

*Family Allowances Act, 1973*

In fact, in debate in this House in recent days, I have heard Government Members say that they have noticed, they have been told and they are convinced, that the rate of inflation is actually coming down. The other day, talking about the old age pension capping, the Member for Thunder Bay-Nipigon (Mr. Masters) was telling us about how supportive his mother was of that legislation. He said in that debate that inflation was coming down. I said in that debate: if it is, why do we need to bother with the 6 per cent cap on indexing of either the old age pensions or, in this case, the Family Allowance? You cannot have low inflation and a desperate need for a cap. They just do not add up; they are not compatible, those two situations.

I can only conclude therefore that the Members opposite do not really believe what they say when they say that inflation is coming down, or else they do not believe that there is a real necessity for this Bill, because I really think that the Government itself can probably add still, and those two things do not add up together.

I just want to say finally that I appeal to those Government Members to reserve for themselves the right to decide next year, one year from now, what the program for capping Family Allowances—or any other program, but in this case we are talking about Family Allowances—should be in 1984. Let them decide one year from now, not try to decide now, especially in view of the predictions they are making for such a rocky future.

**Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway):** Mr. Speaker, I might say that it is a real pleasure for me tonight to speak following the Member for Bruce-Grey (Mr. Gurbin) and the Member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Clarke), who must surely both together be God's Christmas gift to the insomniacs of Canada.

I cannot believe that 60 Conservative Members would be at some other meeting, except maybe at the meeting in Winnipeg, or some other meeting, to get rid of you know who. As a matter of fact, the story is around in Toronto today, I do not know if you have heard it, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) rushed to Toronto last weekend to hear The Who concert. He thought it was for him. He heard there was a retirement party, and he wanted to be at it.

The Member who last spoke did say—and I take this seriously, as I do all his speeches in the House, at least the ones that I can remember—that Family Allowances would be taxed back. He gave himself as an example of a parent who was receiving Family Allowance. Anybody in Canada who is not a millionaire or not in a really high tax bracket can tell you that we have a disgracefully inadequate and unjust tax system, that the poor and the middle income people pay most of the taxes in this country, and that the big companies, especially the oil companies and the taxpayers who earn a large amount, do not pay a fair share. I do not see how he can rely on the kind of a taxation system that we have. Besides, the Canadian Council on Social Welfare has said that the budget specified that the 50 per cent rise in the Child Tax Credit received in 1983 is a one year temporary increase, and that the \$50 will not be carried over to subsequent years. It seems to me we have a

terribly bad taxation system, and it is not going to be helped here.

● (2140)

The Hon. Member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Clarke), whom I know very well because he represents a neighbouring constituency, said that the NDP should have a lot of amendments. How can you have a lot of amendments to a Bill that is entirely wrong? He said that the Conservatives had amendments, and that the logic of the NDP was bad.

I offer this to Hon. Members and to the people of this country. What kind of logic is it for the Conservative party to vote for six and five because they thought the polls reflected what is that people wanted to deal with the terrible problem we face? Suddenly they realize that six and five means penalizing the children, the old people and the poor people of this country. When these Bills started coming down, Bills C-131, C-132 and so on, suddenly they draw back and have to vote against them. Who is logical and who is hypocritical? The Conservatives are illogical and hypocritical in dealing with this. They are trying to get off the hook with this amendment because they want to support the 6 per cent freeze. I have heard some Conservatives say that they would even like to see rollbacks.

I am criticized by my thick-headed friend to my right who says that the NDP voted against the salary increase. Let me put that to rest. We voted against the six and five, and in the six and five Bill salary increases were dealt with. Logically, and it is reflected in this amendment, you had to vote against six and five or support these other Bills all the way down. That is where the Conservatives were illogical. I challenge them on that. They are illogical, hypocritical and not fit to be the alternate Government in Canada.

These are tough times. All Members will agree, including the heckling Members on my right and the silent Members, as they say in French, "les navettes", across the way. The Liberal backbenchers from Quebec who take no part in this Parliament will be replaced, and God help us, in the next Parliament by Péquistes, and then we will have problems. They do not take part and they are prepared to vote against Family Allowances and against helping the poor people in the Province of Quebec. I suspect even they would agree we have tough times.

We have 12.4 per cent unemployment and the growth of our GNP is down. Hon. Members do not have to take that from the socialists. I refer them to the *Financial Post*, not exactly a socialist paper, of December 18. It reads:

By the third quarter of this year, real GNP was down 6.9 per cent from its peak in the second quarter of 1981. By November, the jobless rate had risen to a seasonally adjusted 12.7 per cent from 7.1 per cent in the summer of 1981, and almost 600,000 jobs had fallen by the wayside.

If one reads this paper, one will see stories about those who are out of work, students, those in the manufacturing industries, people out of work all across the country. I repeat, Members opposite recognize that there is a problem. The Members to my right, as much as they are misguided in their