

Time Allocation

represents an attempt to move from the limbo between thought and action, from speech to action. It really represents an attempt to use the time of the House for action taken on the basis of reasoned thought and debate.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton (Mr. Dick) rises on a point of order.

Mr. Dick: Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Schroder), recognizing that he spoke the Bill out last night and he is speaking again today, would agree that the Bill would be in committee today if he had not talked it out last night; and I was wondering if he would permit a question on that.

Mr. Schroder: If there is time at the end of my remarks, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Dick: His second speech in less than 24 hours.

Mr. Axworthy: And they are all good speeches.

Mr. Schroder: We are trying to manage our time properly and the Opposition insists on interruptions which really make no significant contribution to the debate. I will just have to continue with my speech, and if they listen I presume they might learn something.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Schroder: I think my next quotation is very apt for Members on the other side, particularly the Hon. Member who has just interrupted my speech. Sir William Osler said in 1919: "Consider the virtues of taciturnity: speak only when you have something to say".

Mr. Lewis: Take your own advice.

Mr. Schroder: If Hon. Members on the other side would listen to this, they might recognize the fact that while they maybe made some good points in this debate, they made them over and over and over again.

Mr. Lewis: That is because you do not catch on quickly.

Mr. Schroder: The purpose of this debate is to add objectivity to the issue, to add some new points. That is the science of debate. After 23 speakers it is becoming increasingly obvious that they have nothing new to say. Another quotation, which I could perhaps take credit for if I wanted to but which is anonymous, is to not speak unless you can improve on silence. I think, Mr. Speaker, that what we can do with around this House is a little more silence.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lewis: Starting now.

Mr. Schroder: Especially from the Opposition. Perhaps in reforming the House we should have incorporated a silent period during debate which perhaps would have been good for all of us. Certainly by continuing this debate, the Opposition can no longer improve on silence. They cannot even improve on

what they are saying. You know, most of us are ordinary people.

An Hon. Member: Speak for yourself.

Mr. Schroder: Ordinary people merely think of how to spend time. You can draw your own conclusion, because I am talking about the Opposition. But those with talent try to use time.

Mr. Lewis: Save him from himself, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member but the time allotted to him has expired. He may continue with unanimous consent of the House.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Lorne McCuish (Prince George-Bulkley Valley): Mr. Speaker, I heard a Member opposite comment that really the issue before us right now is whether or not we should be discussing the Bill at length, whether or not the Bill should be passed in principle. I do not know just exactly what principle the Hon. Member was considering. I know the principle which I worry about in this Bill, and I know it is not being addressed by Members opposite. If we are discussing principle, we must discuss the decency which should be inherent within this Bill.

Here we have a Bill which is a method whereby the Government can save money, money to help compensate for the gross deficit that Members opposite so irresponsibly have brought on the people of Canada. We cannot talk about the principle of the Bill without talking about who is going to be affected by it.

Bill C-131, an Act to amend the Old Age Security Act, was introduced in this House in October. It was the Liberal Government's way of offering a thanksgiving gift to the senior citizens of Canada. It was the Liberal Government's way of saying: "thank you, golden oldies; thank you for what you have done for Canada. Thank you for what you have offered to Canada. Thank you for the dedication and the love you have bestowed on your country. We want to thank you for this, and this is the way we are going to do it."

This country now has a misery index of 22 per cent, and the Government is going to attack the senior citizens as the most helpless group within our country. The Government is going to hit them because they are easily hit. They are down and Members opposite are ready to kick them. It is the Liberal Government's way of showing gratitude and appreciation for what has been done. That is why I rise, Mr. Speaker, because I am concerned with who is being hit by this atrocious piece of legislation.

Who are these people affected? They are people who went through a depression, a world war, people who waited behind for their loved ones to come back from that war. They are people who suffered their way out of that world war, people who put everything they had into bringing Canada back on its feet. They are people who worked hard during the post-war