

Multiply this example by 210 or 211, if you include the one who crossed the floor to the NDP. They are all the same. It is a disgrace. It is worse than anything else this Government and this Party has done, worse than all the other scandals, flagrant and not so flagrant. Of course we need tax reform. We have to get rid of the tax shelters. We have to share the exemptions.

He wanted suggestions about the Registered Retirement Savings plans. For instance, instead of giving a tax exemption to someone who has a higher income and costs the Canadian taxpayer more in tax shelters, we might say that anyone who puts \$1,000 into an RRSP will be entitled to a \$100 tax credit. Whether this person earns \$10,000 or \$100,000 a year, the tax credit will be \$100. This would be fair. However, I am now convinced that the Government after improving the RRSP system, will not touch it in its tax reform in view of its hypocrisy: nor will it alter the tax breaks given to the rich, such as the capital gains tax exemption and the tax exemption for RRSPs which benefits the rich.

The only things the Government wants to touch are the tax exemptions for senior citizens, dependent children and spouses and the personal tax exemption. The Government will change these exemptions and implement the purchasing tax credit. If, instead of an income of \$15,000, you have an income of \$17,000, the Government will take 10 per cent of this money and say that it will be given to low-income Canadians. The balance will be used to compensate the loss of revenue from the capital gains tax exemption and the RRSP exemption which benefits the rich. Who will be penalized? Who will have to pay the 10 per cent, 11 per cent or 12 per cent tax when he needs the plumber, the electrician, the accountant, the lawyer or the notary to make out a will, the baker, the grocer and the milkman? Middle income earners. They are not the pals of the Conservatives.

The Hon. Member for Trois-Rivières has already explained in which tax bracket the pals of the Conservatives are. They are the ones who will benefit from exemptions because they have already had all kinds of goodies. But this will not be allowed. It will not be allowed, not only by the Official Opposition which knows this Government and knows how it misleads the public and how to make it back down, but it will not be accepted by the public either. The public will protest vigorously, perhaps with the same results as for the reform of unemployment insurance.

Mr. Speaker, this Government which has once again deceived the Canadian public is committed to amending the Unemployment Insurance Program. All political Parties and the Canadian population generally agree that it should be amended. Following four reports, including those submitted by the Macdonald Commission which was prepared at a cost of millions of dollars, the Forget Commission which cost \$6 million, those of an internal committee of officials and the House of Commons Committee, four reports, on which the Government wasted almost \$8 million of our taxpayers' money, the learned Minister of Employment and Immigration

Supply

(Mr. Bouchard) rose on a Friday morning on the orders of the Prime Minister and stated solemnly that on the basis of all these reports and after spending all that money, that he felt he had different opinions from various groups. He was satisfied with sitting on his bum and doing nothing.

Such are the political will and guts of this Government.

But who pays for all of that? Who pays for all this foolishness on top of the \$7 million or \$8 million of the taxpayers' money which was wasted? It is the men and women working part-time who will continue to be penalized by not being paid full unemployment insurance benefits, those who are on maternity leave or on sick leave. Should a labour conflict arise, either through a strike or a lock-out, these people will be penalized and will lose their benefits because they will be deemed striking employees, even though the House Committee, including its Tory Members, unanimously agreed that there had to be changes.

Mr. Speaker, I do hope today, and I conclude on this, that there will be at least one Progressive Conservative Member who will open his eyes and read the article published in *La Presse* under the signature of Alain Dubuc, a guy highly regarded for his honesty and expertise and who clearly describes the implications of capital gains tax exemption, who foresees what is going to happen in the so-called tax reform, but the people here, no matter their political stripe, should stand up and tell the Prime Minister, as the population as a whole did: Do not touch our senior citizens and do not levy a food tax.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, it is essential that the voters in every constituency go to their Member of Parliament, whatever his Party, and have him sign a paper promising to vote against any measure which would impose a tax on food products as this is a basic necessity.

Mr. Speaker, I warn the Prime Minister that there will be a national campaign with leaders in every riding and that every Member of this House will be contacted. The public will remember those who refuse to sign and to promise that they will object to a tax on food products and who agree with such a tax. The public will remember them at election time.

• (1640)

[English]

Mr. Redway: Mr. Speaker, when one comes from a Party that does not have a policy, like the Hon. Member's Party, or when one comes from a Party which has a number of policies that conflict with one another, like the Hon. Member's Party, what does one do?

The Hon. Member, as have many of his colleagues, has chosen to spread fear and confusion in the minds of the average Canadian about the issue of tax reform and the question of a tax on food. The Hon. Member is obviously spreading fear and confusion on the basis of not one single, solitary shred of evidence.