

*Supplementary Retirement Benefits Act (No. 2)*

December-January world tour and what percentage of the full cost would be paid for by Canadian taxpayers. As we all know, the Prime Minister has taken several jaunts since that world trip. Recently he was in Moscow. Now he is planning to go in the other direction. Surely the people of Canada are entitled to know what are the total costs to be borne by them with respect to these capers.

**Mr. Smith:** Madam Speaker, I am shocked by the use of the word "caper". These were official visits undertaken by the Prime Minister as the representative of the Government of this country. I regret the Hon. Member has chosen to inject that tone into this question. Nevertheless, I have made inquiries since he raised this with me a few days ago and I will continue to pursue the matter on his behalf.

[Translation]

**Madam Speaker:** Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### SUPPLEMENTARY RETIREMENT BENEFITS ACT (NO. 2)

#### MEASURE TO MODIFY BENEFIT INDEX

The House resumed from Monday, December 6, consideration of the motion of Mr. Gray that Bill C-133, an Act to amend the Supplementary Retirement Benefits Act (No. 2), be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton) (p. 21305).

**Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River):** Madam Speaker, last night I had about four minutes before ten o'clock. I was dealing with a comment by the Hon. Member for Churchill (Mr. Murphy) in connection with Bill C-124. Today I have the benefit of *Hansard* and I want to pursue the matter further. It would be bad for this to remain in *Hansard*, because it is not correct. At page 21328 the Hon. Member for Churchill said:

—Bill C-124 that set the stage, that announced the Government's basic principle of limiting wages, old age pensions, Family Allowances and the pensions of retired civil servants, to six and five.

As I mentioned last night, there is not one word in Bill C-124 about the old age pension, the child allowance or superannuates. When the Hon. Member for Churchill says that we supported those items by voting for Bill C-124, he is completely in error. The Hon. Member should have read Bill C-124 before coming to that conclusion. If he had read Bill C-124, he certainly misled the House and the people out there in the great beyond.

I want to tell the Members of this House and the people of Canada that the Progressive Conservative Party did not support the reduction in indexing of the old age pension, child

credits or the superannuates. I suppose when a Party is drowning, it will grab at any straw. That appears to be what the Hon. Member was doing last night. I hope I have put the record straight.

A little further in the Hon. Member's speech last night he said something to which I objected, but I did not have his exact words. He said, and I quote:

I remind the Conservatives of some of the things their Leader said. He said, in reaction to the budget of June 28, 1982, which announced the particular six and five regime:

He then quoted our Leader as having said:

We are relieved that it is beginning to accept that Government spending is a major cause of current economic problems . . . it is a step in the right direction.

How in the world the Hon. Member for Churchill can equate that with a reduction in indexing for old age pensioners is beyond me. There is no relation whatsoever. Our Leader and this Party have been calling for reduced expenditures on the part of the Government. Government expenditure is one of the major causes of inflation. The NDP may want more expenditures, but we want less and we want Canadians to know that. The Government cannot go on spending money that it does not have. That is one of the major causes of inflation.

If anyone can find the items in Bills C-131, 132, 133 or 124, I will apologize to the House, but they are not there. Bill C-124 reduces the wages of MPs, Senators and judges, those who have jobs. The NDP opposed it. In fact, they bragged about that last night. They did not want a reduction in wages for Members of Parliament or Senators. They could not have or they would have voted for the Bill. They do not want a reduction for those in the high income brackets of the Public Service or for judges. Nobody likes a reduction, but when things are tough those with jobs should suffer the reductions first, not those who are retired or without a job. Bill C-124 did not have anything to do with Bill C-133. I repeat that I oppose Bill C-133.

I now want to deal with some of the provisions of Bill C-133. The first item that bothers me is an item that I raised in this House on July 27 in questions to the then Minister of Finance. The reply that he gave should be repeated. People should know what is involved. My question to the then Minister of Finance on that day is recorded at page 19086 of *Hansard*, July 7, 1982, and I quote:

• (1520)

It involves about 120,000 retired public servants, 30,000 retired armed forces people, and 5,000 retired members of the RCMP. Given that former public servants who worked from 30 years to 50 years for the federal Government contributed 6.5 per cent of their earnings for basic pensions plus one per cent for indexing in order to secure full pensions when they retired—this was not only a condition of their employment; it was confirmed by law in the Supplementary Retirement Benefits Act—and given that the June budget has capped the indexing of these pensions at 6 per cent, under what authority is the Government doing this? Why is the Government breaking its promise to former employees who are in the sunset years of their lives, by cutting off part of their pensions when many of these people are barely making both ends meet now?