

*Family Allowances Act, 1973*

mously opposed deindexing. Their consultation has been ignored. They will not ignore the Government, I know. The Government promised to protect universal social programs. Remember universality was sacred. I have already shown how universality has been attacked by Bill C-70.

Remember the Leaders debate, Mr. Speaker. The Prime Minister said he was going to be very sensitive to women's concerns, that women would have equal participation in society and that he was going to focus on women. He is focusing on women, all right. He is attacking women and their children. Women have told us over and over again that they have lost confidence in him. Even the Government advisory group has said how strongly it opposes this Bill.

The Conservatives said and the Minister who is sitting in the House says repeatedly that they want to help those in greatest need. The facts show that Bill C-70 and the other Budget measures are hurting families in greatest need. That is more rhetoric and another promise down the drain. The Government said it would recommend cuts to social programs when the economy improved. The Government now says the economy has improved, that there are more jobs, yet the Government is not willing to reconsider its stand.

We urge the Government to put a sunset clause in Bill C-70. We tried for amendments in committee and here at report stage so we could look at the Bill in a year if the Government would not do away with the Bill. We were ignored which shows that the Government either lied to the people about its intentions or it is lying now when it says the economy has improved.

**An Hon. Member:** Order.

**Ms. Mitchell:** I want to say that by refusing to reconsider Bill C-70 which will hurt women, children and families and, in fact, this country, despite the unanimous recommendations of all expert witnesses who appeared and despite a massive country-wide protest as seen in petitions, by renegeing again and again on promises, the Government, while trying to distort the facts has permanently alienated Canadians. Canadians have lost confidence in the credibility and in the humanity of the Government.

● (1540)

**Mr. Kilgour:** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Hon. Member for Vancouver East (Ms. Mitchell). The Hon. Member repeatedly mentioned throughout her speech terms like "progressive". Also she mentioned helping poor people with lower incomes. Does she accept, as I believe her Leader did this morning, that Bill C-70 will help lower-income mothers and their children for the next five years and will take away funds from high-income mothers and their children? As I understand the word "progressive"—

**Ms. Mitchell:** You do not understand it.

**Mr. Kilgour:**—one hits harder people with higher incomes and one helps people with lower incomes. Could the Hon.

Member tell the House what is her understanding in respect of low-income families and this particular Bill?

**Ms. Mitchell:** Mr. Speaker, it must be a very strange definition of progressive legislation.

**Mr. Frith:** It is the definition of Progressive Conservative.

**Ms. Mitchell:** Yes, there is a different definition of "progressive" when we talk about Progressive Conservatives. I mean, what can one answer?

**Mr. Kilgour:** Answer my question.

**Ms. Mitchell:** I have documented throughout my speech that they are reducing the indexation on family allowances for poor people and of course it will hurt them. Meanwhile, the costs of their food, clothing and so on are rising. Of course it is hurting them. As the Minister himself said, we cannot really take this Bill in isolation from some of the other budget measures as well. I gave the facts in the documentation from CCSD and from the National Council of Welfare which proved beyond a doubt that they are hurting most the lost income families. They are hurting families at the expense of other taxpayers as well.

**Mr. Kilgour:** Mr. Speaker, with respect, we have to be honest with each other in the House. The Hon. Member just said that we must not take this Bill in isolation, that we must look at other Bills. We have only one Bill before us. Does the Hon. Member know about the tax credit and the fact that low-income families, mothers and children, will have more in their family purse under this Bill for the next five years than they have right now? If she wants to rise, would she please speak to the Bill before the House, not to 17 other Bills or 17 other issues? My question relates to Bill C-70 only, and I submit that that is the lurking fallacy in everything the Hon. Member has been saying.

**Ms. Mitchell:** Mr. Speaker, how can a mother have more money in her purse as a result of this Bill, when the cost of living is rising by 4 per cent and the Minister is only giving 1 per cent in the way of any kind of adjustment for the cost of living? How can she have more money in her purse if she has to pay out that extra money?

**Mr. Kilgour:** It is called a tax credit.

**Ms. Mitchell:** Let us talk about the real world. Let us talk about the real value of money and what that mother has to pay when she goes to the grocery store. It is ridiculous to try to give the impression to families across the country that the Minister is being generous by giving a cent per child per month when he should be giving four times that much for indexation to the real cost of living. It is inconceivable that he can pursue this point.

**Mr. Hawkes:** Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Vancouver East (Ms. Mitchell) has accused Government Members of lying about their intentions and of being deluded.