

*Supply*

Where does it stop? The urge to cut back even further will become irresistible. Where will it end? This Government has totally lost its credibility.

I would like to conclude by quoting from a speech made by the Tory Whip, the Hon. Member for Calgary West (Mr. Hawkes), who said while debating a similar related issue in this House in 1983: "This particular piece of legislation is an attack on the principle of universality and we are voting against it. Every speech we have made is in accordance with that principle".

This is a time for mourning, because we have not heard from one Tory in this past week who has had the courage to speak out on the principle which obviously appears to have once been one of the mainstays of Tory philosophy.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, since World War II, Canadians have given themselves a universal system of social programs such as family allowances, old age security pensions and medicare. Universality means that all Canadians have access to the same quality of services, regardless of their income.

However, universality is attacked for the first time in the last Budget presented by Mr. Wilson. When the principle of universality is no longer respected, the government has the discretionary power to decide who is going to have access to social services and who is not. This is a very dangerous precedent. The government will decide who is going to receive the money that is paid by Canadian taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, this strange and unjustifiable notion of social justice that the Conservatives have is not consistent with that of most Canadians.

[*English*]

When this Government tried to deindex seniors' pensions, thousands of seniors rose up in protest. Now, with the introduction of the new agenda all Canadians will rise up in anger. We will not be betrayed again. The true Canadian social vision will prevail.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Redway:** Mr. Speaker, I listened with care to the Hon. Member's comments. I listened with mounting concern and mounting disturbance over the impression which she has been trying to convey to Canadians. I

speak as one who some four and one-half years ago stood up in the House to question the Government with respect to its stand on the principle of universality. I speak as one who spoke out publicly to question the Government on its move to partially deindex old age pensions. I speak as one who felt the concerns of the Whip of my own Party, and the concerns of others in my own Party, when I spoke out on those issues.

However, I spoke out on those issues because I have been firmly committed to the principle of universality. I have made that statement quite clearly and quite strongly with my constituents and with the Canadian people.

This particular proposal that is before the House clearly observes the principles of universality. There is no question about that.

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Redway:** The Hon. Members on the other side can hiss, boo and shout and try to obscure the facts. However, they cannot obscure the real facts. Every person 65 years of age or over who applies for the old age pension has in the past received an old age pension cheque and will continue to receive an old age pension cheque.

As the Hon. Member indicated, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) said that old age pension benefits will continue to increase. In fact, those old age pensions continue to be fully indexed and continue to increase each year with the cost of living according to full indexation. What has happened is that as part of a progressive tax system there is now being applied a tax to people with higher incomes rather than lower incomes. That is part of a progressive tax system. That is a system which I would assume the Hon. Member and the members of the Liberal Party should be in favour of. I have heard them in the past speak out many times on the question of the unfairness of the tax system and the fact that the rich should be taxed and the poor should be taxed at lower levels. That is exactly what this proposal is doing. The tax is at a higher level for people with higher incomes than it is for those with lower incomes.

I would ask the Hon. Member this: Is she and is her Party in favour of a progressive tax system which taxes people with higher incomes more than those with lower incomes?

**Ms. Guarnieri:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member for his commentary. I appreciate his commitment to the principle of universality. You will forgive my sceptic-