

myself, I can say that we are all very proud of the oil exploration being done in this country. I also wish to point out, for the information of the Opposition, that if research is carried out in co-operation with Petro-Canada, this will be a tremendous stimulus for technological development, especially since in my riding, we are facing the situation created by the Iron Ore Company, and lay-offs as well, and if research on iron ore could have been done with other companies, we might not be as badly off as we are now. In the proposals by Petro-Canada, it says that there will be research in the petro-chemical sector, and this means it will be possible to provide truly creative jobs for young people jobs with a future. I hope the opposition parties understand that the present Government and Canadians support job creation in the high technology sector. Whatever our political affiliations may be, Petro-Canada represents an asset for Canadians. The public may think Petro-Canada is expensive, but in fact, it is not costing Canadians a cent. The corporation is financed with revenues from oil, from the gas purchased by people who want to use their cars and from purchases of oil products. It is therefore entirely wrong to say that Petro-Canada is being paid for with the taxpayers' money. I would like to point out to all opposition parties and the government side as well that if private companies were to make the same effort to carry out research as Petro-Canada is doing and intends to do in the oil sector and oil products, I think Canada's future would be as rosy as that of Petro-Canada itself.

[English]

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. gentleman another question. Has he run across any young persons who are prepared to agree with him that it is morally right to carry out the programs that he says the Government intends which will attack senior citizens?

Has the Hon. Member been lobbied by those people that it is imperative the Government cut old age pensions and pensions which have been bought and paid for? Has he run into anyone so heartless? Is that the reason the Hon. Member agrees with the Government Bill, or has the Hon. Member lost all sense of balance with respect to the matter itself?

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Before recognizing the Hon. Member for Manicouagan—

[English]

—may I just remind Hon. Members that I have, I think, three times sought unanimous consent for an exchange of questions and replies. There is no difficulty in continuing if it is the mood and the will of the House. Therefore, until I hear some indication that Hon. Members wish to revert to Bill C-133, we will continue in the present direction.

[Translation]

Mr. Maltais: Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the House that in addition to the young people I met, for the information of the Hon. Member, I also met

Supplementary Retirement Benefits Act (No. 2)

senior citizens who told me: We are prepared to do our share as Canadians in helping the Canadian economy to recover, so that young people, our grandchildren, will have jobs. I would go even further. Being young myself, I feel that the elderly, our senior citizens in Canada, deserve to get even more than 6, 12 or 30 per cent, because they are the people who built this country. However, there comes a time when there is a limit to what the budget can bear. We must act responsibly, and I certainly do not think that either the Government or the Opposition are out to restrict aid to senior citizens. As I said before, the aim of the Government is to have all Canadians contribute their fair share towards relieving the economic recession, and if anyone asks me whether I have met any young Canadians who were prepared to attack senior citizens, my answer is that I have not, and that the Hon. Member opposite is the one who brought up the word attack. We are merely concerned with distributing benefits fairly and allowing everyone to do his fair share. If we manage to bring down inflation, this will increase the purchasing power of senior citizens and improve their standard of living. That is what the present government is aiming at, and I think this is perfectly clear to Members on both sides of the House.

[English]

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, with the unanimous consent of the House I would like to participate in this very lively debate and put a question to the Hon. Member.

I notice that the Government over the last number of months has put a great deal of stock in listening to the advice of the blue chip community of Canada, seeking the advice of business leaders and particularly the advisory group headed up recently by Mr. Ian Sinclair. We read this morning that Mr. Sinclair and his blue chip group has now looked at the six and five program and has deemed it no longer appropriate.

An Hon. Member: That is not true.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Sinclair has talked with the leaders of Canada's Government and said that it is now time to divert our attention away from six and five and into job creation.

If the Government has been listening to the blue chip business community up to this point and the blue chip community now advises the Government that it is time to move away from its preoccupation with six and five and into job creation, about which the Hon. Member obviously feels very strongly, is it not time now to show good faith on behalf of the Government, pull out this legislation which will not add a single job—and I am simply following the advice of the blue chip community—and strike another committee in an effort not to impose five and six, but to impose job creation programs in Canada?

[Translation]

Mr. Maltais: Mr. Speaker, I should like to emphasize a basic element of our economic system: if industries are to invest, we must first of all appreciate our currency, and the purpose of our anti-inflationary 6 and 5 program is to