

*The Address—Mr. Malépart*

debate, and stated in the legislative assembly that his party had always advocated sovereignty-association. Following those statements, I checked the PQ platform from 1975 to 1979 and in chapter 2 we find in black and white a reference to accession to independence and on page 62 of the 1978 platform under the title: "Mandate to all representations of the party" the following in paragraph 6 and I quote: The sixth convention asks that an evaluation of federalism be made to show the necessity of independence to carry out the platform of the party. To my knowledge, Mr. René Lévesque, an active member of the PQ, attended that convention.

Mr. Speaker, the PQ government is promising the Garden of Eden to the people of Quebec. Promises, promises and more promises! At that rate, I think they are about to beat the record set by the Parti Rhinocéros for impossible promises. You can find them in the white paper of the Parti Québécois. This is all very nice, but I would like to remind Quebeckers of all the promises the Parti Québécois made before 1976 and never kept. Here is one of the very first the party made. It appears in its 1975 program at page 19, and I quote:

A government led by the Parti Québécois would commit itself to providing all people, including the elderly, with a guaranteed minimum income based on the following principles:

- a) the minimum income of a person cannot be allowed to fall below the poverty line—

I would like to know why Mr. Lévesque is keeping social assistance benefits below the poverty line. For example: a single person on social assistance in Quebec receives only \$301 per month, and a single person who receives the old age security pension with the federal supplement will get \$361 a month as of July 1, 1980, and that pension is indexed every three months whereas in Quebec it is indexed only once a year. I would like to know why Mr. Lévesque did not live up to his commitment and why he so quickly abolished the indexing of welfare benefits and decreased, not to say stole, by some \$15 million family allowance benefits, when the federal government decided last year to grant a \$200 child tax credit. Mr. Speaker, the leader of the Parti Québécois also made another commitment which is set out on page 21 on the party's program. It says that a Parti Québécois government is committed to indexing the minimum wage rate to the increase in the cost of living.

Another promise gone up in smoke. On page 24, chapter 9, of the same program, under the heading "Senior Citizens," one finds that a Parti Québécois government promises to build housing units with rents based on income which will provide, apart from the usual services, superintendent, elevators, laundry facilities, tuck shop, medical services and a lounge. The Quebec finance minister recently informed us that this project will be abandoned next year. This statement appears on page 33 of the Parti Québécois budget speech.

● (1600)

In that same program, the government guarantees free transportation for the elderly in urban areas and transportation at reduced fare for intercity travelling. Everybody in Montreal remembers the increase in fares for older people. Moreover, those who live in homes know full well that every three months the Lévesque government deprives them of their indexation; who knows what will happen to the \$35 the Canadian government intends to give them?

Another promise made by the PQ government on page 27 concerning the education of young people reads as follows:

To implement universal free education at all levels, to raise the compulsory school age to 18, to set up a coherent system of scholarships and living allowances or possibly a pre-salary system.

Just another unfulfilled promise.

Mr. Speaker, how could we believe all the fine promises in the PQ's white paper and in the statements Mr. Lévesque and his team have made, when they were not even able to fulfil those they had made before being brought to power?

The PQ's advertising during the referendum campaign reminds me of those finance companies which prevail upon the public to borrow from them without indicating that they charge twice as much as any other institution. That is why the PQ is exerting a pressure on the feelings of Quebeckers to sell them its project, without having the courage to tell them the truth about how much this sovereignty-association adventure is going to cost them.

Mr. Speaker, in 1973 the Parti Québécois had presented its so-called year one budget but the electorate, knowing the true cost of sovereignty-association, massively rejected the Parti Québécois and its option for independence. Let us not forget that a Yes vote in the referendum would achieve nothing but maintain uncertainty, and that Yes vote would put our country in jeopardy, as the Prime Minister of Canada put it in his speech to the Parliament of Canada: since provinces refuse to negotiate the association, the Canadian government has no mandate to negotiate sovereignty and Mr. Lévesque will not get the mandate to negotiate association pure and simple. Which means that a Yes vote leads to nothing but uncertainty. Can we afford to pay the price for that uncertainty and take the risk of seeing it last until the second referendum? Moreover, who says that in two or three years the PQ, afraid again to present its option honestly, will not use new tactics to perpetuate this climate of uncertainty?

I would also like the chief of the Parti Québécois to tell us what would be the consequences of a Yes for the 3,000 employees of CBC, the 8,000 employees of Air Canada, the 1,050 employees of Teleglobe Canada, the 600 employees of the Federal Development Bank, the 900 employees of the National Film Board, the 500 employees of the St. Lawrence Seaway, the 500 employees of the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, the 14,000 employees of Canadian Na-