

Supply

would not be made on the backs of those who can least afford to pay—our senior citizens. That promise was spouted by the Prime Minister in his own tome *Where I Stand, the New Tory Leader Speaks Out*. The book was printed some two years ago, and presumably he has not had a conversion on the road to Damascus. Let us hear what the Prime Minister had to say some two years ago, about indexing benefits for senior citizens. He said: "Beginning with politicians and senior public servants it should become a priority to reduce and eventually eliminate and outlaw indexed contracts and benefits, including indexed pensions in line with inflation."

Clear and justified exceptions should be made for mothers' allowance and all other social programs designed to protect the ordinary and disadvantaged Canadians from the ravages of inflation for which they are not responsible".

● (1620)

Those were the words of the Prime Minister two years ago when he told the Canadian people where he stood. Where does he stand now, Mr. Speaker? Where does he sit? We cannot even find him in the House of Commons.

We see that he made those same promises again during the election campaign. The Tories said quite clearly, and it is alluded to in the motion before the House today, that the Tories are committed to reinstating complete indexing of old age pensions to the actual cost of living as of January 1, 1985.

What did the Minister of National Health and Welfare have to say in this House less than six months ago on the issue of indexing? Let me quote from the House of Commons debates dated December 21, 1984, when the Minister said:

I can confirm that the regular indexing of the Old Age Security, the Guaranteed Income Supplement and the family allowance will be increased as of January 1, 1985—

I realize that the Minister of National Health and Welfare may not have won his battle in Cabinet. I realize that the hawks in deficit reduction have prevailed upon the Conservative Party to ensure that the deficit is reduced on the backs of those who can least afford to pay. I would have thought that, at the very least, the Minister of National Health and Welfare would have had the courage to stand up and explain, on the one hand, why this Government is calling upon senior citizens to make this sacrifice and, on the other hand, why the Government is prepared to give away a half a million dollar capital gains write-off to the top 4 per cent in our society who can afford to take advantage of it.

The facts are clear. This Budget is not a fair Budget. This is a Budget which gives to the rich. It will ensure that a family of four earning \$200,000 a year over the life of this Budget will actually, if that family takes into account the capital gains write-off, pay \$2,352 less in taxes as a direct result of the Budget measures which punish senior citizens. At the same time, a family of four earning \$15,000 a year, not exactly living in the lap of luxury in Hamilton, St. John's, Newfoundland, or in Vancouver, will pay \$413 more in taxes as a direct result of these Budget measures.

I congratulate those Members on the government side of the House who had the courage to tell the people what they think about the measures of the Wilson-Mulroney Budget and what they think about this Government's complete turnaround in its promises to senior citizens.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp) has referred to promises. He referred to promises made by the Liberals, but what he did not tell Canadians and what he did not make clear today in the House is, that while he is asking the elderly who are most in need to shell out \$30 a month for this Budget, he is giving more than \$2 billion to the oil multinationals, because this Government has rejected the energy policy option proposed by the former Government party, the Liberal Party.

The Conservative Party has shown Canada its true blue colours in the Budget, that cold blue blood that gives a cold shoulder to Canadians who are most in need.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am ashamed of the fact that Conservative Members are not rising in their seats to tell the Minister of National Health and Welfare, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) and the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) who made so many promises and who promised several times here in the House and outside the House that the Government would not make any changes whatsoever in the pensions paid to the neediest in Canadian society, our senior citizens.

[English]

I do not know whether a promise from a Tory means the same thing it means to other Canadians. I think what we have at issue here is not only the financial hardship and devastation which will be faced by hundreds of thousands of senior citizens, apolitical and of all political stripes, but also the credibility of this Government and this Prime Minister who promised the Canadian people that universality was a sacred trust, that they would not touch indexing at the expense of senior citizens, and that they would not reduce the deficit at the expense of those who can least afford to pay.

We see that the very words of the Prime Minister have shown themselves to be simply a blarney sham, simply a fraud to encourage the Canadian people to cast a ballot for a Party which pretended to be something it was not.

This Budget, this measure, this attack on senior citizens is the true colour of the Conservative Party of Canada. The Conservatives tried to adopt neo-Liberalism during the campaign. They tried to tell the Canadian people that they were going to protect our older people and create jobs for our young unemployed Canadians. But we see, Mr. Speaker, that the moment the Tories get their clutches on investment power in Canada, they give to the multinationals. They give to pension funds which are going to invest outside of Canada.

My colleague, the Hon. Member for Trinity (Miss Nicholson), today in the House raised a very important point about the philosophy of the Conservative Party. She pointed out that as a direct result of budget changes this Government has now