

that this particular measure is part of a three-part package in the Budget which refers to family benefits. The first, of course, has to do with this change in the family allowance. The second is the child tax credit to which the Hon. Member referred, and the third is the change in the child tax exemption under the Income Tax Act. I know that the Hon. Member is quite aware, in spite of his comment that he has great doubts, that the net effect of all these changes is that the benefits for families earning low amounts are increased and the benefits for families earning larger amounts are decreased. In fact, I am sure he is aware, as the Minister of National Health and Welfare indicated in his comments, that right now under the present system a family which earns some \$30,000 a year receives a greater advantage from these benefits than a family who earns only \$10,000 a year. Of course this will change that situation. I know as well that the Hon. Member is aware that nothing is being taken from the social package by the changes being made in the modification to family allowances. In this fiscal year, 1985-86, for the \$20 million that is coming out of the family benefits package, \$190 million will be used to pay for the new spousal allowance for spouses between the ages of 60 and 65. In fiscal year 1986-87, for the \$90 million which will be coming out of the family benefits package, \$325 million will be going into the spousal allowance provisions. I know the Hon. Member is aware of all those facts, but I am interested in knowing the official policy of the Liberal Party, of which he is a member, with respect to improving family benefits for those at the lower income end of the scale and taking into account the proper and reasonable financial management of the company—

● (1120)

Ms. Copps: To bail out banks.

An Hon. Member: It is not a company.

Mr. Redway: Of course some opposition Members feel that this matter is not serious and that they have to interrupt at this time. They should listen carefully. I am sure the Hon. Member will tell us the official position of his Party with respect to improving family benefits for people at the lower income end of the scale, many of whom he represents, of course bearing in mind proper and reasonable management of the debt with which we are now faced.

Mr. Baker: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. member has noticed that some of my colleagues are a little restless this morning. The reason for that is that we are debating our particular motion for a six-month hoist; in other words, to throw the Bill out of the window where it belongs. The Hon. Member referred to three elements of the social package, but when we think about the social package in the Budget, it involves at least a dozen elements. It does not only involve the Bills of the Minister of National Health and Welfare. It involves reductions in the amount of exemptions one can claim on one's income tax form, which affects everyone. Also it involves the elimination of the federal tax reduction program, which affects everyone. In the Budget it was indicated that that was introduced in 1973

because there was a difficult economic time and that it is no longer needed.

I could go on and on. However, I am sure the Hon. Member will have to agree that when we look at the total social package, there is an over-all reduction. There has to be. If we look at only three programs, wherein the Minister takes away from two and gives on one, there is a benefit to some poor families. However, the total social package is covered by the Budget. How much will we end up with in the end? As a matter of fact, everyone in society will lose except millionaires.

Before sitting down, I want to say that there is one particular clause in the Bill on which the Minister should perhaps be congratulated. I am referring to the amendment in Clause 4. Some Hon. Members in a future speech should make reference to it. I did not have a chance to do so because the Speaker cut me off; the Speaker would not allow me the time to explain my point on Clause 4. That particular clause enables the forgiving of amounts owed to the federal Treasury. That is a very important clause. We have difficulty with it from one point of view in that it says the Minister "may". It does not say the Minister "shall". It says it would apply in cases of hardship perhaps over a period of time—it is a judgement call. The provision should be more specific than it is in this particular Bill. That is another clause that should be talked about more generally.

● (1125)

To conclude, in answer to the Hon. Member's question, let me say this, that family allowances and old age security and all such programs are Liberal measures, Liberal policies. The Liberal Party brought them in. The NDP says, well, the Liberal were forced to do it by the NDP.

Ms. Mitchell: Right on.

Mr. Baker: But certainly the one claim that cannot be made in this Chamber is that the Tories had anything to do with it at all.

I think that is the final point and I think it answers the Hon. Member's question. He can perhaps understand our frustration here on this side of the House. We want this Bill thrown out through the window, thrown out, kicked out, not rewritten, not even discussed. That is why we have the motion before the House today and that is why some of the Members here in the House are perhaps a bit unruly at times.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Malépart: Mr. Speaker, perhaps my hon. colleague, considering the comment made by the Hon. Member on the Government side, who, I am afraid, only reads the Bible according to Brian—

Perhaps my hon. colleague would consider what was said by the Advisory Council on Health and Welfare, a non-partisan advisory agency whose role consists in advising the Government. It stated clearly,—I wish the Hon. Member would read