on this issue, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nickerson: I was talking to the Hon. Member for Nepean-Carleton (Mr. Baker), whose memory is a little better than mine. It appears that what happened is that during the report stage on Bill C-124—and you ruled earlier that we should not speak about past Bills, but this matter was brought up by the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain so I feel obliged to reply to it—they introduced the motion that he just read out, and in fact at the report stage a very similar motion was introduced by the Progressive Conservative Opposition. It was the finding of the Chair at that time that those motions were out of order, and they were not put before the House. Therefore, of course, there was no vote on these matters, and the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain, I am afraid, is rather in error. His memory of these events is no better than mine initially was, before I was put right by the Hon. Member for Nepean-Carleton.

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): I was talking about Bill C-133.

Mr. Deans: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. On a point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): The Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Deans: My point of order is that the Member has mistated what is factual on page 523—

Some Hon. Members: That is not a point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order. That is not a point of order. The Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. John Evans (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, every sector of our economy, indeed our society, is facing an extremely difficult time. The private economy has serious problems, business profits have fallen over 50 per cent in the last year from an already low level, the number of bankruptcies is higher than at any time since the Great Depression, wage and salary increases in the private and the public sectors alike have fallen dramatically to the 5 per cent and 6 per cent range and, indeed, in many cases there has been an absolute reduction in compensation.

The over million and a half unemployed Canadians represent the highest number of unemployed since the 1930s. The youth unemployment rate is in the range of 25 per cent, Mr. Speaker, and it is estimated that even with full employment a budgetary deficit in the range of $5 billion would continue. All major economic organizations agree that we are facing a world economic crisis, a battle for our very economic survival. Governments all over the western world, irrespective of political stripe, are realizing and acting on the necessity of restraining expenditures, even social expenditures.

Governments must act to restrain all outlays of the taxpayers' dollars because the taxpayer cannot bear more. At the same time we simply cannot borrow more against the future for this would place even heavier burdens on future generations.

I have personally fought long and hard to have this attitude of fiscal responsibility adopted by the Government, and I will continue in this effort. An economic crisis such as the one we are now facing requires not only that real restraint be achieved but that the remaining Government spending be refocused on those areas which promise to contribute the most in the fight to restore economic growth. We will not have rising standards of living without economic growth; we will not provide opportunities for our citizens without growth; we will not be able to support social expenditures, even at present levels, without restored growth.

The Government has responded and will respond further, Mr. Speaker. This is the concept within which the six and five program was introduced. The Government has acted to restrain the increases in program expenditures to no more than 6 per cent and 5 per cent. The Provinces and municipalities have followed suit, in the main, and all areas of federal outlay, including administered prices, have fallen under the restraint program. Where it can be shown that expenditure of taxpayers' dollars is involved, six and five must apply, as much for the