

• (1200)

There is going to be a bunch over there looking for votes across the country. They are going to need more than the votes of the five rich families I mentioned. They are going to need some of the votes of ordinary people, of people who do not drive around in limousines, of people who have to agonize from season to season whether they are going to get enough money to keep them through the winter through seasonal employment opportunities.

Maybe they are going to need that kind of person to support them in their leadership bids. If they do they better have a look at this kind of legislation because it has helped the rich of Canada shelter billions of dollars in assets in family trusts and postpone paying taxes.

Yes, the original bill in 1972 allowed that to happen for 21 years. They have had 21 years to get their house in order. Do they need another 60, 70, 80 or 90 years?

Let us have a look at what others are saying on this particular bill. Look at what the dean of the University of Victoria Law School is saying on this particular issue. The impression here is somehow that I am the only person who takes this position. Maureen Maloney, dean of the University of Victoria Law School, says: "It is nothing more than an interest free loan from the government to Canada's wealthiest families". It is an interest free loan to whom, to the people on minimum wage, to the 40 per cent of the people working in the service sector whose wages are below the poverty level? For 40 per cent of all the people working in the service sector their wages are below the poverty level.

We know the answer from the member for Don Valley North. She said: "Let's rewrite the rules" if there are too many poor people out there. She said the other day that she can solve that problem: "Let's change the definition". If there are too many poor people under the poverty line then move the line down. That should buy a lot of groceries. How is that for a brilliant Tory solution? By a stroke of the pen let us tell them they are not poor.

The member for Don Valley North has got news for those who live in Calgary; Edmundston, New Brunswick; Mississauga; Welland; or Halifax. She has figured out their problem. If they are poor then she has the solution to their problem. She is going to rewrite the definition.

Government Orders

They can go the grocery store and tell them what the member for Don Valley North said. She says they are not poor at all. They are not poor. The government just wrote the rules the wrong way so it is going to change the rules for them.

What is it going to put in their pockets? We know what the government has put in the pockets of the Bronfmans because I have just been through that in discussing Bill C-92. There is no question about that. Do not take my word. The lady from the University of Victoria Law School says: "This is an interest free loan to Canada's wealthiest families". How many of the not so wealthy families in Canada would like to have an interest-free loan so they could buy some groceries, fix up the house, fix the roof on the house, or pay to send their young fellow or young girl off to college or university?

There are a lot of Canadians out there who would like that kind of leg up from the government. The government is not particularly interested in those people. What does it spend the time of the House doing today? We are discussing a bill to benefit a few people who can afford those family trusts. That is what this is all about today.

I had to get up and debate it and put on the record my party's position, and my own position on behalf of the 85,000 people I represent in Burin—St. George's, but the whole bit of legislation is a pure waste of time.

• (1205)

The explanation that came out is interesting too. One of the people who will probably be running for the leadership actually sponsored this piece of legislation, the former Minister of Finance. It is interesting that the other piece I kept mentioning, I say to my friend from Gander—Grand Falls, Bill C-113, was sponsored by another would-be prime minister of this country, the minister of employment.

I will be interested to watch the news as it unfolds during the next few months to see how these two guys explain that. How do they explain that their names are associated with two bills, one to pamper the rich, this one, and the other to pummel the poor, Bill C-113?

Do they want to be prime minister of this country? We have just been through that kind of prime minister, thank you very much. One is enough for the next hundred years or so.