

Government Orders

That was a response to the 1989 Budget by Professor Peter King. One would wonder how many hamburger flippers Canada can afford to turn out.

The theme of Bill C-69 and of the other legislation that has been introduced by this government in the area of social services, is one of cruelty and hypocrisy. There is Liberal hypocrisy as well because under 6 and 5 in 1977 the requirement that health and post secondary funding had to be spent on health and post secondary education was abandoned.

In British Columbia, in particular, the popular belief and oft-cited allegation is that the money is spent not on services and education but in fact on pavement.

When the member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley asked the Secretary of State if they had studied this problem and to tell us that this was not the case, the reply was: "You will have to trust us". The member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley has a private member's bill calling for a return to the pre-1977 era when we had accountability for the expenditure of these funds. We would hope that members opposite, on the government side of the House, and the Liberals, would support this initiative.

Women will be hurt by this freeze. Yet again women are caught in the squeeze and the freeze when it comes to funding. It will mean a loss of jobs for women who are the majority of health care workers.

When looking at the whole picture of how this government handles money there are a couple of figures that I have trouble getting out of my mind. One is \$1,721,170. That is the amount of the smallest of three government grants given to Noranda in 1988. Noranda is the giant natural resources holding company. In 1988, it made \$603 million in profits. It also deferred \$233 million in taxes that it will probably never pay, and it does not even have to pay interest on those deferred taxes. The \$1,721,170 is more than the \$1.6 million cut from 80 women's centres across Canada. It is as much as many programs in Canada need to survive. That \$1,700 million would go a long way in any province where welfare cuts are happening because of the capping of the federal program.

• (1650)

The Prime Minister stated during the 1988 election campaign that the free trade agreement fully protects

and preserves all of our existing social programs and places no restrictions whatsoever on our ability to improve and expand upon them.

We have seen, over the mandate of this Parliament, one after another of our social programs attacked and cut back. I am waiting, as I am sure every member on this side of the House is waiting, to see one improvement and one expansion of social programs.

In November of 1988, the Prime Minister said: "Why would I do anything other than ensure that my mother and all the mothers of this country get the programs to which they are entitled and richly deserve? The simple unvarnished truth is that medicare, pensions and social programs are not at risk". That from the mouth of the Prime Minister in 1988.

Well my mother is not impressed. Many mothers in Canada are not impressed, particularly women who are elderly and mothers of young children. Yet, we have seen clawbacks to the old age pension and child allowance. We have seen a cap on the Canada Assistance Program as represented in this bill. We have also seen the UI cuts.

Mr. McDermid: Your mother is making \$80,000 a year then.

Ms. Langan: My mother is not making \$80,000 a year. My mother is a pensioner.

Mr. McDermid: Well then she's not caught in the clawback.

Ms. Langan: I have obviously touched a nerve on the government side of the House and have awakened a bunch of members who were busily mumbling in their beards up until now. I am telling you that there is not a mother in this country, possibly with the exception of the Prime Minister's mother, who is impressed by the agenda of this government.

You cannot even get a handle on it. You cannot go out and say, "this is the government's agenda". It is so insidious.

Bill C-69 is so bad that I would like to move the following amendment:

That the motion be amended by deleting all of the words after the word "that" and substituting the following therefor:

Bill C-69, an act to amend certain statutes to enable restraint of government expenditures, be not now read a second time but that it be read a second time this day six months hence.