

*Government Orders*

Perhaps they did not know that the people who are governing this country are, by and large, people who represent the wealthier class. Perhaps they did not see on their income tax returns and then in talking to people in their own community that most people who have an income now, and not necessarily an upper income but a substantial income, have options instead of paying their income tax and, of course, they exercise those options. They read about how to avoid paying taxes and they pay people to give them financial advice on how to defer their taxation.

It is clearly understood among people all across Canada now that one becomes rather stupid if one gets caught in the taxation net. So what you find out is that people who have a take home pay cheque with taxes deducted at source are people who are carrying the tax load in this country. They look around them in their own community and they have knowledge of those who pay no taxes. They understand that is unfair. So when this government brings forward this type of legislation, they question whether or not it is sincere in what it is doing. Of course, the test with any kind of legislation is not whether it fits into an ideology, whether it fits into a political philosophy, but whether or not it responds to the reality of the day.

I would put to you, Mr. Speaker, that in my own province of Ontario it does not, because Ontario is going through what some would call a recession, but I think is, in truth, a restructuring of its economic base. A recession, in my mind, would be a decline in buying power. People do not buy the cars people in Oshawa build, perhaps not as quickly or as often. But a restructuring means that some of the plants that used to supply parts for that auto plant in Oshawa do not exist any more. You cannot get recalled to a job that has been moved to Alabama. That factory is not there in Ashburn any more, it is gone.

There are a number of people all across Ontario who face the same thing. This is not just a downturn in our economy, it is a restructuring of the whole fibre of our industrial base in Ontario. Oddly enough, it will not be this government which feels the pinch as directly as municipal governments. Although it would be a theory, it is true that the Canada Assistance Plan, for example, serves several functions, but when you get down to the

municipal level what you find out is that the funding may come down a tunnel and the program may be designed to fit specific needs, but in practice the money is necessary. What we are finding in Ontario politics now at the municipal level is that people at a council are saying: "We have had a 50 per cent or 60 per cent jump in the welfare case load in our community."

Now we have to find some money because there is a law on the books that says we must provide these kind of assistance programs. The money is not forthcoming from the federal government or the provincial government because those have been budgetary matters decided some time ago. It is now in the court of the municipality. What they are doing is making the hard choices they have to make. Although it is a theory, it has nothing to do with the Canada Assistance Plan, but their legal obligations must be carried out and so they must delay expenditures for other things like streets, roads, arenas, libraries, schools and all of those other expenditures to find their percentage of this funding program.

I think part of what is wrong with this bill and is reflected across Canada now is that people would understand if this government all of a sudden said: "Well, we really are under a restraint program and there will be no more use of consultants anywhere in the Government of Canada for a whole year." The people would then say: "Boy, it must be serious because consultants, by and large, turn out to be their friends and they turn out to get rather large and handsome contracts for doing work for the government. So it must be serious if they are turning down their friends.", or if the Government of Canada said: "Well, there will be no more big sponsored conferences by the federal government for a year and a half. You can have your conferences but somebody else has to sponsor them." Or, mercy me, they could stop their massive advertising campaigns and say, for example: "We would be happy to supply you. We have lots of print material that you can get in all the constituency offices of the members, but we are not going to do any television spots promoting this".

I am reminded that the advertising programs of the government are sometimes not quite as effective as it would like them to be.

A woman called me at home this summer and asked me: "What is this tax on student loans"? I asked: "What