

on TV and his Minister of Finance had to make amends and say it was all a mistake.

Well, once more you're making a mistake, you Tories, and once more you misled the people. The 65-year olds. Universality was established because every person who worked all his or her life and paid taxes, who painstakingly put money aside, who even paid a special tax during 20 years to be entitled to universality, those people should not be deprived of it.

Moreover, this Tory Government starts at the level of \$50,000 a year or more, even though this does not even reduce its deficit. Next year, it will lower that to the \$30,000 income level, and the year after that to \$20,000. And it makes no difference which Government is in power. Just as income tax was meant to be a temporary measure but has become a permanent fixture, the Minister's surtax was temporary. It is now permanent and has been increased, Mr. Speaker.

And now they attack people with \$50,000 yearly income—and I am not speaking of my constituents. If today's poor families, today's poor senior citizens do not join forces with everyone else to make the Government relent on its attack against social program universality, the next victims will be those with a \$30,000 yearly income, and after that those with \$20,000.

We have seen that before with respect to other programs, Mr. Speaker. When the universal Old Age Security program was implemented it was only fair to the men and women who had worked for hours on end during their active lifetime, they had paid their taxes and they rightfully expected to be entitled to OAS benefits at the end of their career. The guaranteed income supplement was just another way to make life easier for less fortunate elderly Canadians. The whole program was designed to help as many people as possible.

But again the Government is misleading senior citizens. Not only the Prime Minister, him and his mother. No a single Conservative Member here would dare stand up and say he or she did warn older people that some of them would have to pay back their OAS benefits. Not one of them told the people.

Here they are again telling us they take from the rich to give to the poor, but that is not true, Mr. Speaker. Had the Government said it would raise the guaranteed income supplement paid to people living under the poverty line by taking back \$300 million from others

Supply

earning more than \$50,000 a year, I would have said that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) was not pulling the wool over the eyes of Canadians.

But it just is not so. The Government grabs that money so the banks will not have to pay their fair share to reduce the debt and lower the deficit.

Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of approach and policy which make people lose confidence in their Government and their politicians regardless of their political persuasion.

Let us consider family allowances and family policies. One of the problems facing Canada and Québec is the declining birth rate. We all know how much it costs to raise a family these days.

When the family allowances program was launched it was designed to help families with children, as opposed to childless couples. Now it seems the Conservatives want children to come only from poor families, they do not seek to help middle-income families.

I would suggest this is why Québec Liberal Government Family Minister Thérèse Lavoie-Roux said that the Budget of the Minister of Finance is an anti-family Budget. We remember that it maintained de-indexation of family allowances and lowered the child tax credit eligibility threshold. It has also recently imposed a special tax on family allowances and cancelled plans to increase child care spaces, which was the most important thing in that area.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with Mrs. Thérèse Lavoie-Roux that it is an anti-family Budget. And now that the declining birthrate is a problem it is not a good time to take money away from families with children. It should be the opposite: we should encourage young couples to have children by helping them with the extra costs involved.

Mr. Speaker, health and hospitalization insurance is another program that is free and universal. Health Ministers throughout the country, be they Liberals or Conservatives, are not fools. Before the Budget was tabled, they all sent the Minister of Finance an SOS saying that his 1986 Bill C-96 resulted in a \$5.776 billion cut in the health and hospitalization insurance funding program. Hospitals have had to close beds and deny treatment to patients in order to make ends meet. You have people suffering, people who need a heart bypass operation but who must wait a year; some even die