

family allowance cheques would still go out to all the pensioners and parents, regardless of their incomes—but it does reduce the net value of benefit to upper-income recipients”. This allows more for the poor.

* * *

TAXATION

INCOME TAX INCREASES

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, it was not *The Toronto Star*, it was the Prime Minister of Canada who promised to maintain the principle of universality in social programs. The Prime Minister and ordinary Canadians will understand that if today teachers' pensions are attacked, tomorrow it will be steelworkers, after that it will be bank clerks, and the whole social policy program will be turned into a system of welfare and the people of Canada will reject a Government that does that.

My question to the Prime Minister, who so categorically abandoned another sacred trust on the floor of the House of Commons, is this: if he is so concerned about fairness—

Mr. Speaker: I would ask the Hon. Member to put his question.

Mr. Broadbent: If the Prime Minister or the Minister of Finance is so concerned about fairness, why has the Government increased the taxes on the poor since 1984 by 60 per cent? Why is there a \$1,700 increase in the taxes of an ordinary family? A man who makes a \$100,000—gain in the stock market this afternoon in Toronto will not pay one cent of tax on that. Is that fair?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I hope that the country will take note of the fact that, while Canada is wrestling with a very serious fiscal problem, while everyone recognizes there is a very major debt problem and the Government is standing up for ordinary Canadians, the NDP is standing up for the rich.

I want to point out to my hon. friend that these measures, as the National Council on Welfare states, and as the *The Toronto Star* has pointed out, maintain the universal character of these transfer programs. Everyone

Oral Questions

eligible for these programs will continue to receive his or her benefits regardless of income. Those who need assistance most will continue to retain all of their benefits. Recipients with high incomes will retain less. This preserves the social safety net and helps provide a sound financial basis for social programs into the future. Surely this is what all parliamentarians want on behalf of Canadians.

• (1140)

Mr. Broadbent: Under different circumstances the Prime Minister knew what was at stake. When it comes to the universality of social programs, he defended that concept. Now that he is trying to justify a Budget that puts a \$1,700 tax increase on the average family that still leaves over 6,000 upper-income Canadians with no tax obligation and 80,000 profitable companies not paying a tax, he comes in with this gobbledegook, but he will not fool the people of Canada, I tell him.

[*Translation*]

UNIVERSALITY PRINCIPLE—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, since the Minister made the same promises, probably even to his mother, about maintaining the universality of social programs, why did he deny today everything he said about this principle a few years ago?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we are not denying anything. In fact, the principle of universality is maintained in today's budget proposals provisions. One authority, for instance, which is no friend of the Government's, the *Toronto Star*, one of our big papers, stated that the integrity of the universality principle had been maintained. This measure leaves intact the universal character of these transfer programs. Everyone who is eligible will continue to receive benefits, irrespective of income. Individuals who are most in need of assistance will continue to keep the full amount of their benefits, high-income recipients will keep less. We are maintaining the social security net while helping to put social programs on a sound financial basis for the future.

Mr. Speaker, we are giving more to the poor and less to the rich. Now that is a genuine social policy!