

as irresponsible as to make a statement like that about the stability of his own dollar is real heresy."

• (1650)

I said, "That might be so, Sir, but my prediction will rest upon what this Government does this year and what it continues to do in successive years". I do not take back my statement that this is the basis for the 80 cent dollar. And the evangelistic Turner stood across the floor of this House and defended that extravagance with a verve that could hardly be understood in view of the way he is presented to the Canadian public today. Those were the budgets which started us toward the position where we can no longer extend to civil servants, old age pensioners or retirees from the army the indexation for which they paid and which this Government committed itself to extending to them. This is unquestionably an absolute renege by the Government of Canada on its contractual arrangement with those people. It is criminal that we should have to neglect the needs of this nation so badly and that we should have conducted our financing with so little forethought.

But it is even worse than that, Mr. Speaker. We have today a group of farmers who are going bankrupt. We are in a financial position where we are not going to index pensions for civil servants or any retirees. Nor are we going to put enough money into the Farm Credit Corporation to extend to farmers the bridge financing they so badly need. We are, however, going to put billions behind such crummy corporations as Maislin. Where is the judgment of this Government with respect to the needy people of this land? How can we put literally billions into guarantees for outfits such as Dome, Chrysler, Massey-Ferguson and Maislin and then say to our old age pensioners: "I am sorry, but we cannot index your pension"? Does the public not understand the hypocrisy which this Government is practising?

Why am I concerned about this, Mr. Speaker? It happens that the latest statistics indicate there are approximately 8,700 people in the constituency of Carleton-Charlotte who are over 65. These people, constituting 19 per cent of the voters in my riding, are going to be affected one way or another. Now, let us carry that a little further. There are roughly 3,000 who do not get the GIS, which means there are 5,700 who do. So the 3,000 do not get indexation. I know some of those people, Mr. Speaker, and they are scraping the bottom of the barrel to get by now. When the Government uses a broad brush in this policy of retrenchment, it is not being equitable. It has not recognized the real and pertinent need of some people.

It would be popular in the eyes of Canadians, perhaps, to say to a retired deputy minister or a retired director general with 35 years of service: "We are not going to index your pension". Of course, no Member of the Government would admit that a deputy minister who retired five years ago is now getting more pay in pension than he drew when he was employed. So he is all right, he is looked after, but the little guy below the poverty line is the one who is going to suffer.

What about the army retirees I mentioned earlier? What about those who have had short service in rather menial jobs

and they retired five or ten years ago? They have been struggling to exist and their pension will not be indexed except to the extent of 6 per cent. They have not had the opportunity a retired deputy minister or director general has had to be receiving more in pension than they ever earned. These people are going to suffer because the pension they accumulated over, say, ten years of service does not amount to much.

I see that I have used up my time, Mr. Speaker, but I want to say to you that the broad brush approach of hitting everyone over the head with a club does not work. We need a compromise between the insanity of that approach and the need of many people.

Mr. Blaine A. Thacker (Lethbridge-Foothills): Mr. Speaker, I also rise on the report stage of Bill C-131 to express my extreme disappointment that the Government is attacking a certain segment of our society under the guise of six and five. Government Members need to realize right from the start that the only reason that we have these cutback Bills is the years and years of deficit we have had, the years of Government spending more money than it was taking in. Those deficits led directly and inevitably, as they have since the beginning of organized society, to inflation. Inflation, Mr. Speaker, is simply too many dollars chasing too few goods. As societies in the past have learned, inflation impacts upon different segments of society in different and unfair ways. It always attacks people with fixed incomes most severely. Those people, of course, are old age pensioners.

We all know that inflation of 3 per cent to 4 per cent causes the value of a dollar to drop by 50 per cent in maybe 15 or 20 years, so that by the time a person who has retired at age 65 with a pension of \$1,000 a month reaches 80, that pension will be worth about \$500. Now inflation of 3 per cent or 4 per cent can be coped with, but when you get into inflation rates of 10 per cent, 15 per cent and 20 per cent, the value of money drops by 50 per cent within three, four or five years. And that is how inflation impacts so severely on the seniors. That is why they need to have the indexation, Mr. Speaker. Therefore, this cutback is totally unfair and clearly the result of deliberate actions by this Liberal Government, backed by Liberal Party policies.

There is no doubt that our friends to the left, the NDP, also support that, because they continually call for more Government spending. So they have to be roped in, and Canadians need to understand that. Every person receiving Old Age Security who votes for the Liberal Party in the next election, is voting for more of the same, and for his own self destruction. Every retired federal civil servant now realizes, the few who voted for the Liberal Party in the past, that he had been sabotaged, and if he votes for the Liberal Party in the future he is going to get more knives in the back. The situation is exactly the same for the youth of this country, Mr. Speaker, because those deficits simply mean that the next generation will have to accept a much lower standard of living in order to pay for our expenditures today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, none of us would do that to our families, we would not impose a debt on the next generation. Indeed,