

Borrowing Authority Act

Mrs. Bourgault: Yes, we will bring them here, Mr. Speaker. So they were pleased because what they think... it all depends how the matter is explained to them. When you people over there do the explaining, you obviously do the explaining in your own way. When we do the explaining, we do it our way. And our way is the intelligent way.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding I would like to say that the elderly in my riding understand the issue because I explained it to them. My congratulations to the Hon. Member and keep up the good work.

[English]

Mr. Reimer: Mr. Speaker, in response to the remarks made by my colleague, I can tell her that I have had comments from senior citizens, as I am sure every Hon. Member has, about the modified indexation plan. Some are supportive and some are not. However, a large number of senior citizens are being confused by some of the rhetoric of the opposition Parties which are not painting the whole picture. I think it is very important we give the senior citizens the whole picture. As I indicated in my remarks earlier, it is true that we have modified the indexation to begin after only 3 per cent on the OAS, but the GIS is fully indexed. I should also add that some of the people across Canada who are on GIS also receive subsidized housing. That is another plus they have as opposed to those who receive only OAS.

I believe it is also important to remember something else. During these past few moments as I have been speaking, there have been one or two children born in Canada. Are we aware of the fact that that young child, boy or girl, now has a \$7,535 debt to pay which was given to him or her by the 16 years of Liberal mismanagement?

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Reimer: We should also recognize—Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could have order.

Mr. Nystrom: Tell those Tories to shut up.

Mr. Reimer: An Hon. Member of the New Democratic Party says to tell the Tories to be quiet. I hear it from both the Liberals and the Tories.

If one takes the taxation statistics of 1982, Mr. Speaker, and simply looks at the total figures of all federal income taxes raised, then looks at how much we are paying on the interest on the debt alone, in round figures one could say that all people earning less than \$40,000 annual income would not have to pay any federal taxes if we did not have to pay interest on the debt. That is how large our debt is. I have told that to some of my seniors, and they applaud the actions of this Government. I think we have to put the whole picture before the Canadian people. I wish the Opposition would tell the whole story and not just a few selective parts.

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Kitchener (Mr. Reimer) talked about all the seniors in his riding who support deindexing. I wonder if he could read into the record

the names of any organizations in his riding which support it, or read into the record any letters which support the government's move to deindex pensions?

Mr. Reimer: Mr. Speaker, if I understand the rules correctly, I would have to seek permission to do that. However, just in response to what the Hon. Member is saying, I have met with some seniors. I cannot say I have met with all of them, but I have spoken on the telephone with some and visited some in their homes. The biggest single problem they are having today is the misinformation and the rhetoric they hear from the opposition Parties and from some of the media. That is where the problem really lies. When I give them the information in the Budget books and give them the full picture, the vast majority—I did not say all of them—are supportive of the attempts we are making.

● (1750)

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, the Government wants to borrow some \$18 billion, and I suppose the way things are in this country it has to. My question is: Money for whom? Who is going to pay for it? What is this money going to be used for? I look at the Budget brought down by this Government a few weeks ago and I say to myself that the low income people, the senior citizens, are the ones who are going to have to pay. I ask the Government why? Members opposite were elected on a platform which said they were going to be fair.

In the few moments left to me, I want to make a couple of arguments based on that concept of fairness. I have here a copy of an article from today's *Globe and Mail* concerning a study done by the Canadian Council on Social Development. This is a fairly reputable organization. In fact, the director was for years a gentleman named Reuben Baetz. He was and is a Conservative Cabinet Minister in Ontario and will be, I guess, for another week or so until a vote in that legislature. What that organization is saying is that the PC Budget redistributes money from the poor to the rich. The report says that by the year 1990, the wealthiest families in this country will be receiving an extra \$4,500 because of the Budget, and the poorest people will see a drop in their income. They say:

A study by the council, to be released later this week, says the Conservative Government's budget will increase the disposable incomes of families earning \$50,000 or more in 1990, while families with earnings of \$40,000 or less will face reductions in their disposable incomes.

What they are saying is that a family earning about \$30,000 a year will receive an average of \$1,089 less by the year 1990 because of this Conservative Budget. The less affluent families will also face significant cuts in disposable income ranging between \$808 for a family earning \$20,000, to \$396 for a family earning \$10,000.

In contrast, Mr. Speaker, and here I speak to my friend in the Conservative Party from Quebec who was just on her feet, the wealthiest families in this country will receive a windfall because of the Budget. The Council says that families who earn over \$200,000 a year will have their disposable incomes increased by \$4,500 by the year 1990. That is not fair, Mr.