couple both make $49,500 a year, they can collect family allowance. With a combined yuppie income of $99,000 a year, they will be able to keep their family allowance cheque, but the family with only one wage–earner with an income of $50,000 will lose its family allowance cheque. This Budget provision clearly discriminates against single parents and those families where a spouse stays at home to care for the children. This exemplifies the discrimination and unfairness inherent, not only in this Budget but in too many programs and policies of this Government, and it must not be tolerated.

* * *

IMMIGRATION

Mr. Al Johnson (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on a matter of grave concern to my constituents in Calgary North. They and I are very disturbed that those who have claimed refugee status in Canada, have been afforded due process under our very generous immigration system and have been rejected and deported, are then permitted to immediately return to Canada and begin due process all over again. This manipulation and harassment of our immigration system has put into question its credibility. This abuse is also a great expense to the Canadian taxpayers.

I support an immigration system that takes the time to assess the legitimacy of refugee claims and which demonstrates compassion toward real refugees. However, I believe that once a person has gone through due process, has been found not to qualify and is returned to the country of origin, that the same due process should not be afforded him again. I recommend legislation that is consistent with the need to protect people's rights and at the same time allows Canada to prevent illegal re–entry and immediate removal by the authorities of those who do so.

* * *

THE BUDGET

VIA RAIL CUT–BACK TO PASSENGER SERVICE

Mr. Robert D. Nault (Kenora—Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, this Government's plan to further erode passenger rail service in this country is a threat again to Canada's unity. The railway industry built this nation from coast to coast. Further cut–backs to VIA Rail will

severely affect the future of passenger rail service especially in the more disadvantaged regions of Canada, and more particularly in northwestern Ontario. Many small communities in my riding depend solely on the railway industry for transportation between communities. Areas such as Sioux Lookout, Minaki and Redditt will feel the effects of these cut–backs. A further reduction in the quality of service provided by VIA Rail will lead to the demise of this vital method of transportation in this country. Increased fares will lead to decreased ridership and remove the competitive edge. Lower and middle–income Canadians who rely on passenger rail service will once again carry the burden.

VIA Rail cannot survive in the transportation business under these circumstances. I urge this Government to reconsider its decision on the cut–backs to VIA Rail and provide the necessary funds to allow VIA Rail to modernize and enhance its existing equipment.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

THE BUDGET

CLAW BACK OF PENSIONS AND FAMILY ALLOWANCE

Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, last Friday the Prime Minister, in answering questions about his disastrous Budget, quoted from the pre–Budget submission of the National Council of Welfare in a way that created the impression that the Council supported the Budget's intention to claw back from some Canadians 100 per cent of the old age pension and the family allowance. I went to take a look at that report and here is what it said, prior to the portion the Prime Minister quoted:

> Here are some of the options the government could consider to pare more social spending and raise more taxes. The reader should keep in mind that these are not recommendations of the National Council of Welfare, but rather our guess as to some of the changes the Minister of Finance may be contemplating.

Some Hon. Members: Shame, shame!

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): The Council did go ahead and make a specific proposal, and here it is: