

adopted the Conservative strategy, so naturally the Conservatives support them.

What is happening is that the formerly unchallenged industrial economy of the United States, of which we have been a branch plant thanks to Liberal policy over the last few decades, supported by the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada, is having to compete with advanced industrial bases in Europe and Japan, the Third World and even in Communist-bloc countries like China where the ideological purity of the multinationals is being compromised by the lure of endless cheap labour. The almighty dollar, after all, is really the only ideology that counts.

Global capital now flows to wherever the return is greatest, and returns will be greatest where wages are restrained and where taxes are low, generally due to the absence of social programs and the social and political equality and freedom which Canadians rightly feel that they should not have to sacrifice in order to be competitive in the modern world, yet that is exactly what they are being asked outright to do by the PC Party and duplicitously asked to do by the Liberal Party.

We in the NDP say the way out of the problems created by the global mobility of capital is not to accommodate ourselves, not to give up all of the things we have come to regard as important to the social and economic fabric of this country. We should devise a way of bringing our economy before the bar of the common good, bringing it under more Canadian control, and try to devise a strategy in which we could on one hand meet human needs and wants in this country, be competitive in the world economically, but not in the short-term have to give in to the demands of the international investment community that we curtail those things which have been important to the achievement of social justice in this country in order that they would continue to invest here.

That is exactly the kind of blackmail the Liberal Government has given into. That is what six and five is all about, and that is why the Conservatives support it. They believe the only way to get anywhere in this world is to capitulate to those market forces. We have long rejected the political and economic solutions based on capitulation to those forces, and we invite the Canadian people now, as we will in the next election, to join with us in trying to see our way out of that darkness instead of giving in to it.

Mr. Paul Dick (Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I want to intervene briefly in this debate. I want to set out and state clearly that when the Liberals introduced the six and five program, I supported it and still do. The reason I supported six and five was that it appeared that the Government was taking an initiative, that it was doing something and showing some leadership in trying to come to grips with the inflation which has been ruining this country for most of the 12 years the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has been in power.

However, once the cape was taken off the six and five program and we saw how they intended to implement it, it appeared that their implementation strategy was not one of showing leadership but one of following. I do not see how the Government can call itself a leader and say that it is giving

Supplementary Retirement Benefits Act (No. 2)

leadership when in order to implement its six and five program it introduced the three Bills, C-131, C-132 and C-133.

In Bill C-131, which we discussed the other day, the Government is cutting back on the indexing of pensions to senior citizens of this country. At the same time, it is abandoning the principle of universality on senior citizens' pensions. Those who have worked 40 or 50 years are being asked to take the lead, carry the burden and show leadership in the six and five program. These people have done their bit. They have given to this country. They have turned it into what it is today. They should not be asked to head the fight once more.

The second Bill, C-132, with which the Government is implementing its six and five program, cuts back on the indexing of the baby bonus or Family Allowance, and the mothers of young children—and not all of them are wealthy—are being asked to lead the fight of six and five. They first called upon the senior citizens, then they called upon the mothers and children of this country as the next line. Now they have introduced Bill C-133, the Bill we are dealing with today, and have asked a third group if they would be the ones to lead the fight and support the six and five program so inflation could be handled, and that group is the public servants.

• (2100)

I would like to say categorically that I have not seen, and I do not believe there have been, any actuarial studies done to prove that indexed pensions are affordable and that we can have them. And I want to explain right now that I am skeptical that we can afford fully indexed pensions in this country. But, having said that, I must point out that the Government legislated in 1974 that it was going to index the Public Service pensions fully, and when it makes a promise, it should keep the promise. After those people, from 1974 on, have planned their retirement, their way of living, or the date of their retirement, depending on a fully indexed pension, they find they have been deceived by this Government. The Government is not showing leadership by attacking senior citizens or by denying mothers and their children. The Government has not shown leadership in taking away what it had already promised. In fact, I would go as far as to say that if the Government breaks a promise, breaks a contract which it imposed by legislation, if the Government breaks faith with those people, then the Government deserves no trust whatsoever. We heard the Prime Minister begging for trust three nights in a row earlier this year, but no trust is deserved by this Liberal Government because they have broken a contract, they have broken their promise.

Perhaps public servants from this day forward should not have their pensions indexed. That is, perhaps, open for debate. But the Government would not be breaking a promise if it so changed the rules. The fact is, it cannot go back, as it has in Bill C-133, and renege on a promise already made.

There are some things which the Government could do if it wanted to show leadership in the six and five program, which I