

honest, fair and just tax collection system we could have a universal program and those who did not need to have family allowance would have it taxed back.

Let me say to my hon. friend for Lethbridge—Foothills (Mr. Thacker) that year after year corporations such as Shell Oil, Hudson's Bay Company, the Bank of Montreal, the Royal Bank of Canada, Nova Corporation—I could go on and list 79,000 profitable corporations—have not paid a single penny in tax. If they were to be properly charged under the tax system, if they were not to pay excessively but just their fair share or, in some cases, if they were to pay anything, we would have more money than we would need to take care of those people in soup lines and at food banks. It is immoral for a country that is obviously the richest in the world to have food banks and soup kitchens in 1987.

• (1600)

To return to the Hon. Member's original question, if we had a decent tax system, his question would be irrelevant. He would know that once one reached a certain level of income, one would be properly taxed and we could maintain universal programs without having to hire legions of bureaucrats to monitor how people would shift incomes during the year or from one year to another to ensure that they would not be collecting family allowance if they did not actually deserve it.

**Mr. Baker:** Mr. Speaker, I have a brief comment to make about soup kitchens. There must be something wrong with our social security safety net if those are necessary. Of course, each province has a different social security safety net. How much money one can actually get on which to stay alive depends upon which province one lives in. This is incredible. Certainly there is something wrong with having completely different systems right across the country. Yet the Government of Canada would move to pay off unsecured depositors of a bank, individuals who had more than \$60,000 in the bank. These individuals got paid their \$60,000 or more and the Government of Canada, through the taxpayers of Canada, decided to pay off the rest. Yet this Government is now taxing popcorn.

I would like to ask the Hon. Member a question which I have only asked twice in this Chamber. Hon. Members rose after I did and said they wanted to ask serious questions. This question on the Budget is perhaps the most serious one. It is a real question.

Can the Hon. Member understand why the Government of Canada decided to collect \$50 million or \$60 million on the backs of children who want to buy popcorn? Does the Hon. Member understand whether or not Cheezies are being taxed as well as cheese based puffs, and whether or not fudgesicles are being taxed as well as ice-cream bars? What does the Hon. Member think of children having to pay probably an extra 15 cents for recess?

**Mr. Riis:** Mr. Speaker, actually it is a serious question and I appreciate the seriousness of it. Rather than providing an

answer directly, I will provide one indirectly. Last night, both of my two sons had a view on this matter. As a matter of fact, I think one of my sons shares a classroom with one of your daughters, Mr. Speaker. When I got home last night, they said to me: "Dad, how low can the Government go?"

**Mr. Charest:** Come on, now, don't bring your kids into this.

**Mr. Riis:** I suspect people do not believe that that is what happened. I will guarantee that that is what did happen. As a matter of fact, I have heard from a number of my colleagues from both sides of the House who have young children and some not so young who said: "Isn't this the living end?"

As my friend, the Hon. Member for Gander—Twillingate (Mr. Baker), has indicated, when international banks, including Wells Fargo, the Bank of Japan, the Bank of Hongkong, the Bank of Dubai and the Bank of Kuwait, had millions of dollars on deposit that were uninsured, the Government could come up with a thousand million dollars over a weekend to bail these uninsured depositors out. This is something which has never happened before in the history of banking, but we did it. To make up this difference, the Government has to dig up some more money, so it has gone to the children. It has imposed a tax on children. "Make the kids pay" is the new slogan of the Minister of Finance.

As a quick response to my friend I will say that, although I do not think it was appropriate, but perhaps what is most telling of all is that both of my sons, Jon and Nils, asked me how low the Government could go in terms of taxing the people of Canada.

**Mr. Charest:** Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity of rising after the Hon. Member for Trinity (Miss Nicholson) made her speech on the Budget. At that time, I said that I was disappointed in her and I said that I did not think that she had read her own speech. She rose after that to give us a little hope. There was frankness in her answers and we appreciated and acknowledged that.

In the case of the Hon. House Leader of the New Democratic Party, we are not disappointed. His speech was everything we expected it to be. In fact, I think he re-read what he said during the Budget Speech of 1985 or of 1986, because it was just about the same thing. I am sure that if he re-read his 1985 speech, he could use it again today.

I am sure that in 1985, the Hon. Member said, as he did today, that thousands of jobs would be lost. Did he not do that? I think I heard him say that. In 1986, I think I heard him ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) how many thousands of jobs would be lost. Did he not do that? I think he did.

**Mr. Daubney:** Yes, I remember that.

**Mr. Charest:** Some other Hon. Members also think he did. Was he wrong? Yes, he was wrong. Will he admit that today? We do not expect him to do so. We do not expect him to admit he was wrong because we have heard from him before and we