

credit, they are also being pushed into higher tax brackets. They are getting a double whammy.

● (1250)

Federal sales tax has been increased, which will hit the same families. Low-income families making less than \$15,000 per year will lose more than \$1,800 due to all these measures. Meanwhile, high-income families have been given various advantages.

A startling revelation is that advantages given to the rich will cost the Government more than the savings realized from changes in the child tax credit and in the child tax exemption. In other words, the money saved from the changes and reductions in the child tax credit and in the child tax exemption will go right across the board to the wealthy. That is what the Government calls progress.

The Government talks about new and innovative policies, but it has removed funds for security services at small airports. Who will pay the bill? Of course it will be local taxpayers. In areas where local airports are not owned by municipalities, the Government wants to sell them to the municipalities. That will be a burden upon local people in those areas. What about CMHC? CMHC has done a pretty good job over the years in terms of building houses for low-income families. What is the Government doing? It is removing the regional offices from various areas in Canada. I lost a CMHC office in my constituency.

An Hon. Member: Good.

Mr. Hopkins: I hear the Hon. Member saying "Good". I want all people in the Ottawa Valley to know that there is a Conservative Member over there who thinks that was a great idea. We will remember that.

People in large rural areas could come into those CMHC offices to sit down and talk. Those managers go with low-income people to see bank managers and real estate agents. These people do not always have an understanding of such dealings. What will they do now? There will only be a long distance system to Ottawa or an impersonal effort.

I see you signalling, Mr. Speaker. In conclusion, the Government promised that it would do all kinds of wonderful things for the Canadian farm community; it was promised the world. Today, hog producers and many other farmers are facing serious conditions.

Mr. Dick: We are talking about family allowances.

Mr. Hopkins: The Hon. Member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton (Mr. Dick) is becoming a bit upset. I tell him to tell his Prime Minister to start backing up some of his promises.

Mr. Dick: We are talking about family allowances, not about hogs.

Mr. Hopkins: Does the Hon. Member think that hog producers and people who live on farms do not raise children? They are in serious circumstances. The Conservative Govern-

Family Allowances Act

ment promised them all kinds of income. It is even importing more meat into the country at a time when our red meat industry is in serious trouble. That is the new Tory approach.

Mr. Towers: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Member is usually an honest Member in what he says. There is an element of truth in what he is saying, but last year the Liberals allowed 50 million pounds of imported beef from Ireland into the country. He says that it was our administration. He is entirely misleading the House—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Hopkins: Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised by that. The other day, when I delivered a speech and used factual information, as I am doing today, the Hon. Member sent a note across the floor saying: "And you are a Rotarian; don't you believe in the four-way test?" I say to him that one of those four-way tests is: Is it fair to all concerned? I ask him and I ask the Prime Minister of Canada: Is it fair to all concerned that although the Government had promised not to deindex family allowances or the tax system as it affects children, now it is going ahead with it? Is that fair to all concerned? He had better start talking to his Leader.

Mr. John Reimer (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few comments on Bill C-70, an Act to amend the Family Allowances Act. I should like to refer to a few historical facts arising from the time of the previous administration. I hope the Hon. Member for Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke (Mr. Hopkins) listens. At the time of the six and five program, that Member voted for a reduction in the increases to the child allowance system of \$1.97; not the 94 cents proposed by this Bill if inflation continues at 4 per cent. I remind the Hon. Member that he voted for that in the past. I think also he was a Member of the House back in 1976. At that time inflation was running at 11.2 per cent, and the child allowances were frozen at \$22.08. That resulted in cost of living minus 11.2 per cent, not cost of living minus 3 per cent as proposed in this Bill.

I also remind the Hon. Member that he should be truthful to all of us and to his constituents. He should remind them of all the facts and remember what he did, as part of his Government, back in 1976. Also in 1976, there was no offset increase in child benefits as proposed in our Budget. If Canadians had had full indexation under the previous Liberal Government since 1976, and starting with a child allowance of \$22.08 at that time, the child allowance today would be \$51.83, not the \$31.27 it is now. I remind the Hon. Member for Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke that his Government did that, not this Government. He prided himself on being a member of the Liberal Government which brought in social programs. I remind him that if the child allowance were fully indexed today, that allowance would not have been reduced from \$51.83 to \$31.27, a reduction of some \$22. I remind him of that, and it was done without any offsetting benefit to the child tax credit. May I call it one o'clock, Mr. Speaker?