

Government Orders

This bill first of all is a waste of the time of this House. There are more important things we could be doing here.

I started to say that when the former Minister of Finance explained the reason for this bill some months ago, he indicated that without it things would be very complicated. Is that not awfully tough? Can you imagine those poor old Bronfmans down there? Can you imagine them having to shell out a few more bucks on another legal bill to straighten out their family trust?

Would you not like to be in the kind of situation where you had a trust that was so rich and so complicated that you had to get a lawyer to straighten it out for you? Is that not a rough tough position to be in? Do not worry.

Your ever-trusting former Minister of Finance is coming to the rescue. If you rich people out there are having trouble with your legal fees, with your complicated family trust, he is coming to the rescue. He who wants to be the prime minister of this country, there he is, aided and abetted by the minister of defence and the minister of employment. There they are ready to see that the Steinbergs of this country do not have undue agonizing over their legal problems. He will straighten it out. Do you have problems? We will pass a new bill for you, folks. There is no problem at all.

If only the ordinary people of this country had the same access to this Chamber, if only the ordinary people could get that kind of action, if only those 325,000 people who have lost their manufacturing jobs over the last nine years since the gentleman from Baie Comeau became Prime Minister had that kind of responsiveness from this House, what a great country it would be. What a great government it would be.

The question is, should we pass this rich man's bill. Should we help the former Minister of Finance in his quest to make things legally simple for the richest in this country? I do not know about the rest of them here, but we in this party are against this bill. We are against Bill C-92. Not only is it a waste of time, but it unfairly gives an advantage to those who need it least.

I am looking forward to hearing from my friend from Mississauga South. He is panting over there. He is all ready to get up. He is going to explain to us the fine points of this bill. Unlike him, I do not have the financial training that he does. I did not come here to represent

that sector of society. I came for a completely different reason altogether.

He too has an opportunity to rise in this place and tell us why it is he is so chafing at the bit to see to it that the Bronfmans and the Steinbergs are properly protected. They should be as long as their protection is no more gilt-edged than the Smiths, the Levines, the Jones, the Leblancs and the others in my riding and across this country.

We do not stand here to oppose the concerns of particular people, but only to ask that those concerns be dealt with in a way that does not trample on other people. That is why during my few minutes, and I realize that my time is up, I talked about the two bills together, Bill C-92, which in my view is a rich man's bill, and Bill C-113 which pummels the poor, the unemployment changes bill.

• (1210)

These two have to be taken together because it puts in stark relief what this government is doing to various groups of people in this country. That I deplore and that is why I am so opposed to this particular bill.

Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—St. Clair): Madam Speaker, yesterday we heard of the departure of the Prime Minister. My leader has described him as brother Daryl and we know that the opposition is led by the other brother Daryl. I am really puzzled by this debate.

We heard the member from the Official Opposition raking the government over Bill C-113 which cuts unemployment benefits from 60 per cent to 50 per cent. This is the same party that cut those benefits from 66 per cent to 60 per cent. Now he rakes them for this tremendous gift to the very rich, the Bronfmans, the Reichmanns and so on.

I ask him who was the first to give those rich people this gift back in 1972? Who provided the shelter for the trusts in 1972? Why, if it was so good then, is my other brother Daryl raking the government for doing the same thing in 1993?

Brother Daryl and this other brother Daryl, as most Canadians know, stand for the same thing. We hear great eloquence condemning what is given to the rich and taken from the poor by the Official Opposition, but they seem to forget that so much was taken back from the poor and given to the rich when they were in power.