

Madam Speaker, it is time to have a government for ordinary Canadians.

[English]

It is the same thing with social programs. They are under attack. We have the beginning of the end of universality in social programs in this country. It is the old Chinese proverb: A journey of a thousand miles begins with a single step. What we see now is the beginning of the end of universality in social programs. In fact, with family allowances, some 535,000 Canadians will see either part or all of their family allowances taxed back by the federal Government. Some 132,000 old-age pensioners will see either part or all of their pension taxed back.

Mr. Blenkarn: Those earning over \$50,000.

Mr. Nystrom: The Chairman of the Finance Committee is always accurate. He is a very honest and open guy. He is very frank. He said Canadians would pay an extra \$10 billion in taxes if the Government was elected, through the national sales tax. He says the cut-backs—they call it a claw-back in the Conservative Party by the big Conservative tiger across the way—will apply to people that make over \$50,000 a year. And he is right.

Mr. Blenkarn: This is taxable income.

Mr. Nystrom: Suppose we take a family with a couple of kids with one person working making \$51,000 or \$52,000 a year.

Mr. Blenkarn: He won't get clawed back.

Mr. Nystrom: You are going to have some of that money clawed back if you are making over \$50,000.

Mr. Blenkarn: That is taxable income.

Mr. Nystrom: Okay. If you have taxable income of \$51,000 a year where one person is working, some of that money will be clawed back.

Mr. McDermid: That means he is making about \$85,000.

Mr. Nystrom: That person might be making a fair amount of money. But what about another family with two wage earners, both making about \$48,000 in taxable income. They are making about twice as much money as the first family, yet none of their money will be clawed back. That is not fair. The Chairman of the Finance Committee knows that is true. Where is the fairness, Madam Speaker, when you compare those two families? Do you think it is fair that one family making almost twice as much money would not have any of its income clawed back? If the determination is \$50,000 today, how long will it be before that amount is \$40,000, or \$30,000,

or \$25,000? How long will it be before the social policy in this country becomes the welfare policy and we will have a means test that will hurt ordinary Canadians?

[Translation]

But Madam Speaker, it is not only family allowances, not only old age pensions, not only that, it is unemployment insurance.

The federal Government is now privatizing unemployment insurance by withdrawing from it. Imagine, Madam Speaker, the Unemployment Insurance Commission—

[English]

Imagine, the Unemployment Insurance Commission run by Canada's big companies. The Government wants to save hundreds of millions of dollars by withdrawing from unemployment insurance. It will save money by withdrawing from promises made for child care.

• (1250)

You will notice the chairman of the Finance Committee did not talk about child care in the campaign because he knew that once elected the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) would not keep his word and would cut back on promises and commitments he made to the women and mothers and fathers of this country to spend more money on child care.

The Government is cutting back but it is cutting back on social programs. The Government is cutting back but it is cutting back on universality. The Government is cutting back but it is cutting back on unemployment insurance. The Government is cutting back but it is cutting back on regional development. It is cutting back on programs for ordinary people. What it is taxing under this borrowing Bill are ordinary Canadian people right across the country.

I also say to you that what we are seeing now for probably the first time in terms of a budgetary measure is the real Conservative agenda, which is to harmonize our policies and our programs more and more with the programs of the United States. Step one was the free trade deal—

An Hon. Member: I prefer Argentina.

Mr. Nystrom: —and they got the free trade deal. A Member across the way said he prefers Argentina. Step one was the free trade deal, free trade with the United States of America where we lose a lot of Canadian sovereignty. Despite the fact that the overwhelming majority of Canadian people vote against that idea, vote against the Conservative Party, because of the quirks in our electoral system we now have free trade.