

Conservative Party in supporting the full indexing of all those programs, in particular, the family allowance.

● (1640)

I wish the Hon. Member for Provencher would read the speeches he made between 1972 and 1974 in support of full indexing. He sat in this House with the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney), when he was the Leader of the Conservative Opposition, in support of indexing. I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, and since the Hon. Member is now in the House, I will repeat it, if he is having problems with the Minister of Finance and the President of the Treasury Board, we will support him if he withdraws this provision to deindex family allowances. It is a small, cheap, chiselling on the children of this country when the Government can slap a 10 per cent surcharge tax on deferred corporation taxes for the coming year and pick up \$3.5 billion. If the Government did not allow corporations to defer taxes for 1985, it could not only keep full indexing for family allowances but it could double the family allowance, reduce the deficit by that amount and still retain full indexing of the family allowances. There are a dozen other ways to reduce expenditures or increase revenues without hurting those who cannot defend themselves. If the Government is worried about the well-to-do who collect family allowances, those who earn \$50,000 or \$100,000 a year, a few small amendments to the Income Tax Act will allow the Government to recover the whole darn thing. It would be administratively efficient, it would maintain the principle of universality and those who need it would receive it. There would be no need to chisel them for the sake of saving a few dollars which will amount to nothing in terms of reducing the deficit.

I urge the Government, if nothing else, to accept this amendment. Perhaps if the Government reviews it a year from now it may have some second thoughts.

**Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, in the last minutes remaining on report stage, I want to make one or two points regarding the debate. First, the Hon. Member who just finished speaking is one who has been in this House for a long time but in his speech he has made only half the argument. If he would go back to 1972 and 1974, the period to which he refers, and take a look for example at the amount of money which the national treasury needed to pay for the national debt of Canada, he would find it was a very different circumstance than that which is facing the Canadian people today. That is the first point which has to be made. If the Hon. Member goes back to 1968, he will find that the accumulated debt for the first 100 years of the Canadian Government was \$17 billion. He has to recognize that today the cost of the debt is \$26 billion annually. The Hon. Member does not say that. He constantly tries to make the point that there is this magical wand, as he likes to call it, and which he mentioned the other day in Question Period, which can be waved and somehow these issues will go away, that somehow reality can be pushed aside. But it cannot. The Hon. Member from Vancouver has made the point that this is an attack on children. In fact, the opposite is true. The greatest attack on

children, and on this country's social programs, is the debt. That is the greatest attack on those children.

We will not have to pay that debt for as long a time as will those children. They will have to pay that debt as well as the children who are yet unborn. Hon. Members opposite constantly forget that point. They somehow believe that that is not reality, but it is.

The family allowance went up in January, 1986. It did not go down. Hon. Members opposite have constantly said that family allowances are being cut, but family allowances went up on January 1, 1986. What those Hon. Members are talking about is the reduced escalation. Family allowances went up, universality was maintained, and everyone who received family allowance in 1985 is receiving it in January, 1986, if eligible, and they will receive it after the Bill is passed. The points Hon. Members opposite make will just not bear the scrutiny they should be given.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** It being 4.45 p.m., pursuant to order made Tuesday, January 14, 1986, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the report stage of the Bill now before the House.

The question is on Motion No. 2 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Vancouver East (Ms. Mitchell). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**An Hon. Member:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some Hon. Members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five Members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Pursuant to Standing Order 81(2), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

**Mr. Epp (Provencher):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I did not hear anyone say "yea" and we all heard the "nays", so I take it the motion is not passed, there being no one in favour.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I regret to say that I did hear a "yea". Call in the Members.

The House divided on the motion (Ms. Mitchell), which was negated on the following division: