

Family Allowances Act

the notion that the state has a role to play in ensuring the welfare of Canadian children is a mistake.

I remember standing here as other Members did, including the Hon. Member who just spoke so eloquently, telling the Government it was making a mistake in attempting to take dollars out of the hands of mothers and fathers, primarily mothers, used to caring for their children. This is immoral, unjust and wrong and the Government will not get away with it.

I am sure I speak for both opposition Parties when I say that Members are not here simply to make noise, to score political points or to embarrass the administration. We are telling the Government that this measure is unacceptable to us as parliamentarians and that Bill C-70 is unacceptable to Canadians. Let me tell the Government now that this country is going to organize. The Coalition for Justice that spontaneously came together just before this House rose for the summer will come together again. The sense of moral outrage expressed by Canadians last May, June and early July, shall be expressed again.

Bill C-70 will progressively, over the next four year period, take precious dollars and cents out of Canadian households, the dollars targeted to ensure the health and welfare of children.

When I sit and look at the assessment undertaken by the health critic for the Liberal Party, the Hon. Member for Sudbury (Mr. Frith), showing the impact of this Bill on Canadian families, I am startled. By 1990, a family with an income of \$15,000 a year—two earners and two children—will pay an additional \$1,844 in taxes. A family with an income of \$80,000 taking advantage of capital gains, will pay an additional \$404, and one not taking advantage of capital gains will pay an additional \$1,125. Where is the justice in telling a family with an income of \$15,000 which puts them squarely below the poverty line and on the bottom of the totem pole, that it will have to pay an additional \$1,844 while a family earning \$80,000 will have to pay only \$1,125? Where is the justice in that kind of measure? Where is the reflection of the so-called sacred trust which the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) claims was bestowed upon him by Canadians last September 4? How can that kind of regressive and immoral measure be described as keeping faith with Canadians?

● (1230)

We in Ottawa live in an ivory tower, not only as we work in the House of Commons, surrounded by stained glass windows and marbled imported from the continents of the world, but as we live in the suburbs of Ottawa, in Rockcliffe Park, Craig Henry and so on. These are neighbourhoods of beautiful brick homes with two-car garages, paved driveways and even pink flamingoes on the front lawns. However, that is not reality. It is a lovely model for the rest of the country and it is a dream to which those who have not aspire.

What about a \$15,000 wage earner in the community of Anchor Point, Newfoundland, with a house built on the rocks overlooking salt water? The husband slaves for four months of

the year in the North Atlantic in order to bring home some income. I see the Minister of State for Small Businesses (Mr. Bissonnette) nodding his head; he visited that area not too long ago. In fact, the wife works in a fish plant splitting fish for three or four months a year so that the family can make that \$15,000. Do the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) really believe that such people can afford to pay an additional \$1,879? Do they really believe that loggers in northern British Columbia can afford to pay that amount? Such loggers find themselves facing a diminishing resource. They work with their hands in order to bring home incomes for their families. They are not living on taxpayers' dollars from bureaucratic jobs and living in Craig Henry or Rockcliffe Park. They live in northern British Columbia communities such as Smithers and work with their hands for a living. Can they afford to pay an additional \$1,879, which will be taxed away from their income? Is that the trust which he placed in the hands of the Prime Minister, the sacred trust which the Prime Minister claims is a mantle of prime ministership? No, it is not.

Last summer Canadians amazed this administration when they spoke with one voice in defence of the quality of life of senior citizens. The true measure of any nation is how it treats its elderly citizens and its children. We saw that Canadians would not accept a measure or an attempt to balance the books on the backs of senior citizens at a time when the Government was contemplating capital gains giveaways and giveaways to multinational oil companies. Every Member of the House knows that Canadians will not stand by silently and watch a measure being introduced which, between now and 1990, will have a serious impact upon the ability of the poorest people to provide for their children—to provide a roof over their heads, to provide proper clothing and to provide decent food. Canadians will not stand for it.

Mr. Lapierre: Nor for tainted tuna.

Mr. Tobin: Nor for tainted tuna, that is for sure. I plead with Hon. Members opposite to do what they did last year. They should speak up in their caucus meetings and in their private councils. They should warn the Minister of Finance that this will not wash any more than the Government's last attempt to punish those least able to fend for themselves. If they were astonished last summer and learned respect for grey power, they should remember that every senior citizen, among the most unselfish people in Canada, who stood and demanded justice at that time will join the cause and demand justice for their children and grandchildren. I advise them to withdraw this Bill.

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, it is with a degree of sadness that I rise to participate in the debate on Bill C-70. At this time in the progression of civilization and the human race, major social, economic, cultural and technological changes are taking place. They are changing the way in which society operates and traditional family structures. They are also affecting the manner in which children are raised and the traditional roles of males and females. Also at this time