

women's issues. There is no mention of compulsory credit splitting on marriage breakdown. There is no mention of continuation of benefits on remarriage. There is no mention of improvement of survivors' benefits. There is no mention of improvement of disability benefits. All of these were commitments of the Prime Minister and of the Conservative Party during the election campaign, commitments made by the Prime Minister on television when he debated the other two Leaders. There is no promise to improve child care as undertaken by the Conservative Party during the election campaign. More than 70 per cent of single women live below the poverty line. Why is there no shelter allowance, as we promised? There is no protection against inflation for senior citizens. Most senior citizens living in poverty are women, and their pensions will be eroded 3 per cent per year, and there is no additional protection. The Minister says the Guaranteed Income Supplement is not touched. However, the base is touched, so the total of the pension and the GIS come down 3 per cent a year or whatever the lower percentage will be after calculating the GIS.

Let us look at health care. The health care system in Canada is under attack. User fees and extra billing are undermining the equality of that system. The health of Canadians is too important to be played around with. We all have a commitment to preserve that system. However, in the Budget the Government intends to cut by the year 1990-91 over \$4 billion in cash transfers to the provinces under EPF. Another \$1.6 billion will be cut from post-secondary education transfers. Two key areas where we share responsibility as parliamentarians with provincial Governments are health care and education. Can you tell me, Mr. Speaker, two more important vital priorities for the country than a decent, universally accessible health care system and improvement to education, particularly at the technical and post-secondary levels? I do not know of any stronger priorities for Canadians, yet these are proposed to be cut under the Budget.

The Minister is also imposing a two-cent per litre tax on gasoline, indeed on all other transportation fuels. When the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Miss Carney) signed the deal with the western provinces, we called it a giveaway to the multi-nationals which would cost consumers. She said to us in the House that the consumer would not pay. She accused us of pitting region against region. She told me that we were causing hatred and division. She promised that there was nothing in that agreement "that hurts consumers", as reported in *Hansard* of March 29. We were undermining the future of the nation by even suggesting that the consumer in Atlantic Canada or in Ontario would have to pay. I hope that Minister will at least have the decency to apologize today for misleading the people of the country in the Parliament of our country.

That tax is also being applied in a very sneaky way. It does not come into effect until September. The Government hopes the consumers of the country, motorists and those who drive trucks for a living, will have forgotten by then. It hopes the people who drive and who depend on transportation for a living

will not remember why they are being hit at the pump. The simple reason is that it is to pay for a giveaway to multi-national oil companies. The tax also applies to aviation and other transportation fuel. It means that everything that moves gets more expensive, including air fares. Less than a year ago, the now Minister of Justice (Mr. Crosbie), then finance critic and lusting after the portfolio, as quoted in *The Citizen* of Ottawa on July 26, 1984, said:

We are not planning any gasoline sales tax increases on the Canadian public.

Oh, those broken promises; oh, how they must hurt.

Mr. Nunziata: Who said that?

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): Laymen would call him "John Crosbie"; we call him the Hon. Member for St. John's West. At the same time, the Government is increasing user fees and putting a larger tax burden on farmers.

Let us look at the agricultural picture. The Government increased fees in November on inspection services and grading up to \$32 million per year. The Minister says that the capital gains exemption will solve the problem. That is the one commitment they lived up to, that a capital gains exemption would be applied immediately on the transfer of farm land. Mr. Speaker, you were sitting in a less exalted place when I eliminated the capital gains tax on the transfer of a family farm from one generation to another. That being said, all the other promises were reneged on.

The Minister says that the capital gains exemption will solve the problem. It will only help more people get out of farming. What about the 39,000 young farmers caught in the debt crisis? The Government did not keep its promise of an agri-bond program with long-term lower interest rates. Farmers are hit with the increased fuel tax, two cents per litre. The average farmer uses 14,000 litres of fuel per year. His increased cost as of September will be \$280 per year.

There is \$50 million chopped from the departmental budget on top of the cuts in November, endangering dairy programs, freight assistance, crop insurance and other programs. Sales tax increases mean higher input costs for farmers. We in this Party are committed to the family farm. This Budget is great for the farmer, but only if he wants to get out of farming. For his family who wants to stay in agriculture, this Budget is a disaster.

How has the agricultural community responded to the Budget? Henry Pelissero of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture says that he is disillusioned, disappointed, upset and angry and that the Budget mocks the consultative process. That is what the Ontario Federation of Agriculture thinks about the Budget.

[*Translation*]

Michel Lord of the Union des producteurs agricoles had this to say about the Budget:

—it was a great disappointment there were no measures to help farmers in financial difficulty, no proposals for overhauling farm financing.