

*Time Allocation*

The reasoning of the Liberal Party is just as flawed. They talk about partnership. Partnership with whom, the six and five? Is six a partner of five? By the imposition of six and five, which they are seeking in certain areas, are they suggesting that, because of the future application of six and five, they have managed to bring the inflation rate down? They were blaming the United States for causing the inflation rate to rise, and interest rates too, and now they are taking credit for the collapse of the interest rates and the inflation rate. I just do not understand. Goebblesque is the only way I can describe it—if you repeat something often enough in enough places, to enough people, somebody is bound to believe it. But I suggest in the House there is no one who will believe what we heard from the Parliamentary Secretary just a few minutes ago. It is just incredible. What do they mean by partnership? The Hon. Member talked about those savings which have been accumulated by the imposition of six and five. How can we have savings when we are already \$23.9 billion in debt, maybe more than that, maybe \$30 billion? Where does one get savings, when one is already in debt, that one does not apply to reduce that debt? The logic that comes from that side of the House and from the other end of the House is fallacious—I guess they learned it at the same school. It is fallacious, it is misleading, it is Goebblesque and it is dangerous.

• (1620)

I want to read into the record now the text of a telegram which was sent today by the Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada to the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Gray). It puts in a very succinct form the matter now before us. It reads:

Am deeply disappointed that you have resorted through sheer political expedience to measures that would negate the democratic process in order to implement administrative procedures. Following our meetings last December and earlier this month I had hoped that you would have exerted your influence to honour the Government's commitment as employer and not deny pensioners the full indexation to inflation that they have paid for and which present public servants continue to support with their contributions.

Got the message? It goes on:

—the full indexation to inflation that they have paid for and which present public servants continue to support with their contributions. Bill C-133 is a political measure which the Government mistakenly believes will have popular support because it adversely affects public servants, but by forcing pensioners—

This is the point.

—by forcing pensioners to bear the brunt of this evil law, the Government's strategy will eventually backfire. It is still not too late for you to redress the situation. Withdraw Bill C-133 and restore some of your credibility.

I doubt the Minister could ever restore any of his credibility. We have talked about the number of people being injured by the legislation. I was able to get the number of pensioners in the Public Service and in the Armed Service. I asked for the number in the RCMP. It was not easy to get this information because of the three categories. The RCMP were not able, in the time available, to supply me with the figures I was seeking, but they can be pro rated. It is important to know how many widows are going to be hit by this legislation. In the Public Service and in the Armed Service there are approximately 150,000 pensioners. Of those, approximately 40,000 are

widows. Is the President of the Treasury Board aware that his measure is going to have an impact on widows who rely on this pension for their livelihood?

This is an iniquitous Bill. Commitments were made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in 1977 and by the then President of the Treasury Board, now Minister of State for Economic Development (Mr. Johnston), as late as June 1981 indicating that the Government confirms the concept that pension is part of pay and—

*[Translation]*

—a viewpoint well supported by the compensation policies which give its full value to the pension plan . . . we, the government, have attempted to formalize a policy of matching the total salary compensation of our public servants with that of other Canadian employees. An important aspect of these comparisons consists in giving a value to the pension benefits of federal employees.

*[English]*

That is an extract from a letter written by the then President of the Treasury Board to the National Association of Federal Annuitants. They are deeply distressed.

There is another aspect to this matter that has not been fully underlined but deserves to be underlined. This imposition of a lower index is to be applied to current pensions, despite the 11 per cent inflation. A catch-up will not be made. This brief, which I believe was presented to the Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates in December of last year, suggests what ought to be done if, as seems likely because of the predominance of the heavy weighting on the Government side. The Government is going to have its way. Once the six and five formula is implemented, appropriate increments should be added so that the base from which the 1985 or 1986 pensions are paid will be restored and there will not be a backtracking from the current expectation. That is a legitimate request. With time running as short as it is, I will reserve any further comments until third reading.

**Mr. Norman Kelly (Scarborough Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to participate in this debate because, quite frankly, I take issue with the arguments raised by Members of the Opposition Parties. In debates like this, it is not unusual for Opposition Members to rant and rave about this Government's predilection for using closure in the House. They like to create the image of the Government strangling democracy, having its fingers and thumbs firmly around the neck of this House, squeezing as tightly as it can, and perhaps even cackling with enjoyment.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that you are an astute student of politics. Like everyone else in this House who does any reading on the state or character of legislative politics today in the western world, you know that many Houses of Commons like this are rapidly becoming anachronistic simply because they cannot get the business of the country done quickly enough in a world that is changing with enormous speed.

The Mother of Parliaments in Great Britain recognized this fact long ago. There is not a Bill introduced in the British House of Commons that does not automatically carry closure with it. If you look at the rules of some of the other Houses in