

be, which is not only denied for two years, but the base upon which all other future pensions are calculated has been diminished. And the figures are really quite significant. I believe it is open to argument, and I hope some day someone will argue—which is why I want this Clause supported—that when it expires, not only does it expire, but the status quo ante is restored. That is simple justice.

It is one thing to say that a person who is employed suffers a two-year diminution in his economic prospects, but that person knows through reclassifications and promotions, and a whole host of things which can be bargained for, that that person has at least a chance of recovery. But if this Act goes through as it stands, the persons to whom this Act will apply have no chance of recovering at all. And it is very important that we remember the effect of it.

Of course, the program should not go on any longer than two years. Is there anyone on the other side who will call the Minister of Finance a liar? I would not call him a liar. Is there anyone on the other side who would vote and, by implication, call the President of the Treasury Board a liar? I would not want that to happen. I want them to support the statements made by the President of the Treasury Board and the Minister of Finance and the blandishments which we have heard on other things and say, "Yes, Mr. Minister, we support this amendment. This will 'sunset' the Bill and the burden will not be further extended."

I say to those people in the Public Service who are interested that they ought to ply their books to see whether or not, if this amendment did in fact carry, there would be the opportunity to get rid of the injustice which is there if the Act stays unamended. I am proud to support the Hon. Member for Ottawa-Vanier with respect to this amendment, we will vote in favour of it, and I invite my hon. friends to join us.

Mr. Sid Parker (Kootenay East-Revelstoke): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the amendment presented by the Hon. Member for Ottawa-Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) that this Act should expire December 31, 1984. I would have much preferred to have seen the date "December 31, 1982".

I would like to point for a moment to some of the remarks made by the Hon. Member for Ottawa-Vanier, where he suggested that some confidence would come back by having this amendment adopted. I want to know how he can possibly expect any confidence to come back from these people who are affected by this legislation. We will support the amendment, but we believe that this Bill must be killed. It must be written out in no uncertain terms.

I would like for a moment to speak especially about some of the comments which have been coming from the Conservative Party whose Hon. Members have been getting up in this House day after day and commenting that this Bill is a breach of contract, a violation of rights, a violation of contracts. I want the Conservatives to know that in my riding every railroader knows that the Conservative Party voted in favour of Bill C-124, and that was a breach of contract. Every public

servant in my riding knows that the Conservatives supported Bill C-124, and that was a breach of their contract.

Every one of my senior citizens, pensioners, are going to know that on Thursday the Conservatives had an opportunity to save their indexing, that those cheques would have been mailed out fully indexed. I would defy the Government, in that case, to roll it back and take it away. But what did the Conservative Party do? They could not wait 15 minutes longer so that the closure Bill would have had to go over to the next day, and then there was no way those cheques could ever be mailed out in time and therefore would have had to go out fully indexed. But no, the Conservatives tripped over themselves to get into this House to accommodate the Government, to ensure that that legislation is now able to be put forward. That is what the Conservatives have done. They have the audacity to stand up in this House and talk about the Gallup poll. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that public servants and retirees are not worried about the Gallup poll, they are worried about what is happening to this legislation in this House. Nor are we worried about the Gallup poll.

● (1230)

The social services of this country are being eroded, Mr. Speaker. They are being eroded in the fields of Old Age Security pensions, Family Allowances and Public Service pensions, by the Government opposite, accommodated and assisted by the Conservatives. The only credible opposition in this House is coming from the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Taylor: They said so themselves.

Mr. Parker: I would like to comment on some of the things which were reported by various groups at the committee stage of this Bill. Under Bill C-133, the Government of Canada is allowing itself to shirk its obligation to its retired employees. It is doing so in a manner which would not be allowed for the sponsors of private pension plans. The private firms could not do it but the Government of Canada is taking away what they have an obligation to fulfil. Retirees from the federal Public Service will suffer a decrease in their standard of living in 1983 and 1984 as the result of Bill C-133. They will not be permitted to make up the reduction.

One of the great promoters of this Bill, Ian Sinclair, Chairman of CP Rail, championed the Government's cause across the country. A constituent of mine from Field, British Columbia, wrote me a letter which I in turn wrote to Ian Sinclair about. I thought the House would like to know how Mr. Sinclair applies such dedication to his own business. Marathon Realty, the Canadian Pacific real estate arm, is increasing the lease cost of one of my constituents by 90 per cent and has announced that it will increase it by a further 12 per cent a year. The Chairman of Marathon Realty has written to me to say that the increases are fair and reasonable and they do not propose to make any changes. This is what is happening, Mr. Speaker. There is no control on prices or profits, but the Government is asking our senior citizens, old age pensioners and Public Service pensioners to try to live on a