Mr. Malépart: Mr. Speaker, I am confident that all the people who are listening to us are far brighter than the Hon. Member for Saint-Jean (Mr. Bissonnette). I am pretty sure the little Minister of State for Transport (Mr. Bissonnette) never made much of an impression on anybody, and our population as a whole understands common sense.

Mr. Speaker, he is the only one to protest, but as usual, he has not understood anything. All he wants is his Minister's job, his limousine, the chance to cut ribbons and to travel, and a nice airport in his constituency, but he does not want to listen to those who are worried about the environment.

We shall let this patronage expert be because he will not be around much longer. Let us talk instead about the people who listen to us and who support this Parliament. The public pays the taxes, and the legislation passed in this place therefore has to be fair to the public.

I am convinced that some Conservatives still have the intelligence to understand the situation and that the Liberals are not the only ones to have done so. I am convinced that they have also understood the facts because, since there are 538,000 families involved, when one of them receives a cheque for \$300, the neighbour will say: Why is it that I did not receive my advance payment? She will go to the office of her Member of Parliament where she will be asked to explain her problem. She will say that she earns under \$15,000 a year. Her representative will say: That is impossible: bring me your tax return because this makes no sense. Ah! I see here that you have earned \$15,200. I am sorry, but you are in a different category. You have been forgotten by the Minister of State for Transport, Mr. Speaker, our Brylcreem hero said: That's the cut-off point. And that is when people are going to start complaining and they will say it's all Brian's fault.

You are doing your best to make people hate your Prime Minister. I want to help you improve his image. Nothing could be simpler. First of all, no interest charges. Second, send the full amount, next year the second amount and so forth. Third, set the family income at \$23,500, the cut-off point for families receiving the full child tax credit. That is straightforward and easy to understand. This way the system will be fair and reasonable for everyone. Just these three amendments.

Next year, the Minister can come back and review the situation and perhaps improve the system. It won't be perfect. Even under the Liberals it wouldn't be perfect. Only experience will tell—and three serious mistakes have already been made. In any case, next year the Minister will have to come back and admit we were right.

Remember the cutbacks in Old Age Security pensions: the Minister of State for Transport (Mr. Bissonnette), our hon. friend from Saint-Jean, was positive everyone would support it. He defended the cutbacks, and then looked terribly foolish, Mr. Speaker, when the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) said: Sorry, but we made a mistake. Mr. Speaker, he thought he was the only one in Canada who was right. And this is going to happen again, unless you are honest and vigilant and dedicated enough to consider our Canadian families. You are not being

Income Tax Act

asked to . . . And it won't cost a cent more, although the Hon. Member for Trois-Rivières would have us believe it would cost so much. I am going by the Budget papers, unless what the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) says is not the truth. So what am I supposed to do? Let him contradict what I said.

However, on page 56 of the Budget Papers of the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker, it is clearly stated: "Prepayment of child tax credit, effective date, 1986." In the cost in millions of dollars column, we find the words "does not affect full year cost". This means that this is not costing one cent more to the Government. Why not do it properly? Why always half measures?

You are indicating that I have one minute left. I trust that a large number of Conservatives will meet this evening with the Minister of Finance or the Minister of State for Finance and recommend that the changes we have suggested be made. I shall repeat these suggestions to make certain that all Members have heard them. First, no interest should be charged in the case of administrative mistakes made by the Department. Second, the full amount should be sent in prepayment so that people will not have to go to the tax discounters. Third, instead of setting the cutoff point for families entitled to prepayment of the child tax credit at \$15,000, the cutoff point should be \$23,500 as the Government had already decided that families with incomes under this ceiling would receive the full amount of the child tax credit.

I find it inconceivable that any Member of this House, whatever his political party, could rise and say that he disagrees with these amendments. If anyone does, I would like him to explain why he believes that a family with an income of \$15,200 is wealthier than one with an income of \$15,000.

• (1710)

COMMONS DEBATES

[English]

Mr. Angus: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie (Mr. Malépart). I listened with interest to his participation in the debate on Bill C-11. In light of the debate which will take place within his own caucus starting tomorrow, does he believe that the child tax credit should be universally available to all citizens of Canada regardless of their level of income? Should we in fact remove the cap and allow the current allocation of approximately \$450 to go to all Canadians regardless of income?

[Translation]

Mr. Malépart: Mr. Speaker, if I understood the question correctly, it dealt with the universality of family allowances. I think the message is clear and the fight is over—universality of family allowances is maintained.

On the other hand, there is another aspect, and it will be debated at our convention in November. I think that in the area of social policies, involving families, senior citizens, the handicapped or whomever, it is important that we consider and try to implement what I for one would call the annual guaranteed income, in order to find the most effective way of cutting