

deferred, allows tax loopholes, shelters, write-offs and depreciation allowances and all the other ways in which the corporate sector in this country has the nerve to be on welfare while criticizing ordinary Canadians who happen to be the beneficiaries of social programs at which the Hon. Member does not want to throw money.

**Mr. Jepson:** Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Hon. Member, as a member of the NDP, that he does not have to worry about ever having to prepare for a Cabinet post.

I hear this same political rhetoric from the NDP on corporate tax rip-offs—

**Mr. Blaikie:** Get used to it because you are going to hear a hell of a lot more of it.

**Mr. Jepson:**—and all the figures about which they rant and rave and which they throw about. However, I am not yet convinced, Mr. Speaker. It is easy to cite figures.

**Mr. Blaikie:** Answer the question.

**Mr. Jepson:** If the Hon. Member would like to discuss this with me on a private basis—

**Mr. Blaikie:** It is a public issue. Answer the question.

**Mr. Jepson:** No, you are throwing figures at me—

**Mr. Blaikie:** Your figures.

**Mr. Jepson:**—and it is very easy to bounce figures around when you are making speeches. You show me, my friend, and I will be glad to sit down. But I suggest that if you want to do it in a public forum such as this, your motives are transparent. You are trying to score political points rather than making legitimate and constructive criticism for the best interests of Canadians.

**Mr. Blaikie:** I can't help it if you are not prepared.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Malépart:** Mr. Speaker, in his speech, the Hon. Member said that he was happy and pleased that his government had decided to help people in need. I would like him to explain to me why there are in Canada 165,000 people who share the same need for help, the same age, who live alone, in an apartment, who have the same income . . . and I shall give him figures for Quebec; I do not have the figures for the other provinces.

Some people between 60 and 64 now receive \$427 a month, whether they are widows, widowers, separated or divorced. This is an allowance that safeguards human dignity. How can the Hon. Member boast that he is pleased, that he helps people in need, that he is going to help half of them on the basis of their civil status. Is it not a move backward to the time when the help given was a handout and the dignity of the individual was not taken into account? Can the Hon. Member

### *Old Age Security Act*

explain that when people have the same income, when they are in the same situation?

[*English*]

**Mr. Jepson:** The Hon. Member reminds me of someone walking up to someone else and saying: "Isn't it a beautiful day?" The answer you get back from the Liberals is, "Yes, but it must be raining somewhere else". No matter what positive initiatives the Government takes, it seems the natural response from the Liberals is that it is not enough. Well, on September 4 the people said it is enough and they gave us a very decisive mandate. They saw a Government that was not willing to show responsible stewardship, a Government that indiscriminately threw money at everything it could. This was not in the best interests of the people but it was in their own best interests.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this Government will not take that posture. This is a Government that will do what it can within its means and, hopefully, it will achieve a financial position in the very near future that will allow more revenues to go to those many people who are still suffering economic hardships, those people we would all like to help. As this Bill indicates, we are covering a very specific sector and we are pleased to be able to do this. But we are just not going to throw money around indiscriminately in the hope that when we go to the well, it will not be dry. The well is dry and it is time we started filling it up again in order to allow us those opportunities in the very near future to meet needs far greater than those that exist today.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Tardif (Richmond-Wolfe):** Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member seems to condemn harshly all divorced and separated men and women. He said they are not spouses. Later on, he praised the united family, and rightly so, but it seems to me, from his speech, that the Hon. Member believes these people are second class citizens. I would appreciate his comments on that particular aspect of his speech.

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest):** The period for questions and comments is now over.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jean-Claude Malépart (Montreal-Sainte-Marie):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to speak today to a Bill I think is very important and which should not be considered along party lines. I think it is one of those Bills that all Members of this House should examine with a great deal of humanity and sensitivity, in order to produce a measure that is fair and equitable and respects the dignity of the individual.

If we look at the Bill's definition, what exactly do we have now in terms of security programs for senior citizens? There is the old age security pension, which is universal. We have the guaranteed income supplement for people in need, and something was done for couples when one spouse was sixty-five and eligible for old age security pension and guaranteed income