

Government Orders

my security for the future, "My"—YES—"My"—Old Age Security benefits are jeopardized. The OAS is mine, I paid for it, I count on it, it is part of my rights and the government is stealing it from me.

Another constituent, Mr. Lloyd from Featherstone Drive in Ottawa wrote and stated:

—as a retired senior and as a veteran who served with Bomber Command during the Second World War, I am appalled by the threatened attack by Mr. Wilson on the financial stability of my retirement years by his planned tax-back proposals on our old age pensions.

Although not a wealthy individual by any means, I do receive in addition to my OAS and CPP a superannuation for 27 years of Air Force service—and I can already envisage that eventually the cut-off level for pay-back will reach me, as it is not fully indexed to inflation—

Mr. Hibbard from Fox Run Lane, and Captain Small who lives on Willowdale Avenue have written. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, you have seen some of these letters yourself, again and again, people feeling that they have been attacked unfairly. This one was received by my colleague, the hon. member from Belleville and Picton, from Mr. Cundy, at "Leeside Retreat", Sheba Island, Picton, who stated:

I feel that I have been betrayed by the Finance Minister, Michael Wilson and would like to convey to you my utmost disgust. I look back at the time his so-called leader Brian Mulroney lied to his own mother, stating on national television that seniors would never have their social benefits touched while he was in power. How despicable. How despicable can a son be.

It took me over 40 years to achieve my retirement aims. To establish a good pension, I worked hard and turned my back on many tempting luxurious items. At the same time I paid many thousands of dollars in taxes which I assumed would have a bearing on my old age pension.

Now, on the eve of Bill C-28 being passed, I will have all of my old age pension taxed back.

Over the years, my family have voted Conservative, however, I can assure you that we will all turn to Liberal at any future election.

At least there is some good news in this.

I do not want to miss the opportunity to speak a bit about the family allowance as well and still afford some time for my colleagues to speak.

The family allowance is a different matter in a sense in that it in no way has been a contributory scheme and no one receiving family allowance disputes the fact that they receive it out of the consolidated revenue fund and have not paid for it.

What is of concern is the fact that over the years of this government being in office the tax burden has more and more been imposed on families in Canada. According to the Canadian Council on Social Development the net tax increase—and this does not take into account the goods and services tax, nor does it take into account the clawback—for a one-income family with two children, those at the poverty line of \$23,639 since 1984 has been 61.3 per cent; for the average income at roughly the \$45,000 level, an increase of 29.3 per cent; for the upper income of \$100,000, a net tax increase of 7.7 per cent. It is clear that there has been a shift in the burden of taxes to families.

The Vanier Institute on the Family wrote to the legislative committee on Bill C-28. Even this prestigious organization was denied the opportunity to speak before the legislative committee on these important measures. It wrote to the committee and pointed out that the burden has been shifted more and more to families.

The government party in election campaigns certainly in my area made much of family values. The Conservatives talked about family values, but when the rubber hits the road, when it comes to dealing with support for families, that is where they look to cut. That is where they look to hurt people.

I do not think anyone can satisfactorily explain to me why in imposing the clawback on family allowances the government refused to index the threshold fully. No one on that side has been able to explain to me why the clawback is to be calculated on an individual's income and not on family income. Two individuals with children who have a combined income of as much as \$99,000 will not face the clawback, whereas the single income earner supporting children will face the clawback starting at \$50,000.

Furthermore, what do members of the government propose to do with the savings it will gain from the clawback? They do not propose to use them for social programs to redirect them to low income people. They propose to add them to government revenue so that they can waste them, spend them. That is what they propose to do with them, and the Vanier Institute points out the difficulty that will be felt by families across Canada and the failure of this government to make adequate social policy provision for support for families at whatever level of income.