

*Time Allocation*

Such hypocrisy for Marc Lalonde to say that when introducing the Bill in 1973, and try to cut off debate today.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin):** Order, please. The Hon. Member should refer to other Members in the House by the name of their ridings, or their portfolio, please.

**Mr. Dick:** Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what his constituency was in those days, but he was the minister of health in 1973, and he finds himself as the Minister of Finance today, not being generous as he was in 1973, but introducing six and five to cut down the pensions of the senior citizens of this country. That is what the Minister is proposing; that is the double standard used by the Government today. They insisted then that we keep debating the Bill and wasting time by taking a vote on a motion which nobody opposed.

**Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton):** The worm has turned.

**Mr. Dick:** It was this Government which was hypocritical during the 1979-1980 federal election campaign, when it went around the country and promised among other things that it would increase senior citizens' allowances by \$35. It was after the election that they then said, oh, it is only the GIS, it is not the general package that goes to old age pensioners.

**Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton):** Not the basic.

**Mr. Dick:** That is the second time they have deceived the senior citizens of this country.

**Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton):** That is right.

**Mr. Dick:** Ebenezer Scrooge was a miser, but at least he was an honest miser and he treated his foes as he did himself. The Liberal Government of today is really, in this month of December, playing like Scrooge, but it does not want to have an honest and full discussion about this matter. They want to cut it off because they are so embarrassed. They want to hide this matter. As a matter of fact, in the year 1973 the Liberal Government had to bring in a second Bill on old age pensions which it brought in on September 6 of that year, because it had botched the one it brought in on March 6.

**Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton):** I remember that.

**Mr. Dick:** They had not allowed indexing on the quarterly instalment plan. We spent seven days debating the old age security pension in 1973. Now, after eight and a half hours, they want to cut off the debate.

I understand why they might want to have a double standard but I think it is unfortunate. If they wanted to be true to themselves, and wanted to be fair or even a bit honest, then they would show the leadership required in this country.

I ask them, instead of increasing Government expenditures by 22 per cent or 17 per cent or 16 per cent, whichever figures you want to use, let them cut it to 6 per cent; and next year promise that the national debt is not going to increase by more than 6 per cent. Let them show leadership right at home in their handling of government affairs in this country, and quit trying to lay the leadership on the backs of those who are over

65, who have served this country, who have built this country into what it is today and now, after having shown leadership over the last 40 years, are being asked to show leadership a second time. I do not think that is honest or fair. I think the Government has the responsibility, and should not call upon the senior citizens who have already contributed.

The senior citizens of this country are not equally well off, but the Government is introducing a means test, and some senior citizens, as a couple, will lose almost \$600 over the next two years because of this Bill. I think the Government should bring in restraint, and I believe in the six and five program being applied in certain cases, but it should be implemented where it is most important first, that part which is increasing inflation, and that happens to be the Government's own habits of spending.

My time is almost up, Mr. Speaker and I just want to say one last thing about six and five cutting off senior citizens' pensions. It is unfair, unjust and totally reprehensible.

**Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton):** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Norman Kelly (Scarborough Centre):** Mr. Speaker, there is nothing more edifying then participating in an important debate in front of an attentive House, so I take great pleasure this evening to be able to present my reflections on the motion that is before us on the Bill whose fate we are attempting to shape.

**An Hon. Member:** That should take about two minutes.

**Mrs. Mitchell:** We heard your reflections yesterday.

**Mr. Kelly:** Two arguments have been developed and hurled across at us in this two-hour debate: First that this Government is applying closure in an attempt to terminate this important debate and that it is not interested in looking at the sensitive and detailed technical arguments that are involved in this issue and second, that this Government, in a very brutal way, is determined to fight inflation on the backs of the senior citizens. I would like to look at those arguments and see if there is any merit in them. If there is, this Government is doing the wrong thing to a very sensitive segment of our society.

● (2020)

Are we invoking closure? Are we terminating this debate? Obviously the answer is that we are not invoking closure and we are not terminating debate. The hon. gentleman opposite who is walking down the aisle, in his rococo debating style has charged us with disinterest.

**Mr. Deans:** Are you being mean?

**Mr. Kelly:** No, I think I am being generous. I was actually trying to choose between rococo and Jovian. I did not know which of the two was more accurate or generous. Anyway, are we terminating debate? The answer is no.