

bringing forth this bill. I want to make very clear at the outset that I support the bill and the principles therein. For 18 years I had what I would term the privilege of being a teacher in various provinces in this country, and I had, I hope, some influence on the development of some of the young people in my country.

I saw first hand on many occasions the differences between children who come from a family situation where there is respect for the parents and the children, and even for the grandparents and grandchildren, and the opposite situation where there was no respect in the family for the parents or the children, and very often cases where respect was confused with licence.

We saw in the sixties the breakdown of law and order in this country when the policeman was considered a pig, and anybody in authority was to be abhorred. We reaped the harvest of that breakdown in discipline. Of course, the pendulum has now begun to swing the other way. Now there are those in our society who are demanding for those who violate our laws and our regulations the most severe of punishments. It is important that we recognize in our society, which is based on the family unit, the importance of that integral unit in our society. It is important that we realize that in fact it is the basis of our society, that marriage is still the social stabilizer and the only guarantee children have that they will be brought up in any kind of stable situation.

We hear much about the rights of children versus the authority of parents. Personally I do not see any great conflict between the rights of children and the authority of parents if, of course, both are tempered with a little common sense. It is patently obvious that children who are brought up in a wishy-washy situation without knowing what authority is and what rights are, that rights carry responsibility and that licence leads to irresponsibility, will not be happy children. In all likelihood they will not be contributing members to our society.

It is getting close to the hour so I will not say any more, although there is much I would like to say, because I want to sit down so that we may pass this bill and send it to committee.

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this bill, and I want to deal particularly with the moral and economic aspects of family life. A number of members have mentioned the value of the family in our society. Like the last speaker, I have also seen many instances where the inner strength of those nurtured in the love of a family was very evident. I have also noticed the lonely hopelessness and the moral difficulties of those deprived of the love of a family.

Today many of the moral values which make the family great are falling away. I was happy to see some of the latest statistics which show that there is a movement back to proper marriage as we understand it in this country. More and more our young people are realizing the strengths of marriage and the strength of love, both of which go together and are necessary to make a happy family. We have heard mentioned

Mortgage Tax Credit

many times, particularly by those in the Catholic faith, that those who pray together stay together.

I would like now to deal with the economic aspects of the family.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCain): Order. The hour provided for the consideration of private members' business having expired, I do now leave the chair until 8 p.m.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

● (2000)

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

INCOME TAX ACT

AMENDMENT TO PROVIDE TAX CREDIT IN RESPECT OF MORTGAGE INTEREST AND PROPERTY TAX

The House resumed consideration of the motion of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Crosbie) that Bill C-20, to amend the Income Tax Act to provide a tax credit in respect of mortgage interest and home owner property tax, be read the second time and referred to the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. John Evans (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, I was saying when we broke at five o'clock that there will be no free gift from this government as a result of Bill C-20. The people of Canada will be paying for this piece of legislation in one of three ways, or possibly all three ways. I mentioned at that time that it would be through an increase in taxes, through a reduction of federal government programs, or through deficit financing which would lead to an increase in the inflation rate which would affect all Canadians.

I mentioned at that point that although only 32 per cent of Canadians would benefit from this particular program, 100 per cent of Canadians would be asked to pay for it. What I should like to ask now is why the minister does not "fess up" and tell Canadians that? Why does he not tell them that in order to give some Canadians a \$1,500 gift each year, all Canadians will pay the price in higher taxes, reduced federal programs, or higher inflation?

The minister made a very interesting point last night when he indicated that some taxpayers will get a tax credit even if they do not pay the tax. I find that incredible. I will quote from the minister's speech of last night as reported at page 1468 of *Hansard*:

Oh yes, the property tax credit. Why is the property tax credit a flat rate? Every home owner in Canada, every person who owns a home, whether he pays a cent in municipal property tax or not—and most of them, unfortunately, have to pay