

*Family Allowances Act*

suggest we should reinstate some of the marginal tax rates which previously existed, as the Hon. Member knows, will not be to eliminate or reduce the deficit or change the course this country is moving in, because those marginal tax rates were in place at a time when the deficit was growing and they did not halt the growth of the deficit. Regardless of how we may differ on reform of the tax system, I think we know that that alone will not change the direction of the financial affairs of this country and eliminate the deficit. He and I both know that in our hearts and minds.

However, bearing in mind that regardless of reform there would still be a deficit and we would still have financial difficulties, would the NDP and the Hon. Member personally still advocate that we eliminate altogether the child tax exemption in the Income Tax Act?

**Mr. Riis:** What does the Hon. Member want me to do, Mr. Speaker, put it in writing in blood? We have a position and I do not know what more I can say. Yes! Yes! What I find interesting, as I try to answer his question, is that what we are debating here is not the deficit. I wish the Hon. Member would rise and say that he believes that the appropriate thing to do is to reduce increases to family allowances. Does he really believe that we should be reducing the increases to the family allowance payments across the board to all Canadians? Does he support what is before the House at the moment?

● (1200)

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Resuming debate.

**Mr. Riis:** Give him a chance to answer.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent to allow the Member for York East (Mr. Redway) to answer?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Gauthier:** For a short answer.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Very well, the Member for York East has the floor for a short response.

**Mr. Redway:** Mr. Speaker, as the Hon. Member knows, we are talking about a three-part package—

**Mr. Gauthier:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. The Hon. Member for Ottawa-Vanier (Mr. Gauthier), on a point of order.

**Mr. Gauthier:** Mr. Speaker, we agree with the Hon. Member being given the floor to explain his position. However, I would like to reserve the position of the next speaker, because you may have noticed it is now 12:01 p.m., and I think there are 58 minutes of debate left. If the Hon. Member recognized on this side of the House takes the floor before the 50 minutes are up, he will be entitled to take 20 minutes for his speech and not the additional 10 minutes.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Hon. Member for Ottawa-Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) is right. However, the 58 minutes are up in any case, and the Hon. Member for Montreal-Sainte-Marie (Mr. Malépart) will have 10 minutes.

[*English*]

**Mr. Redway:** Just to conclude, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member realizes that we are talking about a three-part package, the net effect of which is to improve benefits for low income families. The second point is that, apart from that, there is going to be no decrease in the family allowance. It may not increase as fast as it would otherwise, but there is to be no decrease, and the Hon. Member knows that quite well.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Resuming debate. The Hon. Member for Montreal-Sainte-Marie (Mr. Malépart).

**Mr. Jean-Claude Malépart (Montreal-Sainte-Marie):** Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I rise in the House to take part in the debate today, because for the third time we are considering a Bill that is anti-social and is aimed at an important although unorganized group in our society.

Mr. Speaker, there are three groups in society that should have the concern of Governments and all Members of this House and which must be defended. First, the elderly; second, the sick; and third, our children.

Mr. Speaker, there are other groups in our society, and I am thinking for instance of farmers, business people, small businesses, the multinationals and workers, that are structured and organized and able to argue their own case. Unfortunately, the three groups I referred to, namely the elderly, the sick and children, are not organized, and previous Governments, whether they were Conservative or Liberal, have always seen it as their duty to protect them.

And now, for the first time in our history, a Prime Minister with his gang of Conservative Members is attacking the three poorest and least organized groups in our society. For the first time, Progressive Conservative Members, led by their Prime Minister, are basely taking advantage of the inexperience and lack of organization of these groups to get their money and give it to the rich.

Fortunately, the elderly proved to the Prime Minister that they were capable of taking a stand, and they humiliated him right here on the Hill. Fortunately, Opposition Members and the various associations that help people in their struggle against various diseases were ready for this, and again, they obliged the Prime Minister to apologize and backtrack on certain kinds of medication. But unfortunately, he did not have the courage to backtrack on everything.

And now we have a third attack, this time on families with children, Mr. Speaker. It is too bad I have only ten minutes, because I would have liked to have had more time to consider the subject in detail.