

Family Allowances Act, 1973

rate of 6.5 per cent interest rather than 3.5 per cent during the retirement period of plan members.

3. Representatives of PSSA pensioners were not consulted about the change in economic assumptions used to value the PSS Account. The benefits of pensioners were not affected by the change in these assumptions. The assumptions were changed to enable realistic cost comparisons with private sector plans.

Also, pensions are not negotiable with plan members.

ESTIMATED LOSSES IN SUPERANNUATION ACCOUNTS

Question No. 405—**Mr. Cassidy:**

As of December 31, 1984, what was the estimated loss in accumulated interest and principal that the Public Service Superannuation Account, the Canadian Forces Superannuation Account and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Superannuation Account have experienced from the time these accounts were first established as a result of employer contributions being credited to these accounts one fiscal year in arrears instead of being credited currently on a monthly basis to coincide with the current contributions made by employees from their pay cheques?

Mr. Paul Dick (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board): In accordance with legislation, employer contributions are credited to the Public Service Superannuation Account one fiscal year in arrears, and to the Canadian Forces and RCMP Superannuation Accounts one quarter in arrears. If these employer contributions had been credited to these accounts at the same time as employee contributions, the estimated difference in interest earnings would be as follows:

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Public Service Superannuation Account | \$ 385 million |
| Canadian Forces Superannuation Account | \$ 90 million |
| RCMP Superannuation Account | \$ 15 million |

[Translation]

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

Mr. Speaker: The questions enumerated by the Parliamentary Secretary have been answered. Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

FAMILY ALLOWANCES ACT, 1973

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Epp (Provencher) that Bill C-70, an Act to amend the Family Allowances Act, 1973 be read the third time and passed.

Ms. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I understand that I have 13 minutes left, not enough time to tell how strongly we oppose Bill C-70. We are joined by over 100 organizations that have appeared on Parliament Hill and by many more than 100,000 petitioners who oppose the deindexation of the family allowance so very strongly.

Why is the NDP and all these groups and citizens protesting so very strongly? It is for the same reason that we opposed the Liberal's six and five deindexing and the earlier cuts made by the Liberals to the family allowance. First of all, Bill C-70, as we have said many times, is an attack on families. The family allowance cheque is the only family benefit that goes to all families that are rearing children. It recognizes the costs and responsibilities that parents take on when they raise children. It is the way in which taxpayers, who do not have children, contribute to the rearing of the next generation. It recognizes the value of children and of parenting. It shows that we are a caring society. It is also a very important means of subsidizing the heavy costs of larger families, a point that the Federation of Labour from P.E.I. pointed out was not stressed enough in committee.

By refusing to index the family allowance to the full cost of living the Government is not only taking money from children in real terms but is denying all the principles of this very important universal social program that I just mentioned. It is really denying the fact that this program is a social right to Canadian parents. It is a social contract between their Government, their children, and themselves. It is this contract that is being eroded.

This gives very bad signals to parents. It tells them that kids will have to pay for the deficit, that parenting is not important to the Government, that the Government is willing to allow family allowance to be eroded over the years—and that is where the significant decrease comes—and that children and families are not a priority of the Government. Those are the signals that people are getting, and the Government should realize that. The Ministers and Members sitting in the House should realize that this is a very serious and very negative matter from a political point of view.

Bill C-70 is an attack on women. We heard from the National Action Committee on the Status of Women, from the Canadian Advisory Council, and from many, many women's groups across Canada. This has aroused the anger of women so much that in Quebec a very strong and very determined new coalition of 60 or more organizations was formed which will continue to protest to the Government. They have lost all confidence in the Government and its actions.

As my Leader said this morning, women are concerned because they need that cheque for their kids, they deserve it, it is their right, and it should be fully indexed. They are also concerned because, in most cases, the cheque comes to women in their own name. I do not think that many men, who have always been in the workforce, realize what it means to a woman who has been raising kids in the home, who has been working very hard and gets no financial recognition, benefits, or adequate pension as do people in the workforce. The one