

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, January 14, 1986

The House met at 11 a.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

FAMILY ALLOWANCES ACT, 1973

ALLOCATION OF TIME TO CONSIDER REPORT AND THIRD READING STAGES OF BILL C-70

The House resumed, from Thursday, December 19, consideration of the motion of Mr. Epp (for the Minister of Agriculture):

That, in relation to Bill C-70, an Act to amend the Family Allowances Act, 1973, one sitting day be allotted to the consideration of the report stage of the said Bill and one further sitting day be allotted to the consideration of the Bill at the third reading stage; and

That 15 minutes before the expiry of the time provided for the consideration of government business on the above-mentioned sitting days, any proceedings then before the House shall be interrupted, if necessary, for the purpose of this Order and, in turn, every question necessary to dispose of the said stage of the said Bill shall be put forthwith and successively, without further debate or amendment.

Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, my speech was rudely interrupted by other things before the Christmas holidays and so here I am now concluding what I think were very germane and important thoughts. We are now in 1986. It is a brand new beginning, just the kind of beginning that the Tories should welcome, a *tabula rasa* wiped clean, a starting all over again.

Mrs. Mailly: You are not being germane, John.

Mr. Rodriguez: We now have the latest Gallup poll which shows the Tories dropping like a stone.

Mr. Nunziata: And the Liberals are going up.

Mr. Rodriguez: They had better look for a new executive. Interest rates are rising and the Tories are dropping in the polls, and one would think they would want to start a new year with a resolution that I am sure certain elements in the Cabinet would like to make, and that is, the withdrawal of Bill C-70. Withdraw it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rodriguez: I would like to put that to the House. All those in favour of withdrawing the Bill say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Rodriguez: All those opposed say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Rodriguez: In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the yeas have it.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Rodriguez: Since we adjourned for the Christmas vacation, thousands and thousands of Canadians have clearly indicated by petition that they reject the partial deindexing of the family allowance. And we must not forget that the whole question of deindexation started with the Liberals in the previous Government. They started us down this rocky slope.

Mr. Frith: You were doing well until now.

Mr. Rodriguez: I know the Liberals are going to get sensitive, but I want the people of Canada to realize that the Tories did not hatch this up all on their own. All their ideas were aborning in the four years previously.

Mrs. Mailly: Thank you, John.

Mr. Rodriguez: We cannot forget, and as the Tories drop in the polls, the Liberals should be dropping as well.

Mr. Gauthier: But we are not. You're dropping.

Mr. Rodriguez: What are we really doing with this partial deindexation, Mr. Speaker? We are chiseling the children of this country. The Tories finally saw that they could not proceed with the deindexation of the old age pension. Why do they not now see that they should not proceed with the deindexing of the family allowance?

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Because Bob Rae says so.

Mr. Rodriguez: Because the Minister has the cheques already printed and the cheques reflect a cent a day per child. Oh, look at the big-hearted old Santa Clause sitting over there with the white hair, Mr. Speaker. There he is over there taking one cent a day per child. I am not pointing to the House Leader, Mr. Speaker, I want to make that clear; I am pointing to the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp). The Government said that if the economy improved, it would give back the full indexation. To listen to the Government, one would think the economy has improved. It now has a minimum tax, and it should be doing what is fair and just for the people of Canada, that is, fully indexing the family allowance.

I have one last point to make in the couple of seconds I have left, and that is, that the whole section on missing children is fraught with great danger, confusion and complexity. I think,