

the whole brief, because time does not allow, let me however quote from it, especially the conclusion which reads as follows:

In conclusion, we can therefore state that the Budget brought down by Minister Wilson extorts still more money from our members and causes concern to our group, the Prescott and Russell union of social assistance recipients, for the years after 1988. Our members and the small wage earners should be made aware of that and told about the Government's current position.

Mr. Speaker, in other words, this group of low-income people from my constituency wanted at that time to rally people to protest against Bill C-70 and other parts of the Budget brought down by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson). And this has been done, Mr. Speaker. From then on, we kept receiving day after day large numbers of petitions, and as we know, before Christmas, as you certainly remember, Mr. Speaker, entire days were spent in this House presenting petitions signed by Canadians from across the country who were expressing their disagreement on the Bill providing for partial de-indexation of family allowances.

[English]

In summary, let us look at the impact of the Budget on families with children. The Government of Canada, through abolishing family allowances, will gain \$15 million in the year 1985-86; in 1986-87, \$80 million; and in 1987-88, \$140 million. If saving money is a justifiable excuse—and I am not prepared to concede that it is on this particular measure—let us look at what it is doing. There are other measures in the Budget which will reduce revenues for 1986-87 by \$75 million, for 1987-88 by \$205 million, and for 1988-89 by \$300 million. They are not saving money. They are merely taking away from those people who can least afford it and they are redistributing those funds, but not to the people who need them. They are taking away from the poor and giving to those who have more. The people who will benefit from capital gains exemptions are not the ones who have no money. Those people have no gain on which to capitalize, so how can they receive benefit from a capital gains exemption? It will make the poor poorer and the rich richer.

In conclusion, I tell the Minister that this is his last chance to withdraw this budgetary measure.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I want to deal briefly with the amendment which we are now discussing. Before doing so, I would like to direct the attention of the Minister to an article which appeared in today's edition of *The Toronto Star*. It is headlined: "Groups send PM Petition to stop Baby Bonus Bill" and it indicates the following:

Twenty major church, native, labour and women's organizations—speaking for millions of Canadians—want the federal Government to drop plans to deindex family allowances.

The groups telexed a petition to Prime Minister Brian Mulroney late yesterday in an attempt to stop the Conservative Government from passing amendments to the Family Allowances Act.

It continues:

Yesterday, three more MPs, including Tory MP Moe Mantha (Nipissing) delivered petitions from constituents strongly opposed to the changes.

Thousands of petitions have been presented. I have a dozen or more to present today. However, the story continues:

Family Allowances Act, 1973

Among organizations included on the telex are: the National Action Committee on the Status of Women, National Farmers Union, Native Women's Association of Canada, Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops, Canadian Day Care Advocacy Association, Canadian Labour Congress, National Anti-Poverty Organization, Yukon Status of Women Council, Quebec Native Women's Association, Quebec Federation of Women, Metro Family Services Association, Metro Social Planning Council, Registered Nurses Association of Ontario, the United Church of Canada, Coalition of Provincial Organizations of the Handicapped, Citizens Against Child Poverty and the Federation of Women Teachers' Associations of Ontario.

• (1140)

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, when there has been such broad opposition, if ever, to any proposal brought forward by any Government. This is a Government that has prided itself on the idea that it is going to consult. Well, the consultations have taken place and the evidence is very clear that the broad mass of Canadian people do not want this Bill, they want it to be withdrawn.

Let me, Mr. Speaker, deal for a few moments with the particular amendment which we are now dealing with, and that has to do with the presumption of death. We believe that the presumption of death, and therefore the issuance of a certificate, has been the prerogative of the provincial or territorial jurisdiction within which the death occurred. We suspect, even going beyond that, in the case of deaths which had occurred or were presumed to have occurred in jurisdictions outside of Canada, that it would be necessary to obtain the death certificate from that jurisdiction before a decision could be made to discontinue the payment of family allowance. We believe it would be improper for us to give to the Minister in legislative form the power to make a presumption and issue a certificate, inasmuch as we would come into conflict with a very serious constitutional question.

I would ask the Minister that he not proceed with that as he already has the power now to discontinue the payments for any child who it can be proven is not in the custody of the person to whom the payment is normally made. With that power the Minister is able to achieve all that is required of him at this moment. We submit that that being the case, this section of the Bill is not necessary. We say to the Minister we would much prefer that he operate with the power he now has, that he recognize the potential for constitutional dispute. Not only is there the Constitution within Canada, but there is also a serious question of jurisdictional dispute between the Government of Canada issuing a certificate of death, on the one hand, and the jurisdiction outside of Canada which would have the authority and the requirement to investigate the facts surrounding the death of any person and clearly establish for all time who it was that died before any action taken by the federal Government could be considered legal and therefore proper.

Mr. Speaker, the other reason I have for proposing this clause in the Bill is that it is opposed by all the child find groups. The child find groups in Nova Scotia, Quebec, Ontario, British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Alberta have sent telegrams to the Minister asking him to withdraw this section until proper consultation has taken place with them. They, I understand, have sent a special delivery letter to the Minister