

Supply

ers' dollars. The second premise is that wealth is created by the tooth fairy. The Leader of the NDP (Mr. Broadbent) talked about inequality. Perhaps he can answer this question in order to enlighten the needy elderly of this country. We have a former Prime Minister who is receiving some \$90,000 a year in pension as a former Member of this place. How do we justify giving him \$276 a month while we have others who are more needy?

Mr. Broadbent: I want to say very frankly to the new Member that I found the suppositions which lay behind his question very disturbing indeed. The first part of his question was whether I really think that someone, because he suddenly turned 65, ought to get money from the taxpayers, or something to that effect. I say to the Hon. Member that that is precisely what universal pensions are all about. But it is not money that is being given as a charity. Universal pensions mean we recognize as a society that men and women in our country work all of their lives, make a contribution to our society, and deserve a pension. They paid for it through their labour and their taxes throughout their lives. That is what we believe.

It is very clear that the Hon. Member wants what his Party threatened to do before Christmas, which was to put an end to universality. I say to the Hon. Member that in the 19th century people like him believed we did not need universal education because the rich could afford their own schools. Then they went on and said we did not need medicare for everyone because the rich could afford their own doctors. Very clearly he wants to dismantle our pension system and say that only the poor should get pensions. We reject that because we have a higher view of what we can create by way of decency in this country of ours.

[Translation]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Gatineau (Mrs. Maily), for questions or comments.

Mrs. Maily: Mr. Speaker, after they finish congratulating each other, they might want to listen!

I have a question for the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, but first of all, I have a comment . . . Are you going to keep quiet and listen? Mr. Speaker, don't you think whoever is speaking has a right to be listened to? We didn't say a word when it was your turn!

The Leader of the New Democratic Party said that the greedy would benefit from this Budget. I would like to inform the Hon. Member that the greedy he is referring to include at least 100 CIP workers who were informed yesterday that contrary to what was going to happen before the Budget, they will not lose their jobs, new machines will be purchased, existing jobs will be maintained and the number of jobs in the bush increased, because of the new climate being created to stimulate the economy. And those people are not greedy. They are the ones that applauded—

An Hon. Member: That is not the subject of the motion before the House today!

Mrs. Maily: Will you keep quiet!

Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Saint-Jacques (Mr. Guilbault), on a point of order.

Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): First of all, Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. Member has a right to be heard, and my colleague should give her a chance to say what she has to say. However, I wish that what she has to say would be relevant to the motion before the House. and I do not think the subject she was broaching had any connection with old age security pensions.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I think that the Hon. Member for Gatineau was giving the House a preamble to her comments, and I am sure that she will make those comments relevant to the speech by the Hon. Member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent).

Mrs. Maily: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member for Saint-Jacques (Mr. Guilbault) for giving me a chance to be heard.

An Hon. Member: Speak to the motion before the House!

Mrs. Maily: Is that going to go on all day . . . Mr. Speaker?

An Hon. Member: Of course!

Mrs. Maily: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition . . . excuse me, we—

An Hon. Member: Bring on the jobs!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I want to take this opportunity to hand down a ruling.

[English]

Last week the Hon. Member for Gatineau (Mrs. Maily) raised a question of privilege in connection with the conduct of one particular Member, the Hon. Member for Bourassa (Mr. Rossi). The exchange is to be found in *Hansard* at pages 5335 and 5336. I stated that I would take the question of privilege under advisement and make a ruling later. Since there has been no problem between the Hon. Members for the last week I had not made the ruling, but I will make it today.

The matter as raised by the Hon. Member for Gatineau is not a question of privilege. It might more properly be classed as a point of order. The Standing Orders require the Speaker to maintain order in the Chamber, and it is the duty of the Chair to intervene or protect the Member where offensive or disorderly words are used, whether by the Member addressing the House or by any other Member present. It is also the duty