

will extend the ten minute question period now that the Hon. Member for Lincoln has returned to the Chamber, but only based on the unanimous consent of the House, so that I can determine that that is what Hon. Members want. Otherwise, we will continue the debate. Is it the wish of Hon. Members that we debate?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Taylor: Point of order, Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Hon. Member for Bow River rises on a point of order.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, you permitted the Minister of National Health and Welfare, who was not being questioned at the time, to rise and make two statements. Surely we cannot leave without comment some of the baloney she advanced, because that is what it was. There are 1,200,000 mothers who will be affected, and she knows it.

Some Hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Taylor: Why are you trying to kid the people?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Hon. Member for Bow River raises two matters, one being a point of order with respect to the fact that allowed the Minister to enter the exchange, and the other raises a matter of debate. Yes, I did recognize the Minister as I would recognize any other Hon. Member in the House who wanted to rise in that ten minute period, even if that Hon. Member is from the same Party as the one who had spoken.

If there are no further points of order, the Chair will recognize—

Mr. Mackasey: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): There is another point of order.

Mr. Mackasey: I want to make it clear that I left the House fully under the impression that I had utilized my ten minutes. I realize my answers were very lengthy.

Mr. Crosby: So you cannot tell the time either.

Mr. Mackasey: I make this point because I did hear someone suggest that I had left on purpose. The Hon. Member knows that that is not true. He should either retract that statement or apologize because he should accept the word of a gentleman. I left because when the Speaker, with his usual delicacy and finesse, suggested that the question was too long and the answer was too long, I presumed that he was telling me that I had spoken longer than my allotted time, and I ran to make an important phone call. I would not have missed giving the Hon. Member an opportunity to ask any questions he would have liked. The questions I have heard so far have been typical of the type which would have been asked.

Mr. Arnold Malone (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by telling the Hon. Member for Lincoln (Mr. Mackasey) that I did not think his ten minutes had expired. I

Family Allowances Act, 1973

thought that a light year had passed. I also noticed that it was one of the interesting speeches we have heard in the House, one which we did not measure by its length in *Hansard* but, rather, as it registered on the Richter scale.

● (1630)

I want to deal with the analysis put forward by the Hon. Member for Lincoln before getting into my specific comments. He took considerable pleasure on behalf of the Government Party in advocating that the six and five program has been bringing down inflation. It is an interesting paradox to note that all the while that inflation and interest rates were increasing sharply the Government Party blamed the Americans and world conditions. They told us there was nothing Canada could do with respect to its internal policy because we had to live within the reality of a world economy.

All of a sudden inflation in the United States started to decrease. Interest rates began to come down. That fact is also reflected in Canada, and the Liberals take claim with a slogan called "The six and five program". They say if it was not for that program, inflation would not have come down. One of these arguments may sell, but not both. It cannot be a fact that we live in a world economy and then somehow find that we are divorced as a result of something that is not a program but rather a slogan, which is what six and five is.

The Hon. Member for Lincoln took particular pains in trying to tell us that this Party was void of social conscience. He made reference to Margaret Thatcher and the Conservatives in Great Britain. I ask the Hon. Member for Lincoln, and he can tell me on another occasion, whether he embraces the social policies of Jeremy Thorpe. That might be the social policy that the Members of the Liberal Party will want to concern themselves with.

We are dealing today with a question that is indeed serious, one that talks about Family Allowances and decreasing the capping of the indexation thereon. This will cause a constriction on the poorest in this country rather than those who are richer. I see the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin) again behaving like a chicadee eating fermented chokecherries. She knows full well that constraint is there against the poorest people in this country.

Miss Bégin: It is not true.

Mr. Malone: Statistics show that for 15 years Canada's poverty level was decreasing. We were having fewer poor people in Canada. This year the statistics are turned around and the poverty rate in Canada is increasing.

I submit that this is a terrible situation. Canada has one-third of the world's fresh water, has no lack of resources and educated people. This group of 20 million people has all the tools to build a healthy and wealthy society, yet we cannot compete with our major competitors, Japan, Germany and other European countries, to the extent that this year the