

down, and the Government said: "Hold on, senior citizens, we will rethink what we told you last September and we will perhaps partially deindex pensions".

The Hon. Member talked about a motion which condemns, which is political, and which suggests a scare tactic. He ought to know that no one has a monopoly, as was indicated by our first speaker, on the concern for senior citizens—not this Party, not the NDP, not the Liberal Party. We are trying to be a vehicle, in this motion, for thousands upon thousands of Canadians who have been writing, telephoning, telegraphing and trying to give the message to the Government and to its Leader that the proposal is regressive and will hurt. Through this motion we are trying to sensitize Hon. Members opposite to the problems faced by senior Canadians from one coast to the other. The Hon. Member ought to have the courage and the conviction to address himself to the motion. It does not condemn. It is not a vote of non-confidence. It reads as follows:

That this House urges the Government to commit itself now to maintain the present system of full indexation of Old Age Security pensions after January 1, 1986.

Does the Hon. Member agree or disagree that pensioners should have fully indexed OAS payments?

**Mr. McCrossan:** Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker ignored that there are five parts to the pension system. There is the Old Age Security, the Guaranteed Income Supplement, the Canada Pension Plan, the provincial supplements and the private pension plans. All these have to be taken into account. It is the total result from the package which counts, not the individual breakdown.

**Mr. Caccia:** No, no.

**Mr. Rossi:** No.

**Mr. McCrossan:** Absolutely. It is the total package, the total dollars to senior citizens which count, not just one package or another.

**Mr. Nunziata:** It is not a package. Everyone does not get everything.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. McCrossan:** The point I was making in my speech was that that Party has ignored all other sectors of pension reform, knowing full well that work is ongoing in those other areas, that we have already made major strides in the area of base protection in the private system, and that the changes in the OAS will not occur until April 1, 1986. There are various parts of the package which ensure the living standard of our elderly. This Party has a commitment to reduce the number of people living in poverty, particularly the elderly who are under the poverty line.

**Ms. Mitchell:** Mr. Speaker, there are so many questions I should like to ask, I do not know where to start. The Hon. Member talked about hypocrisy. The Government has shown great hypocrisy. In committee the Hon. Member said at one

point that indexation had no basis in reality and that it was just a gimmick of Statistics Canada. In my opinion, he personally led the fight to propose deindexation of the family allowance. We know that it will go down by 3 per cent, affecting all children.

I am sure he will have the figures which show that deindexing is certainly a reality to pensioners, starting with \$100 less this year and moving up to \$680 less in 1991, for a total of \$2,284 less over six years. Since he referred to the matter debated in committee about the savings from reduced family benefits and trying to get them back from the provinces, would he agree that he would not support motions to put those funds directly back into increased benefits for children and that he wanted them to go to social programs?

● (1250)

Also, he said that this Budget gives more benefits to mothers through the increased child tax credit. Would he agree that those mothers in the \$10,000 to \$20,000 bracket will pay extra taxes, that they will pay increased sales taxes of up to \$500 a family, that they will have their family allowance deindexed by 3 per cent and they will only get an extra \$70 on the child tax credit and even that is reduced to a lower eligibility for lower income groups? So where does he see that the mothers are going to get increased benefits for their children? They are going to have at least \$1,000 less money in their pockets.

**Mr. McCrossan:** Mr. Speaker, first with respect to the issue of indexing and the report, I firmly believe that the Hon. Member is wrong, that I have been fully committed to indexing, that I subscribe to it—

**Ms. Mitchell:** Deindexing.

**Mr. McCrossan:** No, no, protection against the cost of living, and I have a record both within this House and within the Ontario Legislature of proposing this.

Second, the Hon. Member stated that benefits would go down by \$100 this year. This is the sort of inaccurate statement that Hon. Members on that side have been making. Benefits will not go down one nickel this year. The Hon. Members have been consistently stating things which are not based on fact.

**Mr. Riis:** In real terms they will.

**Mr. McCrossan:** Not in this year they will not, Sir, they will not. In terms of the savings in the social programs the Hon. Member is quite correct that I argued in favour of retaining savings from rearrangements of programs inside the social envelope rather than on any one specific plan. If the Hon. Member checks out the Budget this year she will see that the increase in social envelope spending more than makes up for any decrease resulting from the Budget in the next fiscal year. That commitment has been continued, and I am sure that as our economic situation improves we will continue to adhere to the commitment which the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) gave in the House.