

Mr. de Jong: Very often it is justified by saying that the oil companies will create more jobs. Would the Hon. Member comment on whether \$2 billion given to the oil companies or \$2 billion given to old age pensioners would create more jobs?

Miss Carney: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Member is deliberately misleading the House or giving the impression of—

Some Hon. Members: Withdraw.

Miss Carney: The Hon. Member is presenting erroneous information. Mr. Speaker, would you care to ask him to address the matter under debate?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Order, please. The Hon. Minister knows that that happens to be a question of debate, not a point of order.

Miss Carney: He is not on the subject.

Mr. Marchi: Mr. Speaker, the Minister has certainly made an unparliamentary statement. I would ask you for a retraction by the Hon. Minister.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): It is my understanding that the Hon. Minister said that the Hon. Member was deliberately misleading the House, and that language is unparliamentary. If that is the case, I am forced to request that the Minister retract the word.

Miss Carney: Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to withdraw that word at your direction, and I would like to restate the case, that the Hon. Member is so ignorant and so belligerent and so malicious that he would attempt to criticize something which has brought unity to this country.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Order, please.

Mr. de Jong: Mr. Speaker, obviously the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Miss Carney) has been eating nails or raw hamburger. She is certainly not in a very fine mood. Not to distract from the question which I am essentially—

Miss Carney: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I direct Your Honour's attention to the fact that the Hon. Member is making value judgments about my feelings and what I eat, which is not appropriate to the conduct of this House.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Again that is not a point of order; it is a question of debate.

Mr. de Jong: Far be it from me to speculate or comment on the feelings or moods of the Hon. Minister.

Miss Carney: Sexist, sexist.

Mr. de Jong: Mr. Speaker, I must say that the Minister flabbergasts me. The point I wanted to make or the question I wanted to ask of my colleague, if government Members will

Supply

allow me to do so, concerns job creation. Would \$2 billion of extra revenues to the oil companies create more jobs than \$2 billion being given to old age pensioners who would be out there spending every nickel of it at the corner grocery store, perhaps on chesterfields or whatever? Very often, in the case of oil companies, very much of that \$2 billion would be invested in other places.

Mr. Parry: Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for leaving me so much latitude with my answer. This leads me to the subject of consumer behaviour, which is one of my favourites. Frankly, the case is exactly as he stated it. If I could restate it, without being ignorant, belligerent or malicious, everyone who has studied economics knows that putting money into the hands of pensioners ensures that it will very rapidly go into the consumer economy and indeed into that sector of the consumer economy which has the highest potential for job creation and job maintenance, namely, the purchase of the daily necessities of life. On the other hand, the oil companies—and here we talk about some organizations which can be belligerent and malicious—will be using the money to spruce up their balance sheets, as the Minister should very well know.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): The period for questions and comments is now over.

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the motion before the House for debate today, in the name of the Hon. Member for Humber-Port au Port-St. Barbe (Mr. Tobin), reads as follows:

That this House urges the Government to commit itself now to maintain the present system of full indexation of Old Age Security pensions after January 1, 1986.

Let me begin by saying that I think all Members of the House, and Canadians generally, accept that position as a desirable goal. However, we have to take a look at the situation. As we examine this question, it is important to keep a number of facts in mind. While this is a desirable goal, when opposition Members are forced to put these matters before the House in the form of motions, they use correct words, but when they ask questions in Question Period, as did the Hon. Member for Vancouver East (Ms. Mitchell) again today, they use phrases which, while hoping to get some short-term political gain, do nothing for the debate. Twice today she used the term "deindexing". She knows and I know that that is not correct.

Ms. Mitchell: Partial.

Mr. Epp (Provencher): She just now said "partial" indexing or deindexing, depending upon one's point of view. That is correct. I am pleased she admits that and has come around to that position.

We hear members of the New Democratic Party, day after day, saying that the position of the Government relative to the Budget is wrong. From their socialist position, I guess they are right. I happen to disagree with their position. I happen to disagree with them when they say that if we keep raising the deficit, we will have more employment.