

### Supply

sometime later it turned yellow but now we are looking at the red light.

True, once again, because of this Budget and those measures, a senior 65 and older whose net income is over \$70,000, I repeat over \$70,000, will have to give back the excess old age pension he received. But suppose that, for some reason, the income of that same person is down to \$15,000 the following year. He will have received cheques the whole time and at the end of the second year he will keep the full amount of the old age pension because his income will be under \$50,000.

The Hon. Member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie said also that it was not indexed. Mr. Speaker, since 1984, there have been three or four increases in the federal sales tax credit and the child tax credit, and the old age pensions are upped every three months. You can see therefore there is no risk whatsoever that the income seniors are entitled to will be cancelled, lowered, whatever expression you prefer. There is absolutely no danger of that.

I think that for once—I have never seen it in four years—the Opposition should leave all partisanship aside and join forces against a problem that is not that of the riding of Trois-Rivières or Duvernay, but a national problem they created. They should work in co-operation with the Progressive Conservative Government to have this Budget adopted as soon as possible so that in the future we will be able to offer Canadian men and women the social programs they want and others they also long for.

Other programs could be implemented if we did not have to spend 35 cents of every dollar in 1989–90 to pay the interest. And we have not even begun to pay back the debt! The debt now amounts to \$320 billion and increases by \$3 million an hour. We have not even started thinking about reimbursing that debt.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Opposition should make an effort. Let's put partisanship aside and take stock of the situation. The Opposition should support our efforts. There is nothing wrong with an opposition party admitting that the Government has come up with a good policy. They won't die if they concede that a policy is good. In four years, I have never heard a member of the Opposition admit that we had done something right. Not once in four years! In 1988, the Canadian people recognized that we had done something right. And I think that it should teach the Opposition a positive lesson. When bills are valid and important to the country, they should admit that the Progressive Conservative Party is right in this case. Their credibility would

automatically be reinforced. However, as things now stand, they always say no to everything. It is impossible to always say no. Say what you want, it's impossible!

Mr. Speaker, I realize that my time is almost up and I would like to conclude by pointing out that the family allowance eligibility threshold of \$50,000 continues to apply and that the level at which one ceases to be eligible for family allowances varies according to the number of incomes and children. I hope these explanations will give some good ideas to members of the Opposition.

**Mr. Bellemare:** Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to part of the presentation by the Hon. Member for Trois-Rivières (Mr. Vincent). I also heard him denigrate my colleague from Laurier—Sainte-Marie (Mr. Malépart), this good man who protects people in difficulty, who protects the poor, who protects the sick, who protects those in need! The Hon. Member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie wants to protect people who need to go to hospital, elderly people who need to be able to have a pleasant and decent life. I heard the Hon. Member for Trois-Rivières talk about the debt and suggest to the Opposition that we should not take sides, that we should support them and applaud them for what they have done over four years—

Mr. Speaker, I have only been here since last November 21, and today you must say, as in a boxing match, you do not talk about previous fights; the one that counts is now. We are talking about the next four years, the next four years of the Conservative Party, not about past years. Because I will remind the Hon. Member for Trois-Rivières, if he wants to talk about the last four years, that the debt in 1984 was perhaps around \$120 billion. What was the debt in 1988, Hon. Member? And from whom did you inherit it?

There was a debt in 1984, but in 1988, what was it and where did you get the debt incurred between 1984 and 1988?

• (1350)

Now, the issue, Mr. Speaker, is that they want to pay off the debt on the backs of those who receive benefits or payments, senior citizens. The money you will save by taxing those who allegedly earn over \$50,000 a year, instead of taxing those who make a lot of money, the rich—in short, why do you, the Hon. Member for Trois-Rivières, attack one of the social programs? And your target in attacking a social program is those people who earn more than a certain amount, but you know that over the years, the cost of living rises and some day, those who are considered poor today with an income of \$20,000 or \$23,000 will in a few years be making \$50,000.