

was \$1,000 over that threshold. Do you know how much tax that cost me, Madam Speaker? It cost \$150 because I have over \$400,000 in stocks or \$800,000 in stocks. I cannot believe that my friends to the left are really telling me that low-income Canadians need this help.

You ought to carry that on a little further because I have talked about the poor Canadian who makes \$51,000. Let us talk about the poor Canadian who makes \$61,000. He makes \$11,000 more than the threshold. There are a lot of seniors out there who are really poor and who have an awful time spending \$61,000 a year. Yet here is someone making \$61,000. In the third year of the program, not the first year and not the second year but in the third year he has to pay \$1,650 out of the \$4,000 that the government is sending him.

I know that the opposition does not like that idea but I have some great difficulty in believing that my friends here on the left are concerned about Canadians making \$60,000 or \$70,000. In fact a Canadian who has to pay back the entire old age security would have to make \$77,000 a year. I appreciate the concern that the members to the left have on high-income Canadians. I have great difficulty in believing that they are at all serious in the belief that seniors who make \$77,000 a year should get government assistance of any kind, let alone the Old Age Security.

Let us not talk about the senior because there is the portion of people who make \$50,000 or more who have families. They get family allowance cheques all the time. There is another group that really needs help. I am impressed as all get out by the opposition members here. The people to the left are really quite concerned that they help low income Canadians with families.

• (1530)

These low income Canadians with families, just how much money do they make? It is really a very tremendous amount of money. Family allowance is about \$32 a month per child.

I see that you are indicating that I have only one minute left, Madam Speaker. I could go on about how these people are trying to help these poor low-earning members of Parliament such as myself who has three children, and I should be eligible for family allowance. I appreciate that they think that I ought to get family allowance. But, you know, I do not mind at all if you tax it back from me. I am serious. I can say that I have had similar representations from every senior who qualifies for old age security in the high income bracket. I have

not had one objection to the tax back of old age security, if they make more than \$50,000 and if they live in my riding. Not one senior in my riding has complained about that. You people ought to get with it.

Mr. Jack Whittaker (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to stand today and debate the amendments, Motions Nos. 4, 6 and 7 on Bill C-28, which is an act to amend the Income Tax Act.

I woke up this morning and I was humming this little song, a little Christmas ditty, "Christmas is coming, the goose is getting fat". It occurred to me whose goose it was that was getting fat. Obviously, it was the goose of the members across the aisle because Tory times are taxing times and the goose on this side is not getting fat, it is getting more slender as we get more and more of this Tory legislation.

We have the UI bill. We have free trade. We have the GST. This morning, what happened? We had the Minister of Finance dropping the GST from 9 per cent to 7 per cent. Wow! What a Christmas present!

But we do not want to lose sight of what is in fact happening. We do not want to lose sight of the dastardly deeds of this government. Bill C-28, for instance, is one of these slippery, sneaky methods that this government uses to hit those least able to fight back—families and seniors. Shame, shame on the members of the government.

We have just seen an example in the last speech before the House and in some of the answers during Question Period by the Minister of Finance of the arrogance and contempt with which members of this government treat the people of Canada. They say they are listening, but they are not hearing. They have not heard a word that the people of Canada have said about the goods and services tax. They have not heard a word that the people have said about the unemployment insurance amendments. They have not heard a word that the people of Canada, particularly families and seniors, have said about these amendments to the Income Tax Act.

It is undoubted as we look at this, in spite of what the members across the way have said, that this is a direct attack on universality. It is not simply a little method of getting some money back through taxation of the rich. Universality, after all, is the means by which we can pay out to people without having them submit to a means test. We in this party want to continue to ensure that all Canadians, regardless of income, have available to them