

S. O. 21

that child. This seems to be a sensible couple, where both parties have agreed to share their parental responsibilities equally. And how are they being treated under our tax system?

This woman always gives the father the family allowance payment she receives for her son. She does not claim any deductions for this child because she is not financially responsible for that child. And now Revenue Canada is asking her to pay \$1,089. Why? Because her file was reviewed and the tax credit granted for the child not in her custody has to go to her since she receives the family allowance cheques.

Mr. Speaker, this tax credit is granted on the basis of family income. Revenue Canada reviewed this woman's income tax returns while also taking into account her estranged husband's income, an income that is not hers—in fact she didn't even know how much it was. It is incredible that this taxpayer should be forced to avail herself of a right that costs her more than \$1,000. What did the tax reform do for those who take their parental responsibilities seriously? This is an anachronism in a society where divorce and separation are common and where it is essential that fathers shoulder their share of the responsibility for their children.

* * *

[English]

CANADA POST CORPORATION**CLOSURE OF RURAL POST OFFICES—PROVISION OF ALTERNATE SERVICE**

Mr. Bob Corbett (Fundy—Royal): Mr. Speaker, the Bloomfield Station post office closed its doors for the last time on October 31.

Bloomfield Station is a small community of some 50 households in my riding. When the acting post mistress resigned, Canada Post took the opportunity to implement changes according to its 1986 corporate plan.

I have no quarrel with progressive change, especially when it will save millions of tax dollars, but Canada Post could not and did not fulfil all of its obligations to this community.

The residents must now make a 30-kilometre round trip to get retail counter service. I do not feel this is right. Canada Post should not close rural post offices unless it can ensure that the residents will have retail service at their disposal.

If rural post offices are to be closed, then the postal corporation should be obligated to provide some type of alternate retail service within the community.

Closing rural post offices without providing alternate retail service is unfair to rural Canadians.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY**CONCERNS EXPRESSED BY INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF GREAT LAKES PORTS**

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Mr. Speaker, this week the International Association of Great Lakes Ports is holding meetings here in Ottawa. This association, which comprises representatives from all of the ports situated in and around the Great Lakes, on both sides of the border, is a dynamic and influential group doing everything it can to make both the Canadian and U.S. Governments understand the desperate situation of the maritime industry along North America's fifth sea-coast.

Led by Jim Hill of the Port of Thunder Bay and Davis Helberg of the Port of Duluth, they are trying to point out that the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway system is facing a great many obstacles to its continued viability. While some of these obstacles are the result of changing international economic conditions, and are not ultimately within our control, many others are the direct result of Canadian government policies implemented both by the present Government and the previous Liberal Government. They are policies which are, quite frankly, pricing the Seaway system out of existence. I am speaking of such things as elements of the Western Grain Transportation Act, inequitable distribution of grain by the Wheat Board, tolls, fees and pilotage charges, marketing of the system, and the list goes on.

• (1410)

I want to encourage all Members of the House to listen very closely to the voices of the IAGLP which is raising matters which are of the greatest concern not just to eastern Canada and the shipping industry but to our country and our whole economy.

* * *

HISTORIC EVENTS**LATVIA—ANNIVERSARY OF PROCLAMATION OF INDEPENDENCE**

Mr. Andrew Witer (Parkdale—High Park): Mr. Speaker, today marks the 69th anniversary of the Proclamation of Independence by the nation of Latvia. On November 18, 1918, after years of occupation by Tsarist Russia, Latvians united to create a sovereign and democratic republic. That treasured status perished when the Soviet Union invaded and occupied this Baltic country in 1940.

In commemorating this event, Latvians around the world are paying tribute to the brave and independent spirit of their nation. In spite of Soviet threats of reprisal, Latvians in Riga are rallying at the Latvian Statue of Liberty, and a sympathetic demonstration is scheduled at the former Latvian Legation in Moscow.