Supplementary Retirement Benefits Act (No. 2)

Earlier this afternoon the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Evans) got up and asked those same pensioners to put their trust again in this Government. He said that he had a promise from the President of the Treasury Board, one that the Minister did not make in this House, that there will be changes to the Public Service pension plan prior to 1985. Well, anyone who is quick with mathematics-I sometimes wonder if the Liberal backbenchers are—will realize that there will be an election before that time, and it is again a situation where the Government does not really expect to have to live up to the promises it is making. This legislation is a betrayal of trust, and the Government has the nerve to come to this House, the pensioners and people who are working for the federal Government, and say: "Trust us again. We broke trust today but that is only because it is a budget item. Trust us because sometime in the next three or four years we will do something different and try to make amends". I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that the pensioners trust this Government. I do not believe we can expect that because trust has to be based on action and the action of this Government is to betray trust.

In the last few minutes I have heard some heckling from my right in the Conservative Party. In the last few days they have been getting up and talking about the Government breaking trust and contracts, and they made all sorts of fancy speeches. Not as many as they should have, but that is to be expected because they do not really defend pensioners when they have the chance. Well, Mr. Speaker, those same Conservatives who talk about this Bill breaking trust should remember that when Bill C-124 was before this House they voted with the Liberal Government, as they do on most pieces of significant legislation, and that legislation broke collective agreements the Government had signed with hundreds of thousands of Canadian workers. That was not just a gentleman's agreement, that was an agreement the Government had negotiated and signed. And the Conservatives, with the exception of two of their Members, stood up and supported the Liberals in breaking that trust. That set the stage for breaking trust with old age pensioners, people who receive Family Allowances and Government pensioners affected by this legislation. Then, Mr. Speaker, over the last few days, when there was an opportunity to fight the Government, the Conservatives have not shown that much strength. We talked about the fact that they only stayed out of the House 15 minutes and defeated our effort to prevent the Government from making a closure motion at that time. They spent 15 days protecting their friends in the oil companies.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Protecting Parliament.

Mr. Murphy: They spent a number of days protecting their friends, the export companies, over Canagrex, but they could only spend 15 minutes protecting the Government's pensioners.

• (1740)

Last night when we were voting on the amendments to Bill C-133, how many Conservatives showed up for the last vote? Fifty-two showed up and 49 were absent, Mr. Speaker. If half of those Conservative Members had been present last night,

the Bill would have been defeated. Where were those 49 Conservatives? There were not that many Liberals absent. I do not know how they pair—is it one Liberal for four Tories? If their excuse is that they are paired with the Liberals, they are admitting that they have co-operated on every vote that the Liberal Government survives.

Mr. Taylor: Who sold out property rights?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The Chair has some concern about relevance in the debate at this point. It is a difficult matter, but I would call the attention of the Hon. Member to the Bill that is before us for debate.

Mr. Murphy: I can understand why the Conservatives in the House—not the 49 who were absent—would be sensitive about this.

Earlier I heard the Hon. Member for Nepean-Carleton (Mr. Baker) ask that more than four Liberals vote against this legislation. We need more than four on that side to support us, Mr. Speaker. We need those 49 Conservatives in the House tonight to support us and defeat this legislation which breaks the trust of Civil Service pensioners.

We have fought against this Bill because it breaks that trust. We have fought against the Bill because we know it is the result of a public relations exercise on the part of the Government. That was evident in a leaked document that came to my Leader early last year. It showed that a Public Service restraint program would be a public relations effort. It said that the main value of such a program would be that the Government would be seen as doing something to fight inflation.

We need a job-creation program in the country. We need an industrial strategy in the country. We need a lot of things to get the Canadian economy going. Something we do not need is a program to fight it on the backs of Government pensioners. We do not need to fight it on the backs of those who receive the old age pension. We do not need to fight it on the backs of the women and children who receive Family Allowances. We need the fat cats in the Liberal Party and the silent and invisible Members of the Conservative Party to support Canadians in need. What we do not need is the hypocrisy we have seen in this debate.

This Party has been consistent in the debate and we have been consistent in fighting the six and five legislation. We have been consistent in calling for a job-creation program. We have been consistent throughout the debate on six and five. The Tories cannot claim that. They supported the Liberal Government under Bill C-124 and now they hop on in the other side of the bed.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Murphy: There seems to be some sensitivity among Conservative Members, and I can well understand that.

Let me speak on behalf of old age pensioners and the others affected by this legislation. We will continue to fight despite the fact that it upsets some Tory backbenchers, despite the