

Board in the groupings which we were studying here or have been in the last two days. I think, having presented a motion, to amend this Bill, I want to come to that amendment soon. My privileges are being—

Mr. Deans: It is the Government that is cutting you off, not us.

Mr. Gauthier:—somewhat stretched right now. I think that with the concurrence of the House, and there is a certain amount of reasonableness concerning this matter, since we have carried on for 35 minutes, we could go on with a question period. However, we are stretching the rules a bit too far when we are starting to have a half hour question period after one Hon. Member has spoken. I would ask that either we revert back to the order of business, which concerns Bill C-133, or that we start Question Period right now and continue all afternoon, as far as I am concerned.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I must indicate to the Hon. Member that there may be some extension of logic which could result in the possibility that he has the basis for raising a point of privilege, but I think, on the face of it, that if Hon. Members seek, by unanimous consent, to have a discussion of the nature which has just been had, then I do not think the decision of the House reached unanimously constitutes a cause for a point of privilege by some Hon. Member. The Hon. Member for Ottawa-Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) has now indicated for the second time that he would like to see debate continue, for the very valid reason that he himself has an amendment.

Mr. Deans: Talk to the Government.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): However, I much appreciated the comments made by the Hon. Member for Nepean-Carleton (Mr. Baker), particularly as to the new rules and their form. It may be that the mood is now changing toward reverting to Bill C-133. However, I must point out once more, as I did on the last occasion, that the Chair cannot refuse to recognize an Hon. Member who rises on a point of order. That would certainly be a withdrawal of privileges from some Hon. Member who seeks the floor on a point of order. If points of order continue to come, they will have to be recognized as they appear on the floor.

Mr. Gauthier: With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, I am not questioning your ruling. I am just saying to Your Honour that I have not heard any points of order. I have heard questions and exchanges. If someone has a point of order to raise at this time in debate, fine, I agree with Your Honour. However, I fail to see that there has been a valid point of order raised in the last half hour.

Mr. Deans: Not even yours.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I would like to indicate to the Hon. Member for Ottawa-Vanier that there were certain points of order raised which I thought were quite in order. However, aside from that fact, I do recognize that Hon. Members use the process of raising points of order to make some comments and enter into debate. What I must explain to

Supplementary Retirement Benefits Act (No. 2)

the Hon. Member for Ottawa-Vanier is that I cannot tell whether a point of order is in fact valid until I have heard the Hon. Member first.

Ms. Lynn McDonald (Broadview-Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I certainly welcome the fact that we actually have had a debate in this House, but I am sorry that it relapsed into the usual discussion about procedure. We almost reached the level of the xerox machine again in the last 15 minutes. However, I do want to return to discussion of the amendment and the Bill before us, Bill C-133.

● (1230)

I am opposing the amendment, as my Party is, because it is too little. To make an amendment in the six and five program, to say 6.5 per cent instead of 6 per cent, is simply not enough. Ten cents a day extra is what this would amount to and that is a ridiculous sum of money. It does not change the nature of the Bill. If Bill C-133 were not passed, retired civil servants would receive the full indexing of the Consumer Price Index, which is over 11 per cent. With Bill C-133, it is reduced 6 per cent. If the amendment is passed it only goes to 6.5 per cent. That is about 5 per cent the people are going to miss, and that is a significant sum. What is worse about it is that this means that the base is lowered, so this taking out of the pockets of retired civil servants will continue year after year. It is not merely a theft in 1983, it is an ongoing theft.

What is wrong with it? A contract is a contract. Civil servants contributed their money to the fund and it is splitting hairs to say that the fund in which, for bureaucratic reasons, indexing money goes is too low. There is another fund; transfers can be made. Those are purely administrative procedures. The point is that civil servants paid their money and were given to believe that they would get fully indexed pensions.

The Government takes very seriously its debt to corporations. It is going to continue the Petroleum Incentives Program grants. Military expenditure is increasing. It would not think of reducing interest on Canada Savings Bonds. The Government respects all kinds of debts it has with companies. It is shameful that the Government will not respect its obligations to its own former employees.

It is unconscionable to break a contract for any reason, but to break it for the six and five program is really pathetic. Six and five is not the answer to our economic problems. We need an industrial strategy which will put people back to work, which will get people working and making contributions. This will build up all kinds of funds for social purposes. Until we address the unemployment program we are not going to have a well-funded economy and we are not going to be able to afford the pensions or the social services we need.

The six and five program goes in the opposite direction. It is going to reduce demand, and that means companies will be laying people off or closing down instead of expanding. That is a popular theory with the lunatic right-wing fringe in the United States, but that is certainly no reason for us to adopt it