

*Supplementary Retirement Benefits Act (No. 2)*

Also it read:

—a 356 per cent increase in the size of the economy, a 545 per cent increase in Government spending.

As recently as 1980, the present Prime Minister said, while speaking in Windsor during the election campaign:

—the Liberal Party puts people first, and it's on that basis that we will worry about the deficit after we finish worrying about the unemployed.

This is the type of rhetoric which the Government, the Prime Minister and Members opposite use in an election campaign. This rhetoric is demonstrated in such acts as the introduction of Bill C-133. The Bill was simply designed as an example to which the Government could point to show that the depression it produced in fact wrestles inflation to the ground.

We now pay as much in interest on public debt in a year as we used to set aside for total budgetary expenditures in the late 1960s. Its record of non-achievement is very pertinent to this debate.

In my allotted ten minutes last Tuesday I was able to begin the basis of the argument which I believe goes to the heart of the issue and accurately describes the sentiment of a vast majority of Canadians. If we look at the Gallup poll results today, we will see that statement carried out in statistics. Canadians believe in restraint. Canadians believe that the Government should show responsibility in its spending habits. Canadians have experienced that and they know that when there is no recognition of the gross results produced by overspending in deficits, catastrophic tragedies await the citizens of Canada. In this situation the vast majority of Canadians are prepared to bite the bullet and to share in the sacrifices which must be made by all to right the madness which has happened within the nation under the direction of the Liberal Government.

I am fully convinced that as a whole Canadians are begging the Government to show leadership and an honest effort to reform its ways. Were honest and generous leadership shown in restraint, I am sure the outcry against Bill C-133 would be much less intense. Even though it is a breaking of faith, if all people were contributing equally to the attack on inflation, the outcry would be less.

One reaction against the Bill is that the Government of Canada has singled out one group of Canadians, namely, superannuates, from its employe, to bear the burden of carrying the Government's facade of restraint. As a legitimate result, the cry is going out against this unworthy action. In light of this record, considering the total lack of evidence that the Government has any intention to mend its ways, and considering the documented undertakings of the Government to its employees on many occasions—that is from the Prime Minister to the former President of the Treasury Board—to maintain indexation and not to change the provisions without consultation, the only honourable step for the Government to take is to withdraw totally Bill C-133.

In conclusion, failing this, surely the Government has an obligation to accept the amendment of the Hon. Member for Ottawa-Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) so that the Act will expire on

December 31, 1984. Surely former servants of the Crown deserve at least that consideration and more.

**Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville):** Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words in support of the proposed amendment of the Hon. Member for Ottawa-Vanier (Mr. Gauthier), that the Act terminate on December 31, 1984. I suppose that the only difference I would like to see is that it terminate on December 31, 1982 instead of 1984. I say that because I believe that this Bill, like the other two capping Bills, is a very regressive piece of legislation. It is unfair. It is not equal. It hits the ordinary and low income Canadian much harder than those who are more highly paid in society.

● (1640)

For example, people who make \$10,000 a year and receive an increase of 6 per cent will have their wages increased by \$600 this year and \$500 next year, with a 5 per cent increase. Those who receive \$50,000 and receive an increase of 6 per cent and 5 per cent will have an increase of \$3,000 this year and \$2,500 next year. I say that is unfair and economically immoral and simply not just in the twentieth century.

We saw a report from the Bishops which was issued on January 5. In their report on economy they said that our economic moral standards are lacking, and they called upon the Parliament of Canada and Canadians to think more about equality and justice in this country's economy.

I want to call upon the Government to implement some of the ideas and ideals of the Bishops of this land. I think we all know of the problems this nation is facing. We are all aware of the tremendous unemployment rate in Canada which stands at about 1.5 million. We know about the high inflation rate and the high bank rates which we have had for the last several months.

I suggest that the piece of legislation before the House today, along with the other capping Bills, will do nothing to bring down inflation or help the Canadian economy. They do not form part of an economic strategy but, indeed, form part of a political strategy for the Liberal Party as a result of the troubles in which they find themselves in this country.

At a time when we have economic difficulties in Canada and need to create jobs for Canadians, I have never been able to understand why the wealthy who have investment funds need to be stimulated by incentives and various tax write-offs in order to invest their money and contribute to our society while the ordinary worker, in order to make his contribution, has to tighten his belt. I do not understand why the poor have to tighten their belts while the rich need incentives in order to make a contribution in this country.

**Mr. Benjamin:** They have the power.

**Mr. Nystrom:** My friend is absolutely right. They have the power.

If one reads the Bishop's report, they refer to the fact that the upper 20 per cent of Canadian income earners are making some 42 per cent of the country's national income while the