

Government Orders

Reform wants Canadians to know the real facts about the future. This is 1995 and the Liberals are still trying to come to grips with the 20th century while Reformers are planning for the 21st century.

For instance, social security has always been provided only through the delivery of costly bureaucratic centralized government programs and agencies. If the government does not come to grips with this program now social programs will not survive this century.

Reform's vision for the future of social programs contains ideas which will generate affordable, cost effective and people effective programs that will provide greater personal security and freedom from dependence on government for all Canadians.

At the heart of Reform's new social vision for Canada is the concept that we can get more social security for dollars spent by changing the division of responsibility between Canadians and their governments. The Reform budget proposes to balance the budget in three years. The Minister of Finance continues to duck the issue. He knows at the rate he is going he will never bring in a balanced budget. A balanced budget is not simply an end in itself, but a means to an end. It is the first step in building a strong, vibrant economy for future generations.

The Reform budget offers hope for the next generation and a chance to escape from the burden of debt. If quick and decisive action is taken sooner rather than later the impact on employment will be minimal and measures will lead to more permanent positive employment for Canadians than the red book plan of slow deficit reduction.

It is inconceivable how the government could ask Canadians, who have the fastest growing personal tax burden in the industrialized world, to shoulder the burden of deficit reduction without first putting its own house in order.

Last month the government announced an agreement had been reached among Liberal MPs to reform the gold plated MP pension plan. The only really good aspect about the plan was the opting out provision and that provision was intended to pit one Reformer against the other and split our caucus.

I cannot deny that was the strategy but it did not work. It did not work and this Reformer cannot wait for a chance to opt out of that plan.

The government made sure that senior Liberals and youthful cabinet ministers will be protected. At the end of their days here they will receive cash for life courtesy of the beleaguered Canadian taxpayer. The taxpayer can only dream of such financial security. The media charge of a double standard rings pretty true.

Where is the hope? At the rate we are going none of us will live long enough for this mortgage burning ceremony. Cana-

dians are beginning to realize this government is not any better than its predecessors. If the government had any heart, any real concern for Canadians, it would deal with this debt now.

In case there is any question, I will not be supporting the bill.

Mr. Jake E. Hoeppe (Lisgar—Marquette, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague for a tremendous speech addressing the problems.

I would like to ask the member a question since he is the labour critic. Every time we see our economy picking up and we see a glimmer of hope that we can increase our revenues, management and labour seem to have a fight and we disrupt the economy with strikes or lockouts or whatever. I have a feeling with our being involved in transportation if we do not settle this issue very soon our transportation system will not be even able to deliver eggs to the provinces, never mind the chicken.

• (1705)

How would the member address this, because I think it has to be addressed?

Mr. Johnston: The Reform Party has introduced in the House a private member's bill dealing with final offer arbitration. It has come to the point, particularly about the sort of disputes my colleague is talking about, at which labour and management have come to rely on back to work legislation. It has therefore become an impediment to the collective bargaining process rather than something that would enhance it.

When the parties are this far apart for 25 months, as we have seen in this past dispute, it is a very good indication they are relying on back to work legislation. Labour knows it will not be out for eight months. It might be out for only eight or ten hours before Parliament starts to talk about back to work legislation. Management also has the same assurance.

There is really no incentive for them to get their positions closer together in real down to earth bargaining. The bill soundly defeated in the House I would appreciate seeing come back from the government side. I hope the Minister of Labour would come up with some similar legislation as a tool for both labour and management to get them to sharpen their pencils, get their positions as close together as possible. At any time one party or the other could ask an arbitrator to step in and select all of one position or all of the other position. That would encourage the two parties to get as close together as they could in their negotiations on their own.

[Translation]

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I rise today to participate in this debate on Bill C-76, an act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled on Parliament on February 27, 1995.