

Board, because how could the member from Newfoundland and the hon. member for Egmont accept such an unjust system?

While the House of Commons has agreed to give second reading to the bill, which is acceptance in principle, and we are in Committee of the Whole under the guillotine—to use the term of the Tories when they were in opposition—the only possible thing we can do is to suggest that the provision at least be reviewed.

Let us look at the effects of this provision. Newfoundland, which has 2.4 per cent of the households of Canada, will receive only 1.2 per cent of the benefits under this bill.

P.E.I., the province of the Secretary of State who wants to be the defender of his province, which has 0.6 per cent of the population, will get only 0.3 per cent of the benefits.

Take the province of the hon. member for Central Nova, who is Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. Some of us thought that this man would be able to fight not only for Nova Scotia but for the Atlantic provinces, and we were happy to see that such an important portfolio was given to a member we thought to be sincere. We still think he is sincere but he is being controlled by the President of the Treasury Board and the barons of Bay Street. That province, which has 3.9 per cent of the population, will get only 2.8 per cent of the benefits.

My province of New Brunswick has been ignored in the real cabinet because we have a Minister of State who does not even have a portfolio, for the first time since confederation. My province has 2.9 per cent of the population of Canada—

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I am not sure that this litany of households in the various provinces of Canada has anything to do with the sunset law amendment which was put forward by the hon. member's colleague.

Mr. Breau: Mr. Chairman, I am explaining the injustices of this bill. The hon. member does not like to be confused by facts, and I can very well understand that, but I am trying to put some facts on the record to show that this bill is an unjust piece of legislation, that it is inequitable, and therefore I want it reviewed by Parliament next year.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Breau: The hon. member does not wish me to prove to the House and to the Canadian public, that the Tories are a party which does not want to use the resources of the government to help those who need help, they want to use the resources of government to help those who do not need help. I suppose that what they want to do is to help those who have complained for years that they could not buy homes. Now they will give them a tax credit so that they can go to Florida and buy a condominium there.

I am trying to show that in my province where we have 3.1 per cent of the households in Canada we will only get 1.7 per cent of the benefits.

Quebec, with 21.6 per cent of the households, will receive 18.7 per cent of the benefits.

Mortgage Tax Credit

Ontario, that poor province—I know that this government is making Ontario poor because obviously the Prime Minister and the premier of Alberta have decided that Ontario was no longer important to confederation and had nothing to say—look at how Ontario is being shafted. That province has 37.8 per cent of the households, but they will get 45.4 per cent of the benefits. Could this be the trade-off between being shafted by higher oil prices and getting benefits under this bill? The taxation structure and the property tax base in Canada are not uniform throughout the country; they are not the same everywhere. In my province, for example, school taxes are not collected on the basis of property value but on the basis of a central assessment by the provincial government.

For that reason, I would ask you, Mr. Chairman, to put the question on this amendment now because we would very much like to have it approved.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Ritchie (York East): Mr. Chairman—

Some hon. Members: Filibuster.

An hon. Member: Obstructing the House.

Mr. Breau: Are you for or against the amendment?

Mr. Ritchie (York East): I rise to discuss the amendment, and it does need some discussion because of all the things that have been said in its alleged support that are highly questionable. The principles of this bill have been put before the Canadian people and have been the subject of intense discussion for more than a year. They are, moreover, closely related to a practice which has been in effect in the United States for 50 years. We are not dealing with something that is new and unknown; we are dealing with something that is known.

During the period in which the principles of this bill have been debated, not just in the House but in the country, we have heard the charge made by people who opposed it that the trouble with it is that once you put it in, you cannot get it out. To me, that is one of its greatest assets. If you analyse that statement, what is being said is that the will of the people will keep this law in place once it is in.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Breau: If you want it passed, let us vote on it.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Ritchie (York East): The argument is that the will of the people should not be allowed to be effective.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Breau: We speak for the people, so let us vote on it.