

issue? Most of the studies agree that pensions should be more portable and vested earlier. These are not difficult things, so why have we had no response from the government? These people all agree pensions should be more effectively protected against inflation, surely a basic thing in these highly inflationary times. They all agree that more people should be covered. Certainly our private pension schemes are not broad enough to do the necessary things.

They all agree, and I think this is most important, that women need better pension protection. When is this government going to give the women of this country better pension protection? Finally, all these studies agree that our pension system will be costly to the individual taxpayer, the business owner, and government. Of course, in these times that is a key issue. Delay and more delay by this government is making it impossible for us to reach satisfactory conclusions on and solutions to the pension problem. To cover the cost of our first problem in pensions, that of elderly people living below the poverty line, would cost some \$750 million. I would be the first to say that this is a very serious matter, and I would like to point out that this government has spent some \$1.4 billion to buy non-productive service stations for PetroCan. It spends more than \$100 million a year on advertising to try to convince the public it is a good government, when the public knows the story is a far different one. Now I find it is going to spend at least \$5 million to celebrate July 1. If the government got to work it could promote and pursue schemes to allow us to finance that \$750 million.

I could pursue this area further but I will not because I know we are in a hurry. However, I think it is incumbent upon the government to proceed on pensions and on its green paper. Surely the small businessmen, workers and elderly people of this country are not going to put up with it much longer. They are going to remember and they will act, I am sure, if this government does not.

I wish to say again that we support this amendment. Our only concern is that it took so long. I hope it will not take so long for the minister's green paper to be brought down.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** Before I recognize the hon. member for Kootenay East-Revelstoke (Mr. Parker), it has been mentioned to the Chair that there is a disposition not to see the clock at four o'clock. Is that agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Nielsen:** Mr. Speaker, that is agreeable as long as we do not see it at five o'clock for the equivalent amount of time we go beyond four o'clock.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** There may be a difficulty in that regard. I had not mentioned it because I did not want to comment on whether or not the hon. member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Schellenberger) was in fact going to appear. The business of private members' hour, to which the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) referred, is Motion No. 7 standing in the name of the hon. member for Wetaskiwin. I have no information as to where that matter will proceed.

### *Supplementary Retirement Benefits Act*

**Mr. Nielsen:** We will cross that bridge when we come to it, sir.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** Exactly.

**Mr. Sid Parker (Kootenay East-Revelstoke):** Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with an act to amend the Supplementary Retirement Benefits Act. During the past year representatives of all three parties have been discussing this, and it is unfortunate that it has taken until June to get it before the House. For that reason we have presented an amendment, which I will place before the House at report stage, and which I believe has been agreed to by all parties in the House. Thank you.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and, by unanimous consent, the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Blaker in the chair.

**The Assistant Deputy Chairman:** Order. House in Committee of the Whole on Bill C-120, to amend the Supplementary Retirement Benefits Act.

• (1600)

**The Chairman:** Shall Clause 1 carry?

On Clause 1—

**Mr. Parker:** Mr. Chairman, we have some concern with Clause 1. We have had agreement from all parties in the House, I believe, and because of the lateness of the adoption or the presentation of this bill we have expressed our concern. Many people could have been planning for their pension earlier on but now all of a sudden because of this bill they could be affected. Therefore, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Mission-Port Moody (Mr. Rose):

That Clause 1 of Bill C-120 be amended

(a) by striking out line 11 on page 1 and substituting the following:

"1982 or later year, and who retires, or whose spouse or parent retires, on or after the day on which this section comes into force, for a month in the"—  
and we carry on with the rest of the bill.

In area (b) by striking out line 27 on page 1 and substituting the following:

"retirement year in 1982 or a later year, and who retires, or whose spouse or parent retires, on or after the day on which this section comes into force, for"—

Then we follow on with the rest of the bill.

**The Assistant Deputy Chairman:** Shall Clause 1 as amended, carry?

**Mr. Nielsen:** Mr. Chairman, as long as your text is the same as mine, because it was not read accurately by the hon. member putting the amendment.

**The Assistant Deputy Chairman:** Then we had better have the amendment in the hands of the Chair as the one which the House will consider.

**Mr. Nielsen:** Perhaps it should be read, Mr. Chairman.

**The Assistant Deputy Chairman:** The amendment moved by the hon. member for Kootenay-East Revelstoke reads:

That Clause 1 of Bill C-120 be amended