

The very concepts of the demand in Form T-2219 are playing havoc with brokers in the stock exchanges, particularly with respect to those investing on a margin account. The amount of accounting required is anti-productive and militates against disclosure of investment activity and will, if carried on, totally destroy the self-assessment principles in the Income Tax Act.

The form was concocted when the Government set out to limit the amount of interest a person could deduct when borrowings were made for investment activity. The Form makes little, if any, sense and is causing untold problems. The accounting costs to complete the Form alone represent an undue burden on the taxpayer. The Minister should forthwith withdraw the Form. It is a bureaucratic bungle.

\* \* \*

### THE CONSTITUTION

#### APPLICATION TO CANADIAN CHILDREN DETAINED IN JORDAN

**Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina):** Madam Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) the case of two Canadian citizens who are being held against their will in a foreign country, with no charges laid against them. I argue that the Government has a duty to defend their right under Section 6(1) of the Charter to re-enter Canada.

The children of the Ahlawat family, Rishi, aged 11, and Muni, aged 8, were born in Toronto of East Indian parents who are naturalized Canadians. The father went to Jordan in 1978 to teach, and the family followed. The father, who had a long history of violence toward his wife, kept the boys and refused to return to Canada or let them return. The mother returned to Canada, obtained a custody order, and returned to Jordan, but the father then converted to Islam, obtained an Islamic custody order, and seized their passports. The mother has interceded with King Hussein, but to no avail. These are Canadian citizens with the right under the Charter to return to Canada to a Canadian court which gave custody to the mother.

I ask that the Government negotiate with Jordan to ensure the return of the children and the father so that the matter of custody can be resolved in a court of the country of Canada, of which they are citizens.

\* \* \*

### UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

#### DENIAL OF MATERNITY BENEFITS TO ADOPTIVE PARENTS

**Mr. Jack Burghardt (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications):** Madam Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention a Section of the Unemployment Insurance Act which I believe is unjust and requires amendment. I am referring to Section 30(1) of the Unemployment Insurance Act which requires that an applicant for maternity benefits

### S.O. 21

“should prove her pregnancy”. This Section, as currently written, effectively denies adoptive mothers the receipt of maternity benefits.

As I am sure we are all aware, the general need for maternal care of the adopted newborn is as great as that required for the biological newborn.

In the case of non-infant adopted children, dealing with the problems of parental or guardian transition can also require thorough parental attention. Immediate parental supervision in adoption cases is deemed so essential that many family service agencies make a six-month home stay a mandatory provision. I believe that the distinction between adoptive parents and natural or biological parents is unnecessary.

Inasmuch as the current unemployment insurance policy with respect to maternity benefits reflects the need of the mother to be with the new child, as well as reflecting the physical inability to work, I feel that Section 30(1) of the Unemployment Insurance Act should be amended in order to provide a form of maternity benefits to adoptive mothers as well as to natural mothers.

\* \* \*

● (1410)

### AGRICULTURE

#### NECESSITY FOR BEEF STABILIZATION PROGRAM

**Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer):** Madam Speaker, the vacillation of the Minister of Agriculture concerning the very important issue of stabilization for the beef livestock industry is a matter of grave importance to producers. Producers have been promised a policy “within months”, “by the end of the summer”, “within a week”, and “before Christmas”. When is it to be, Madam Speaker? In delaying, the Minister is at cross-purposes with the Provinces and the producers. He stands alone in his reluctance to act. Before even reading the provincial suggestions, for him to say that his proposals of a marketing board concept are better than the provincial suggestions is insulting.

Red meat producers can ill afford to wait for a federal Minister of Agriculture who needs weeks, months, even years, to make up his mind. It is hard enough for them to carry him on their backs, especially when he is dragging the one foot he does not have in his mouth.

\* \* \*

### AIR CANADA

#### UNITED STATES REACTION TO SEAT SALE

**Mrs. Ursula Appolloni (York South-Weston):** Madam Speaker, Canada and the United States have in the past followed an unwritten rule not to link issues when certain problems arise between the two countries. This practice has been broken by the United States Government which has