

*Family Allowances Act, 1973*

As I mentioned earlier, there has been no clear statement from the Conservative Party as to what their social policy, if any, is. The Member asking the question said that a little earlier.

● (1220)

**Mr. Ogle:** Tell him that the people of Canada voted them out.

**Mrs. Mitchell:** As my colleague says, of course it was the people of Canada who voted the Conservative Government out, not the New Democratic Party. They could have even avoided having an election if they had been a little smarter in a number of areas.

**Mr. Hawkes:** Mr. Speaker, earlier today we talked about propaganda machines. The Petro-Canada policy was to encourage people to provide voluntarily more money to that Company so that it could drill more oil wells, create more jobs, and improve the economy. The Leader of the New Democratic Party misinterpreted the report, and I guess those Members believe his interpretation rather than the thrust of the report and the policy. In this current time of high unemployment, they might have been wise to look at the actual recommendations instead of following what their Leader said about them.

I ask the Hon. Member to explain how that budget was in violation of the principles we have discussed in the Chamber today. It contained many tax credit proposals of assistance to senior citizens and to families. It was designed to bring down inflation at the same time. It would have created jobs at the rate of 40,000 a month. Where is any of this a violation of NDP principle?

**Mrs. Mitchell:** I would be pleased to answer that. I recall that the Conservative budget at that time was a restraint budget, just as Bill C-132 is a restraint Bill, except that it was restraint in all areas of the economy. I recall the statement "short-term pain for long-term gain" of the Minister of Finance at that time.

Actually I have already answered the Hon. Member's question. From my point of view as critic on social policy, the budget did nothing to ensure that universal social programs would be upheld as a matter of principle. Also it was part of the Conservatives' economic policy, if one could call it a policy, or part of the pragmatism at that time, just the same as it is with the Liberals today. They are trying to control inflation by increasing unemployment, and this Party will not go along with it.

**Mr. Anguish:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Hon. Member a question as well. I would like to know, yes or no, if it is true that it was not a coalition of Liberal and NDP Members that defeated the Conservative Government in 1979, whether or not there were Family Allowance provisions in their budget. Also I would like the Hon. Member to clarify whether or not the vote which defeated the Conservative Government was not necessarily viewed as a confidence vote; it was on a Liberal amendment and a New Democratic Party

amendment to the amendment. If I understand it correctly, that budget dealt with Family Allowances. When the Government of the Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead (Mr. Clark), the Hon. Leader of the Opposition now—

**Mrs. Mitchell:** He is not the Leader; use the past tense.

**Mr. Anguish:** I am sorry. But was it not true that it was the indiscretion or the last—

**Mr. Neil:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It seems that the ten-minute question period after a speech was set up in order to ask specific questions relating to the issue. The issue here is Family Allowances, but the Hon. Member is now getting involved in a political debate. I suggest that he is entirely out of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** I will continue to recognize the Hon. Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake (Mr. Anguish) and other Hon. Members who may wish to rise on points of order as well. The Chair is struck that perhaps it was not the intention of the reformed parliamentary procedures to encourage an Hon. Member to ask another in his own Party questions which do not appear to have a great deal of relevance either to the Bill before the House or perhaps to the Hon. Member's speech.

I warn Hon. Members that I am very hesitant, as I have said before, about setting down rulings, particularly on the issue of the ten-minute question and answer period. Because it is a new technique, I think it is the responsibility of the Chair to ensure that Members themselves feel out how they want to handle the ten-minute period. But I point out that I have some question in my mind as to whether we are going about it in the right way.

**Mr. Hawkes:** Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Members outside the speaker's own Party wanting to ask questions, I think it is appropriate for a Member within that Party to ask questions. Also I might suggest that when we find a Member who belongs to the same Party as the speaker filibustering part of the ten minutes, the Chair might make an accommodation and not count the time spent so that there is adequate time for the rest of us to get to the heart of the question.

**Mr. Keeper:** Mr. Speaker, my colleague was questioning the Hon. Member with regard to the former Conservative budget as it related to Family Allowances. He was doing the same thing as the Hon. Member for Calgary West (Mr. Hawkes). The Hon. Member for Calgary West raised that matter. If it is not relevant when we ask the question, why is it relevant when a Member of the Conservative Party asks the same question?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** The Hon. Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake on the same point of order?

**Mr. Anguish:** No, Mr. Speaker, I am not rising on a point of order. I would like to continue with my question, if I could. The only reason I asked the question in the form I did is that the Hon. Member from "Eric in Wonderland", Calgary North or whatever, made reference to Family Allowances and the