

found the key by that time, I would even be willing to agree that we resume debate on Bill C-132 and that the vote be deferred until later, when they key is found.

**Mr. Nielsen:** Mr. Speaker, ordinarily I would take keen delight in entering into any discussion with respect to the application of the rules of this place. What the Government House leader has said sounds eminently sensible, and I really do not believe that I should take a part in the substantive discussion of the application of the rules, since I am hardly an expert on the bells.

[Translation]

**Mr. Cyr:** Mr. Speaker, if I may be of some service to the Chair? I would like to inform the House that in my office, I have a ship's bell, and perhaps you would care to use it to call in the Members.

[English]

**Mr. Isabelle:** Mr. Speaker, if I could make a suggestion, maybe you could order another set of keys to be made, so that the other set could be kept under the Chair.

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin):** Order, please. The Chair has heard the various interventions by the Government House leader and the House leader of the Official Opposition as well as the NDP House leader. Is there, therefore, unanimous consent that we proceed in the way which was outlined?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Paul Dick (Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, if you would just listen carefully, I think you can faintly hear a bell, and it is a pleasure for me to have this opportunity to rise and speak to the motion on Bill C-131. I can understand why the Government has brought in closure, because it is not the type of matter it would like to discuss for a very long period of time. It is not a popular Bill and, therefore, it would like to sneak it through as quickly and as quietly as possible, hopeful that the Canadian public will not know about it.

Taking away money from senior citizens and asking them to lead us in the fight on inflation is hardly fair, considering the fact that those senior citizens are the ones who led our country to prosperity. Why does the Government of the country not take the lead in cutting its expenditures instead of increasing them by 22 per cent? Perhaps it could cut its spending so that it can increase its expenditures this year by only 6 per cent and maybe, by next year, by only 5 per cent. Perhaps the Government could take the lead in cutting our deficit so that the deficit increases next year by only 6 per cent and, the year after that, by 5 per cent. This would be a new wrinkle. We would all like this and it would be a very acceptable type of Government. We have only been debating this Bill, through which the Government seeks to cut the pensions to the senior citizens in this country, for eight and a half hours. The speech made by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Schroder) this afternoon

### *Time Allocation*

sparked my memory a little bit. I point out that the Parliamentary Secretary spoke last night in the debate and used up the available time. Otherwise, the Bill probably would have passed last night. Not only was he not satisfied with speaking for a lengthy period of time last night but he decided to get up today and make an intervention. He spoke about how Parliament does not use its time properly and how insensitive Parliament is to an effective and efficient use of time.

● (2010)

It made me think, oh yes, we had an increase in old age pensions back in 1973, when I had the honour of being here, and I remember that it was the greatest waste of the time of the House. In 1973, when the Bill to increase old age pensions was introduced in this House, the Members of the NDP and the Progressive Conservative Party, who were then in Opposition proposed to the Government that we have two speakers per Party, and then put the Bill to a vote. The Government refused, and Members of the Government spoke for three full days on the increase of old age pensions. Then the Government Party "forced" a vote, which came to 228 yeas to zero nays. Forcing a vote on a motion when nobody is opposed to it has to be an absolutely ridiculous waste of time. But the Government Members wanted to speak on their then popular measure of increasing old age pensions, and they spoke for three full days. Yet when they are introducing a measure to cut the pension, to reduce what the people get, they want to cut it off at eight and a half hours.

**An Hon. Member:** Double standard.

**Mr. Dick:** The Government certainly has a double standard, to say the very least. It is being a little hypocritical, when they bring in a positive measure they think is going to be well received, to want to talk about it at length. They then have as many as 37 speakers speaking in favour of it so they can zero copies and send them out to their constituents. But when they want to make cuts, and hurt the people who least deserve to be hurt in this country, they want to cut off debate.

I had an opportunity to go down to the Parliamentary Library this afternoon, after I heard the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Health and Welfare, and I want to quote from page 1793 of Volume 2 of the First Session of the Twenty-Ninth Parliament where, after the Question Period, the Hon. Marc Lalonde moved that Bill 147 to amend the Old Age Security Act be read a second time and referred to a Standing Committee. He said:

—the bill that is now before the House for second reading proposes the largest single increase in the basic old age security pension that has ever been made since the inception of this particular program over 20 years ago.

Now we are having the first cut that we have ever had in over 30 years of old age pensions, and they do not want to talk about it.

He went on:

I feel all the more privileged that the very first bill I have the honour to propose for the consideration of parliament is one which aims at substantially improving the economic condition of those 1.8 million senior citizens to whom Canada owes so much for making it what it is today.