

*Family Allowances Act*

Mr. Speaker, I see that you are on the point of rising and I shall therefore conclude my comments.

Those statements are not mine, Mr. Speaker. This is a letter sent by 56 participants in the national economic conference organized by the Prime Minister last March. It should be noted that these 58 signatories of what I have just read represent about half the participants in this conference. This is food for thought.

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that in this debate, the Opposition Members are those who speak for the people, and if I have another opportunity, I shall rise to speak again.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Questions or comments.

The Hon. Member for Beauce (Mr. Bernier).

**Mr. Bernier:** Mr. Speaker, just a comment. Am I entitled to a comment or a question? A comment?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Yes, a comment.

**Mr. Bernier:** A comment? Thank you Mr. Speaker.

I think the Hon. Member who just made a speech, not a masterly one, I must add, because I would like to know the name of the assistant who prepared that pile of figures—she must have taken a leaf out of the book of the former President of the Quebec or Montreal Savings Bank, an expert on distorting figures and interpreting numbers, and she must have drawn her inspiration from her Party's finance critic.

The Hon. Member said that last April, our Government imposed a 9 per cent tax on insurance in Quebec, but she did not specify which Government, and I would ask the Hon. Member to make a correction immediately and make it clear whether it was the present Progressive Conservative Government or the present Government of Quebec that imposed the tax. It is being implied that our Government is doing all the taxing: taxes should be ascribed correctly and honestly and not the way the Hon. Member did a few moments ago.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The Hon. Member for Saint-Michel-Ahuntsic (Mrs. Killens).

**Mrs. Killens:** Mr. Speaker, I am looking at my notes and I think the Hon. Member is right, because I said: Furthermore, in Quebec, since the Budget was brought down on April 23—the Budget date makes it obvious I was referring to the Quebec Government. Mr. Speaker, it was indeed the Government of Quebec that imposed the tax on insurance.

**Mr. Bernier:** I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The Hon. Member for Beauce (Mr. Bernier), on a supplementary.

**Mr. Bernier:** Mr. Speaker, I accept the Hon. Member's withdrawal, but now I wonder why she included this comment

in her speech. So it was just to have people think the Progressive Conservative Government was forever imposing taxes, but I would like to add for the Hon. Member's information that we inherited a situation of which she is well aware.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The Hon. Member for Saint-Michel-Ahuntsic (Mrs. Killens).

**Mrs. Killens:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to clarify the comment I made earlier. I said that in my riding in Saint-Michel-Ahuntsic, I represent people living in Quebec, and that is why I made a reference to the budget of my constituent who came to my office and who, of course, have to pay taxes on insurance in Quebec.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The Minister of State for Small Businesses (Mr. Bissonnette).

**Mr. Bissonnette:** Mr. Speaker, I was listening earlier to the Hon. Member for Saint-Michel-Ahuntsic (Mrs. Killens) arguing about the possibility—and I repeat possibility—of a reduction, but is that what people want or would they not rather have employment and lower interest rates, something which this Progressive Conservative Government has been striving to achieve and has succeeded in doing within a year? Did you tell that to the people in your comments? Did you point out those extremely important facts to the Canadian people?

We definitely did lower interest rates, we definitely did create jobs, 300,000 new jobs, about which you have not said a word. You referred to prostitution a while back. I am somewhat ill at ease when you suggest that people could be forced, when you tend to imply that people could be forced to engage in prostitution.

But, Madam, hearing such statements gets to be extremely frustrating. Even when the reference is to 3 per cent on a possible \$15 family allowance, that boils down to 45 cents a month. Are you telling the people that a person might have to engage in prostitution because of a 45-cent a month reduction? I think a little more honesty and straightforwardness are called for.

This Conservative Government has been struggling to find jobs. We have created 300,000 new jobs. This must be stressed. I think you should look at the positive aspects rather than talking about prostitution in your comments.

● (1750)

**Mrs. Killens:** When I talked about prostitution, Mr. Speaker, I was merely quoting from the comments made by the Hon. Member for Vancouver East (Mrs. Mitchell) in her speech this week.

Besides, to reply to the Minister's question when he asked what people want in my constituency, well, what they want in my constituency is "jobs, jobs, jobs"! You are right, but they