

ment. However, we did not know earlier today that the Government was going to make such an historic announcement affecting farmers throughout Canada, particularly in the prairies. I had hoped that the Government would at least have the courtesy to make a statement on motions, so that we would have a chance to debate the matter. This not having been done, Madam Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House.

Madam Speaker: I am very sorry, but the House cannot accept the motion to adjourn the House because the House at the present is under an order of the House. There is some order of business that has to be completed before any such motion could be in order.

I regret to have to say to the Hon. Member that I cannot accept his motion to adjourn the House. Standing Order 8.(3) reads as follows:

When it is provided in any Standing or Special Order of this House that any business specified by such Order shall be continued, forthwith disposed of, or concluded in any sitting, the House shall not be adjourned before such proceedings have been completed except pursuant to a motion to adjourn proposed by a Minister of the Crown.

For that reason, and based on this Standing Order, I cannot accept the motion of the Hon. Member. It is out of order.

Orders of the day.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

OLD AGE SECURITY ACT (NO. 2)

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-131, to amend the Old Age Security Act (No. 2) as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs, and the motion of Mr. Dantzer (p. 21795).

Mr. Sid Parker (Kootenay East-Revelstoke): Mr. Speaker, before the lunch break I was speaking about the amendment to Bill C-131 and referring to the comments made by the Conservative Party, specifically those of the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Shields) and the Hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Kilgour). The latter Member stated in his speech that his Party considered that the application of the six and five program to working people was not a problem and that they could support it. He said they were opposed to its application to Family Allowances and pensions. They knew full well from the statements and the "Budget in Brief", that it was tied to the Family Allowance, to pensions, and to the various programs.

● (1550)

The Conservative Party and the Liberal Party have openly attacked social programs for which we have fought so hard

Old Age Security Act (No. 2)

over the years. The Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) fought in the House to gain these programs, and now they are being eroded away with the help of the Conservative Party. For Conservative Members to rise in the House at this time after supporting Bill C-124 is a disgrace to the intelligence of the people of Canada. Canadians know that they supported the basic program, Bill C-124, which created the problem we are having today. This was well spelled out in June when the Government presented the program. Today we saw a prime example of what was taking place in the House. At that time I spoke about some of the things which were happening with regard to the six and five program. I said that the President of CP Rail, Ian Sinclair, had been appointed chairman of the blue chip committee to expound on the virtues of the six and five program. At that time the President of the Treasury Board danced to the tune of the President of CP Rail, and the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pepin) danced to the tune of that program. Now we have the Minister of State for Economic Development (Mr. Johnston) dancing to that tune.

We have a situation where the Government of Canada and the Official Opposition are supporting the kind of structure wherein big companies dictate the policies which are eroding the very basic social programs for which we have fought so hard.

I see Mr. Speaker motioning to me. I thank the House for the opportunity of participating in this debate.

Mr. Bill Clarke (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to rise once again and participate this time in report stage of Bill C-131. I recall very well at second reading the Hon. Member for Thunder Bay-Nipigon (Mr. Masters) telling us that his mother liked the capping of her pension, and the Hon. Member for Mission-Port Moody (Mr. Rose) talking about whether she was going to kneecap him or he, her. In any event, his mother did not write me. The Bill has been through committee and it is back here for report stage. It is not my intention to talk about my mother. I suppose I could because she is a recipient of the old age pension as well. Rather, I think it is pertinent to talk about the need of Canadian pensioners for this meagre income, if that is all they have, which was promised to them by their Government and is now proposed to be reduced. I use the word "reduced" in its proper sense. The Government says that they will still get an increase, but anyone would know that the purchasing power of these pensions is being reduced.

I heard the comments of the NDP Member who spoke before me. He was critical of the fact that the Progressive Conservative Party opposed this Bill at the same time as it supported the six and five program. I find that to be the most natural coupling of ideas. We on this side know, even if the Party to my left has no idea of any economic realities, that the Government must exercise some restraint.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Clarke: Mr. Speaker, when one pricks a balloon one gets a lot of hot air out of it. If they will allow me to continue,