House of Commons
Chambre des communes
Canada

House of Commons Standing Committee on Finance – Pre-budget Consultations 2013

This brief is submitted by:

(•) **an organization** **Organization name:** REAL Women of Canada, Box 8813, Station T, Ottawa, ON Tel 613 236 4001, realwcna@rogers.com

or

( ) **an individual** **Name:** _____

Topic: Personal taxation

*Recommendation 1: Please provide a short summary of your recommendation.

To build on the Conservative government's attention to the requirements of the family, we recommend income splitting, while retaining the spousal tax deduction for the at-home spouse, and basic personal deduction equal to that of the wage earner. This would rectify preferential tax advantages for double income families. The family is the basic unit of society and has been found to be the best environment for the well-being of men, women and children.

Expected cost or savings: From the pull-down menus, please indicate the expected cost or savings of your recommendation to the federal government and the period of time to which the expected cost or savings is related.

$1 billion or more

1 year

Federal funding: Please provide a precise indication of how the federal government could fund your recommendation. For example, indicate what federal spending should be reallocated, what federal tax measure(s) should be introduced, eliminated or changed, etc.

Reallocate transfer payments:
United Nations - $700 million annually, UN Population Fund $38 million annually, UN Women 10 million in 2010, International Planned Parenthood $18 million in 2006, renewed .
CIDA - cut funding for social engineering.
Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council - $670 million in 2013, 623% increase in funding since its formation in 1994, inflation portion being 39%. Eliminate SSHRC grants based on extremist ideologies, self-described as designed to challenge parenthood, gender, education and reshape Canadian culture.
Review corporate subsidies.

Intended beneficiaries: Please indicate the groups of individuals, the sector(s) and/or the regions that would benefit by implementation of your recommendation.

Families whose wage earners do not qualify for income splitting.

Across Canada, all families have the same challenges but some are more able to use the tax system to their advantage, such as the self-employed, professionals, high income earners.

Income splitting would lessen the burden on middle class Canadians.

Government would be seen as favorable to families who provide a future generation.

General impacts: Depending on the nature of your recommendation, please indicate how the standard of living of Canadians would be improved, jobs would be created, people would be trained, etc.

Our pension system now costs $72 billion a year and is expected to increase. A demographic balance between young and old would benefit the continuation of this valuable system.

Division of labour in the single income family, which should be supported, helps reduce health care costs, elder care costs, early childhood education costs, cost of supervision of adolescents.

Topic: Children, youth and families

Recommendation 2: Please provide a short summary of your recommendation.

Increase Universal Child Care Benefit by 20%. This welcome support of families costs 2.6 billion a year. This proposal would bring this to $3.1 billion annually. The future of Canada depends on its families. The UCCB funds the parent rather than child care lobbyists, and helps families care for children. Greater provision for the single income family frees one parent to care for children and the elderly, and to volunteer, which reduces government costs for health care, education and social services.

Expected cost or savings: From the pull-down menus, please indicate the expected cost or savings of your recommendation to the federal government and the period of time to which the expected cost or savings is related.

$500 million-$999.9 million

1 year

Federal funding: Please provide a precise indication of how the federal government could fund your recommendation. For example, indicate what federal spending should be reallocated, what federal tax measure(s) should be introduced, eliminated or changed, etc.

Provide equivalent Child Care Expense Deduction for all parents. CCED cost is $750 million annually, available only to two income families. Child care at home is also costly. One income is sacrificed by the at-home parent. Parental child care costs for at-home early childhood education include food, clothing, shelter and its related costs, educational materials and sports equipment.

Cut CIDA's culturally intrusive, gender funding, $792 million (1998-2006). Cut government funding of labour unions. Cut assistance to foreign countries with dictatorial rulers and those who harbour terrorists.

Intended beneficiaries: Please indicate the groups of individuals, the sector(s) and/or the regions that would benefit by implementation of your recommendation.

All families, all children, should be treated equally. CCED elimination or equalization with single income families would end special tax treatment for double income, more advantaged families.

Adding single income families to CCED eligibility would provide inclusion and lessen pressure on families to find substitute care for their children. This expense deduction would leave more income to benefit the single income family.

Cost of day care for double income family is $10,000 per child per year with substantial government subsidies. This preferential treatment is seldom cost effective.

General impacts: Depending on the nature of your recommendation, please indicate how the standard of living of Canadians would be improved, jobs would be created, people would be trained, etc.

Extending CCED to single income families would leave more earned income in the family pocket for spending on goods and services which would benefit the wider community. A healthy economy means more job creation and, in the end, additional tax revenue.

Topic: Federal budgets and the public service

Recommendation 3: Please provide a short summary of your recommendation.

Cut special interest funding, estimated at $27 billion in 2009, often used to propagate out-dated agendas. Times have changed, we are no longer living in the 1960's, Canadians have new challenges. Funding must be re-assessed for value. Strict criteria must be applied to eliminate politically partisan projects. When one designated group, feminists, selected charities and industries, are funded, this puts all other Canadians, who have been rejected as recipients, at a financial disadvantage. Government should treat all Canadian taxpayers equally and not favor certain ideological segments.

Expected cost or savings: From the pull-down menus, please indicate the expected cost or savings of your recommendation to the federal government and the period of time to which the expected cost or savings is related.

$500 million-$999.9 million

1 year

Federal funding: Please provide a precise indication of how the federal government could fund your recommendation. For example, indicate what federal spending should be reallocated, what federal tax measure(s) should be introduced, eliminated or changed, etc.

Cut Status of Women funding, $30 million a year, since they admit that their project objectives promoting social change cannot be measured.
Review Canadian Institutes of Health Research, 2012 budget $977 million. $18 million for research grants to lobbyists for drug injection sites, who used the biased results to successfully challenge Canadian legislation and Health Canada policy.
Public Health Agency of Canada: Family Violence Initiative, $7 million a year, results not measurable according to PHAC.
Cut funding for federally funded projects which duplicate provincial initiatives.

Intended beneficiaries: Please indicate the groups of individuals, the sector(s) and/or the regions that would benefit by implementation of your recommendation.

Families will benefit, as well as Canadian taxpayers. Future generations of taxpayers would benefit, as the tax burden is lifted and consumer spending increases.
Positive message would be sent to Canadians that their tax dollars are well spent, not wasted on partisan projects, duplication, and poor value per tax dollar.
Tax dollars would not be wasted on social engineering to re-shape Canadian culture, families and society, and to cater to passing trends.

General impacts: Depending on the nature of your recommendation, please indicate how the standard of living of Canadians would be improved, jobs would be created, people would be trained, etc.

Result would be smaller, more manageable, government; tax savings; deficit reduction and thus major savings; decrease stress on taxpayer to fund bloated bureaucracy. A more productive private and volunteer sector would hopefully result. Government dependency would decrease. This would be a better balance.

Please use this page if you wish to provide more explanation about your recommendation(s).

Improving family life and supporting Canadians families requires a response to their preferences in child care choices. The Vanier Intstitute of the Family found that when Canadians are asked whom they would prefer as care givers for pre-school children, their first choice was parental care at home, followed by a grandparent, another relative, home day care, and lastly, institutional day care as promoted by government funded feminist special interest groups and socialist leaning political parties. The Institute found that 90% of Canadians believed that, in two parent families, one parent should ideally stay at home and raise the children. The Institute of Marriage and Family found that Canadians prefer that children under six to be at home with a parent, ranging from 83% in BC to 70% in Quebec, and that day care is very unpopular.

This endorses our position that government should establish tax policy that does not discriminate against women who choose the career of full-time homemaker. Government policies should be neutral on the issue of career choice for women.

Government should also remove tax discrimination against the single income family, which provides the freedom for one parent to care for the children, volunteer in schools, hospitals, and social service provision, thus reducing the cost to government of these services, and consequently providing the opportunity to reduce taxes for all Canadians.

Parents in Finland have a choice to raise their children themselves at home with payments by the state of $500 per month per child, or to place them in state operated child care. Most parents in Finland choose to remain in the home to raise their own children until age seven. Canadians prefer at-home care, see IMF poll. A decision about child care belongs to the parents, not government, or government funded special interest groups who only value paid work for women and devalue women's and men's contribution to society as mothers and fathers of the next generation.

CCED provides $7,000 per child under 7 and $4,000 for children 7 to 16 years, in tax deductions. Government provide child care for parents who choose to live on two salaries, cost to government is about $10,000 in Quebec, a system promoted by today's opposition parties. Parents who choose to care for their children themselves are discriminated against by not having access to these tax funded benefits, benefits for which they pay with their more heavily taxed single income (See Canadian Taxpayers Federation calculations,) and other taxes.

The Fraser Institute published Corporate Welfare: Now a $182 Billion Addiction, in 2008. Families which can avail themselves of these lucrative grants are at an advantage, their children benefit materially in comparison to those in families who do not qualify, yet all families pay taxes. This largesse to some chosen Canadians can be reduced, reallocating these funds to family friendly tax policies, to build a better future for all.

*Please note that at least one recommendation must be provided