

the family income. Since then it has shrunk and shrunk and shrunk and become less significant while many families with children become more dependent on the welfare system.

The partial deindexing of family allowances in the last session of Parliament was just the latest step in that process. The government claims that it is just taking the family allowance back from families that can afford it. We already do that through the tax system. We already do it by insisting that families declare this as income and that they pay tax on it. Of course if you are in a higher income bracket you automatically pay a higher rate of income tax on that income.

No income other than the allowance for children and the seniors' pension is charged tax at 100 per cent by the government. One can be a millionaire, make a windfall profit overnight, and still pay one's normal rate of tax. Nobody, no matter how rich, pays 100 per cent of tax except seniors on their old age security and families on their children's allowance.

It is hypocrisy to talk about supporting families. It is hypocrisy to talk about the importance of children when we know that over one million children in this country live in poverty. It is hypocrisy to talk about budgets for shelters for battered women. As I said to one of my colleagues over here when he had the temerity to speak on that, "Let's set up shelters for the men and leave the women in their homes with their children".

It is hypocrisy to talk about that and at the same time not to recognize that battering and assault do not happen only in poor families. It happens in well-off families. For many women the family allowance is the only income that they can call their own, that they can use as they choose, and that they can ensure is available to meet the needs of their children no matter what the family income.

I have a limited time left. I have to comment on the hypocrisy from the opposite benches about helping the poor. I do not see any help for the poor in this legislation. I just see taking away from people.

I have to comment on the poverty of elderly women. Some 72 per cent of the elderly poor in this country are women, and this extra bit of income while the spouse is still alive is often the difference between poverty for

women when that spouse dies and the pension dies with him and a reasonable, if not comfortable, level of living.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Unfortunately I must interrupt the hon. member. It being 4.45 p.m., pursuant to Order made Monday, December 18, 1989, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the report stage of the bill now before the House.

Therefore the question is on Motion No. 4. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

Motions Nos. 6 and 7 will have to await the outcome of Motion No. 4.

The next question is on Motion No. 10.

Mr. Butland: Madam Speaker, I ask that Motion No. 10 be withdrawn.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Motion No. 10 withdrawn.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions on Bill C-28.

The first vote is on Motion No. 1.

Call in the members.

The House divided on Motion No. 1, which was negated on the following division: