

Time Allocation

tives are trying to force through this House today against the interests of Canadian families and children. All families will get less, even the poorest will get less, because of this Conservative measure.

If we consider the cumulative impact of the budget measures to change the child tax credit and the current tax exemptions for dependant children, and the indexation of income tax, then we find working parents who together earn \$15,000 annually and have to feed, clothe and provide a home for only two children, will lose \$1,844. The husband and wife who earn a combined annual income of \$35,000 will lose \$3,452.

There is no reasonable and objective standard of evaluation of the Conservative Budget, of which this Bill is just one harmful part, which can avoid yielding the conclusion of unfairness and injustice. The consistent and undeniable theme throughout is a redistribution of disposable income away from lower and middle-income taxpayers to upper-income taxpayers. Over the next five years those earning \$15,000 a year will have to absorb a 36 per cent tax increase, those earning \$30,000 an 11 per cent tax increase, those earning \$100,000 only a 4 per cent tax increase, and those few taxpayers, great friends of the Tories obviously, earning \$200,000 a year will only have to pay 2 per cent more in taxes. That is Tory fairness. That is Tory social justice.

To conclude, in December of last year the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) appeared to base the entire argument for his Government's unsuccessful attack on the universality of certain social programs on the justice he saw contained in his tirelessly repeated and meaningless anecdote of how bank presidents should not be receiving social programs benefit payments which they do not need or want. He tried to give Canadians the impression that his Government would redirect and enrich social program benefits to Canadians most in need. Well, the Canadian people were not taken in when it came to the OAS and in spite of Conservative efforts to choke off debate on this Bill they will not be taken in by its measures.

Certainly the imbalance, unfairness and injustice of the Budget in general and this measure in particular have only been made more patently obvious by the Government's total mismanagement of its responsibility in the \$1 billion fiasco involving the Canadian Commercial and Northland Banks. While the Conservative Government places an onerous burden of taxation on lower and middle-income Canadians, it is ready to spend more than \$1 billion of the taxpayers' money to make up for its mishandling of the CCB affair. The Government should withdraw its Budget and keep its promises to lower and middle-income Canadians. This Bill, as one step to withdrawing this Budget, should be defeated; the first step is to defeat this motion aimed at unfairly choking off debate on this important measure.

Ms. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, we are debating a motion to limit debate on Bill C-70. As we all know, this means we are debating the Government's intention to close debate; a closure motion. This is a really damaging—

Mr. Dick: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps the Hon. Member does not know and understand, but we are not debating a closure motion. If she knew what the procedure was, she would know we happen to be debating a time allocation motion. Closure is under an entirely different section and is rarely used.

Ms. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Hon. Member would listen to what I am saying. I said it has the effect of a closure motion.

We have had less than 10 hours of debate on this Bill and until today there have hardly been any Conservative Members willing to stand up and say why the Government is putting forward this Bill which is so damaging to families and children. I think it is disgusting, Mr. Speaker! Conservative Members would debate the Crow Bill for hours. I don't care about woodpeckers and carrier pigeons but the Member who spoke a little while ago will remember how long he debated the Crow legislation tailing along after the NDP. Members opposite do not care about children. They do not care about families or women, the ones who are going to be affected most by this Bill. This Government wants to suppress debate because it is afraid. It is afraid that the people of Canada are going to find out what this Bill will do in reality and what it symbolizes as the first of many terrible measures in the Budget affecting families. We are going to continue to keep the public aware and get the message out to people as to just what this damaging Bill is doing. The Government is giving an erroneous impression that this Bill is insignificant. It is a very, very damaging Bill and I hope to continue and conclude after lunch.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Yes, the Hon. Member will be able to complete her speech later.

It being one o'clock I do now leave the chair until two o'clock this day.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S.O. 22

[English]

LABOUR RELATIONS

THUNDER BAY—KRESGE DEPARTMENT STORE STRIKE

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay-Atikokan): Mr. Speaker, for more than five months a number of employees of the Kresge department store chain in Thunder Bay have been on strike in an attempt to win a first contract and ensure for themselves a reasonable degree of recognition and remuneration for their work. Ninety-four per cent of these employees are women and,