

*Time Allocation*

**Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton):** You were not even here to vote for your own motion.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Oh, note the crocodile tears and the astute, well-informed, cogently equipped argumentation of the Hon. Member who has just said that if we had been here and voted with them, if we had come back sooner, then somehow that would have helped the pensioners!

**Mr. Nielsen:** We did your job.

**Mr. Broadbent:** I say to the Conservative Member that even his Party, for once, got all its Members out—

**Mr. Nielsen:** Where were yours?

**Mr. Broadbent:** —to the vote, and we had ours and had voted with them, he knows very well that the majority on that side of the House would have carried the day, the debate would have been finished by six o'clock, and the pensioners would have been cheated. That is what he knows.

**Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton):** Changed your tune, now, Ed. The old 20 per centers.

**Mr. Broadbent:** I say to the Conservatives that if they had really been interested, just as a small percentage in terms of their concern, to the same degree as they were with regard to the oil industry at the time they held the House up for days, not hours, then the pensioners would have had some justice on Tuesday night. If they had just stayed, literally, until one minute after 4 o'clock, and come back in for the vote, then the pensioners' cheques would have been at the just level which they had negotiated.

Our Party opposed the six and five program because we said at the outset that that was a bit of cosmetic window-dressing brought forward by the Government of Canada because it knew that all the economic indicators pointed to the fact that wage and salary increases would be going down, anyway. However, it brought it in to try to claim some credit. We saw it for what it was, an unfair slap at ordinary working people, doing nothing about inflation and, most important, doing nothing about the basic necessity at this point in our history of creating more jobs. We said it last August. We have consistently said it in terms of every Bill which has been related to it. The Conservative Party which, I regret to say, voted for that Bill last August, has now hypocritically stood up in the House and pretended to oppose the natural outflow from that course of action. The Government was wrong in its economic analysis and in its morality, and has been joined in this injustice by the Conservative Party. We oppose both of them.

**Mr. Douglas Fisher (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, in the June budget, the then Minister of Finance proposed that a national partnership be undertaken between the Government and the people of this country to begin a serious effort to fight inflation. On page 4 of his budget speech, the Minister made two important statements which I would like to quote so that everyone can be reminded of the importance of this issue. First, the Minister said:

It is within our power, through deliberate and concerted action, to bring down price inflation much more quickly. We can do this by accepting, for the time

being, income increases that are lower than the current rate of inflation. A reduction of income demands will lower cost and price increases. In this way we can stop feeding the spiral of inflation.

Then a little further on in his budget speech the Minister said:

The private sector and the Provinces could not be expected to accept income restraint unless the Government of Canada showed leadership in the conduct of its own affairs. The government has therefore decided to lead the way by implementing the proposed strategy in the federal public sector for a period of two years.

That is the purpose, the whole direction, of this debate. The Government has proposed a national partnership, and we have further proposed that the public be able to judge its behaviour against our own. The public has accepted that partnership and the public approves the six and five program and the efforts that we are making with our own behaviour.

**Mr. McDermid:** They are asking for a second opinion.

**Mr. Fisher:** Your Honour will recall that in June we introduced three stages. We said, first, that political people, the governing people, the M.P.s, Senators and their staffs, would have their salaries rolled back from an 11 per cent increase to the 6 per cent level for 1982, and that after that we would go through the normal six and five cycle in 1983-84. Then Deputy Ministers and the heads of Crown corporations were limited to 6 per cent and 5 per cent increases from July 1, 1982.

**Mr. Lewis:** How about Campagnolo?

• (1610)

**Mr. Fisher:** After that, in an easier fashion, in a phased-in fashion, ordinary public servants were asked to enter the six and five program. That included not only their salaries but their pensions. Then, having set that out, we turned to the public and asked them to accept six and five limitations on pensions, on Family Allowances and on income tax indexing. I do not know how I could possibly go to my own parents and say to them that their pensions must be limited to six and five but that the pensions of civil servants need not be limited. We had to have that partnership, we had to have that agreement, before going to the general public. We need to remember, as well, that these six and five increases have brought to us lower prices in the form of administered prices, lower prices through the indirect pressures the Government has applied to industry, and lower wages, through the leadership we have given to ordinary companies and ordinary people.

We need to remember that this program has been brought in by Province after Province, as part of a partnership, right across this country. So we are not talking here only about civil servants. We are talking about a partnership involving all Canadians, and the goal of that partnership is to bring stability and health back to our economy. We are not talking about parliamentary gains. We are not talking about fights between politicians. We are talking about the economic health and price stability for this country, and there has been widespread public acceptance of that.