

Supplementary Retirement Benefits Act (No. 2)

the National Capital Region because public service pensioners, the people who are concerned about their pensions, are not confined to the National Capital Region. They will find that speakers from every Province in Canada spoke against this Bill.

I suggest, with respect, that there must be some people over there who would like the opportunity for sober second thought. I think we do have an obligation here; I believe that firmly. We have an obligation to look after the disadvantaged in society, wherever they are. We have an obligation not to distort the position of any group in society, whoever they may be, and there have been a great many distortions in this debate.

I ask my friends in the House to set aside the question of whether or not they are going to be dealing with Bill C-133. I would like to suggest that they would not be dealing with Bill C-133, but would be addressing the question in my motion, that this Bill and its consideration be delayed, that the appropriate consultation take place. Lord knows there are groups that want to do it, that would have liked the opportunity not to have this sprung on them in a budget, and that want to do the right thing in the process that ought to exist between the governors and the governed.

It should be possible to consult and see if on something of such importance there could be a consensus. I think this issue demands that and I invite all my friends, not just those who spoke on the other side of the House, but men like the Liberal Whip who has served many years with distinction in another occupation before coming here, to consider how important consultation is, and therefore how important this motion is.

This motion is not going to delay dealing with this Bill today. If it were dealt with affirmatively, that consultation would take place. The Bill is still there. It is important that this happen. It is just simple, plain justice. That is as plain, as simple and as succinct as I can put it.

I ask my friends on the other side of the House to think the same way. Do not rely on that little argument of "no written agreement". Nobody buys that. It is so patently dishonest it stinks. I say to my friends on the other side, if, after the kind of consideration that ought to apply to Public Service pensions as well as to others, legislation comes forward in the broad sense that would not attack one group for the sake of another, then that legislation may very well be supportable. But this legislation is not. It is confiscatory. It is a tax on seniors. It is dishonest and it ought not to pass this House.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Before recognizing any other Hon. Member the Chair could perhaps be allowed at this time to clarify the matter raised by the Hon. Member for Western Arctic, the Hon. Member for Yukon and others with respect to the seconder of the motion made by the President of the Treasury Board.

I should first of all draw to the attention of the House that our Standing Order 49(1) reads as follows:

All motions shall be in writing and seconded.

Standing Orders do not provide for the seconder necessarily to be a Minister of the Crown.

Further to that, the Chair has in its hands precedents which clearly establish that on a number of occasions private Members, Parliamentary Secretaries—in other words, Hon. Members other than Ministers of the Crown—have from time to time moved motions presented by the Government. One of the most recent examples of this practice occurred on November 18, 1982, and I refer to *Votes and Proceedings* for that date, where the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin) was seconded by the Hon. Member for London East (Mr. Turner) when she moved that the Bill be read a second time.

The Chair also has a number of other examples. In fact, I have one in which a member of the Opposition moved a motion made by a Minister of the Crown on at least one occasion. Therefore, it is the Chair's considered opinion that the motion, as put, was in order and that the debate should proceed as usual.

Mr. Gauthier: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Is the Hon. Member for Ottawa-Vanier rising on this point of order or on another point of order?

Mr. Gauthier: On this point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): With all due respect, the Chair has ruled.

Mr. Gauthier: Twice you said a Member of the House may "move" and I think you meant to say "seconded".

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): It could well be that I may have unintentionally said that but I shall clarify. With respect to Government Orders only Ministers of the Crown may move such motions; but any Member of the House may second such a motion. That is what I intended to say. I thank the Hon. Member for Ottawa-Vanier.

Mr. Sid Parker (Kootenay East-Revelstoke): Mr. Speaker, commencing my remarks I might address the amendment put forward by the Hon. Member for Nepean-Carleton (Mr. Baker) which would in fact give a six months' hoist to the Bill so that consultation could take place. While this may be commendable and we will support that amendment to allow that kind of consultation to take place, I want to make it very clear that regardless of what takes place we oppose this Bill in the strongest terms possible. We do not agree with the concept of what is taking place and there is no way we can support this Bill at any time, whether now or six months down the road.

I want to talk about the hypocrisy of the Conservative Party for putting forward a motion with such a plea, because less than six months ago that same Party supported the Government which had carried out no consultation with the workers in the Public Service. Those are workers who in many cases are lower paid than workers in other areas. There was no consultation with railway workers either. Yet the Conservatives came into this House and supported legislation which