

Order Paper Questions

Impacts of Hypothetical Decreases in the World Oil Price

	Fiscal Year 1983/84			Fiscal Year 1984/85		
	\$31.50/bbl	\$25.00/bbl	\$20.00/bbl	\$31.50/bbl	\$25.00/bbl	\$20.00/bbl
Various world prices: (U.S. dollars)						
Conventional oil price: (\$/bbl)	31.50	25.00	20.00	31.50	25.00	20.00
New oil price: (\$/bbl)	44.00	35.50	28.75	44.00	35.50	28.75
*Consumer Price Index: (per cent change)	—	-0.4	-0.9	—	-0.4	-0.9
*Government revenue (change in \$ million)	—	-1725.0	-1400.0	—	-2650.0	-2375.0
Domestic oil supply: (millions of barrels)	503	507	511	477	479	479
Domestic demand: (millions of barrels)	546	553	561	536	552	566
*Oil import compensation: (change in \$ million)	—	-200.0	-100.0	—	-350.0	-225.0

* These figures represent differentials not levels.

[Translation]

Mr. Peterson: Madam Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Madam Speaker: The questions enumerated by the Parliamentary Secretary have been answered. Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

FAMILY ALLOWANCES ACT, 1973

MEASURE TO LIMIT INDEXATION

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Miss Bégin that Bill C-132, an Act to amend the Family Allowances Act, 1973, be read the third time and do pass; and the motion of Mr. Hawkes (p. 22692).

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): When the House rose at one o'clock for lunch, the Hon. Member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Wenman) had completed his remarks in debate and the House was in the ten-minute period of questions, answers and comments. At that point an exchange was taking place between the Hon. Member for Fraser Valley West and the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Evans).

The Chair will now recognize any Hon. Member who wishes to continue within approximately seven or eight minutes of that period of questions and answers.

Mr. Bill Domm (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I cannot let this opportunity go by without some comment on a statement made earlier today as it pertains to this particular Bill, Bill C-132, which is an effort to reduce the Family Allowances expected to be received this year.

The Government House Leader mentioned earlier when discussing the tabling of documents, that had we not taken so much time in opposition since we reconvened after the Christmas break, we would be able to deal, perhaps, with parliamentary debate and discussion on the matter of the deployment of the Cruise missile.

I find it absolutely shocking that the priority of the day is the reduction of some 50 cents in Family Allowance cheques as compared to the seriousness of the deployment of the Cruise missile. The imbalance between the two is inexcusable and indicates very clearly that this detrimental social legislation which is currently before the House has more priority with the Government of today than the matter of the deployment of the Cruise missile.

Having said that, I would now like to take this opportunity to review some of the things which we are actually being asked to pass in just a few hours from now. Bill C-132 is another example of the Government's allocation of priority which I consider to be totally out of pace with the feelings of the people in this country today. I do not think there is a Member on the Government side of this House who would have the nerve to go home to his or her constituents and say "I am sorry, we did not have time in Parliament to discuss the deployment of the Cruise missile because we were all wrapped up in the priority of reducing Family Allowance cheques by 50 cents". That is a priority situation which is very frustrating for both Opposition Parties. I am afraid I have to agree with the NDP on this point. There are so many areas where the Government could find a place to make up the losses incurred by indexing Family Allowance cheques. Instead, this Bill if