

*Supplementary Retirement Benefits Act (No. 2)*

They are talking about social security benefits, and they are so right, because this particular Bill and the others deal with pensions. That is part of our social security system. In a not too distant future this federal Government and provincial governments will be taking steps to cut back on the fundamental structure of health care and hospital insurance we have established over the years. Then, in dealing with the present strategies of Government, the Bishops say:

The means for curbing inflation are such austerity measures as the federal 6 and 5 wage restraint program and cut-backs in social spending (e.g. hospitals, medicare, public services, education and foreign aid) rather than controls on profits and prices. These measures, in turn, have been strengthened by a series of corporate tax reductions and direct investment incentives for such sectors as the petroleum industry. In effect, the survival of capital takes priority over labour in present strategies for economic recovery.

That is how they analyse the thrust of this Government's policies. They go on to say:

At the same time, working people, the unemployed, young people, and those on fixed incomes are increasingly called upon to make the most sacrifice for economic recovery.

That is precisely what the Government is doing, Mr. Speaker. People on fixed incomes are our pensioners and they are being asked to carry the can, to pay the price for the mistaken policies we have had in recent years from this federal Government. The Bishops talk about alternative approaches and they say:

An alternative approach calls for a re-ordering of values and priorities in our economic life. What is required first is a basic shift in values: the goal of serving the human needs of all people in our society must take precedence over the maximization of profits and growth . . . alternative strategies are required which place primary emphasis on the goals of combatting unemployment by stimulating production and permanent job creation in basic industries; developing a more balanced and equitable program for curbing inflation; and maintaining health care, social security and special assistance programs.

I am not a member of the Roman Catholic Church, Mr. Speaker, but I say that the ideas expressed in this statement are principles which could be adopted with great benefit to Canadians regardless of their religion. I urge the Government to reconsider what it is doing, and to realize it is shifting the burden of the difficulties we are in to precisely those people who can least afford to live with the kind of decisions this Government is making.

**Mr. Lyle S. Kristiansen (Kootenay West):** Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to this latest amendment on Bill C-133; the matter of trust, which was raised continuously in succeeding submissions in committee, once again comes to mind. It strikes me as somewhat odd that the Liberal Member concerned should show such obvious lack of faith and trust in the word of the Party and the Government to which he belongs, as to deem it advisable for him to introduce an expiry amendment which sets out clearly what the Government says is already the case. If a Member of the Liberal Party acts independently to bring forward an amendment which says he does not believe that bunch over there, so he wants to nail it down to make sure there is no mistaking it—what are those in the Opposition to think? What are the people of Canada, who have been given so many reasons to dispute the good faith of that Liberal Government, to think? A lot of questions need answers, Mr. Speaker,

but we have not received them from the Government in this debate.

• (1620)

It was with a great deal of regret that last Thursday, my colleagues and I in the NDP watched the Official Opposition Tories rush in with undue haste in an effort to help rush this legislation through. Their opposition has been token. It made us question the motivation of that Party once again. They did not understand the Government's game plan of compulsion and compulsory restraint that was presented in the budget of June 1982, and again, they dealt with Bill C-124, the parent of the six and five legislation, in isolation. They supported it although they put on a public display of opposition to the companion Bills, Bill C-131, Bill C-132 and Bill C-133 which grew from Bill C-124. Their protest today lacks credibility.

The antics of that Party make me think of a young man who gets a girl in trouble and then takes off when he sees the progeny. That is the kind of game the Conservative Party has been playing. They were all in favour of Bill C-124, all in favour of compulsory restraint, all in favour of breaking written contracts, but now they have the unmitigated gall to pretend opposition to the legitimate offspring—perhaps the illegitimate offspring—of the parent Bill.

I do not believe that many people in the country think kindly of a young man who gets a girl in trouble and then takes off, out of town, and does not live up to his responsibility. But that is the kind of contempt that the Conservative Party deserves for their behaviour regarding this matter. If the people of the country decide on a shotgun ceremony and insist that the other two Parties in the House get together, then no one should be surprised.

**Mr. McKenzie:** Leave that to Svend Robinson!

**Mr. Kristiansen:** Another analogy came to light in Committee.

**Mr. Reid (St. Catharines):** I hope it has more substance than the last.

**Mr. Kristiansen:** It has more substance than some of my PC colleagues on my right appear to have. Their lack of consistency suggests that they have very little.

I can visualize an avalanche, Mr. Speaker, where the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) stand at the top of a hill and roll a stone down, which is Bill C-124. They work together, cheering on the wolves of compulsory restraint against pensioners and public servants, but as the stone rolls down the hill it gathers momentum. Under it are not only the Public Service employees who are being crushed by C-124 but the mothers and children suffering from Family Allowance restraints, the old age pensioners suffering from restraints on Old Age Security and now the public servant retirees who are being crushed by the onslaught. The Leader of the Opposition claims that he only rolled the first stone. But that is how an avalanche starts, Mr. Speaker. Anyone in public life ought to know that.