

*Family Allowances Act, 1973*

oppose this Bill. Well, if the Conservatives decide to oppose this Bill, they will make two-thirds of all Canadian mothers lose their Child Tax Credit or see it delayed. That is what it means. I do not quite understand why The Hon. Member did not address that point and explain why the Conservatives would delay the passage of a Bill which will increase the Child Tax Credit. That is key. I want to stress that this Bill should be passed as rapidly as possible by this House.

**Mr. Hawkes:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would not want the Minister to grossly, or in any other way, mislead the House. I wonder if she can tell us how many pages of this thick Bill deal with the Child Tax Credit and how many things there are in it which must be opposed by any responsible Opposition? She is trying to indicate that there is only one piece of legislation dealing with the Child Tax Credit, and that is just not correct.

**Miss Bégin:** No, that is not what I said. I said that that Bill, however, is the tool which deals with the increase in the Child Tax Credit and I have asked the Hon. Member for Calgary West if he has the permission of his Leader to assure Canadian mothers that there will be rapid passage of that Bill. He did not answer my question, which is a very simple one, because his Leader said he would oppose the passage of the Bill. These are the negative consequences. I have just listed them, in case he had not realized that. He did not know in committee last week that this Bill existed. He did not know in committee that this Bill contained a provision amending the Child Tax Credit and increasing it by \$50 on top of the full indexation. I have explained why that special additional \$50 is given to all mothers receiving the Child Tax Credit.

**An Hon. Member:** For one year only.

**Miss Bégin:** For one year, which is enough to cover the two years of small reduction in indexation. And that, of course, is based on this generous, I must say, forecast of inflation figures which I gave often in committee last week and which has been printed in the proceedings of the committee. They are the figures which the Department of Finance and my Department anticipate for inflation. We calculated what would be missing for Canadian mothers if inflation was that high compared to 6 per cent. We found that the figure for the two years would be a little less than \$50, so we are adding \$50 to the Child Tax Credit for all to make up for that small reduction in Family Allowances.

In the amendment of the Hon. Member for Calgary West to Bill C-132, he does not say if he would also reduce that special \$50. He wants to do away with capping Family Allowances indexation to 5 per cent in 1984. That is his Bill. But the point of the \$50 is that probably half of it, roughly \$25, belongs to 1984, although we are giving it this year. Does he also want to reduce that, which is, of course, what he should be doing to be in line with the calculation and to respect our objective of fighting inflation and reducing it to 6 per cent and 5 per cent? He has not said what he would do. I think this is wrong. I am

convinced Canadian families will benefit more than anybody else from the dollar being worth more, instead of its constant erosion by inflation.

In other words, the faster we reduce inflation, the better it is for any mother or any family, because the family budget reflects the purchasing power of the dollar. This is the ultimate goal. If the price to pay to reach that goal is to ask Canadians who can afford it to take a little reduction in their increase of Family Allowances cheques, I do not think we have to apologize for that. All mothers with a family income of below \$26,330, or more if there are more children, and all the other mothers, by the way, who get only partial Child Tax Credit—and that can go up to at least \$40,000 income—will not suffer at all and will not have to pay a penny to that campaign. We will not apologize, because we are doing for Canadians what we really think is best in the long run to fight inflation and get it under control.

[Translation]

The Member for Calgary West (Mr. Hawkes), using a trick well known to all politicians, tried to create division among the Liberals by calling on Liberal backbenchers to rebel and to vote against the Government. Clearly, the Opposition does not understand why its campaign to influence public opinion never got off the ground. It is clear that, as regards both Bill C-131 and Bill C-132, the so-called public opinion campaign which the two Opposition parties tried to organize never got off the ground, never had any success and in fact has no connection with real public opinion. Every family has members who are jobless, either a husband, a wife, a child, a brother-in-law or a niece who lost their jobs or who need a job because he or she is twenty years old. They know perfectly well that once we set our priorities for creating employment or protecting existing jobs, and we decide to fight inflation and to bring it down by half, let us say to 6 per cent, and after that to 5, we shall not stop until inflation has been beaten.

The public knows perfectly well that it stands to benefit most from this policy in the long term. For instance, last June, the day after our hon. colleague, the Minister of Finance, brought down his budget, I started to draft, with my officials, the insert that was sent with all cheques. This special message was received and probably read by all mothers in August or September, I do not remember exactly. In any case, the insert described in detail how family allowances and child tax credit would be affected by the Government's decision as announced in the June 28 budget. I immediately sent the news to all Canadian mothers. I knew I could reach this group, and that they would read the insert because it would help them understand the facts. The insert was straight to the point, without any political partisanship, since that was not the point of the exercise. Its purpose was to explain: Your cheque is so much today. With full indexing for inflation, it would have been so much. It is going to be a little less. It will be higher than it is now but a little less so. However, everyone receiving the tax