

*Family Allowances Act, 1973*

understand the Minister's own testimony in Committee. The Minister came to Committee and told us that we have now slipped into a system, which she has largely created, where one receives maximum support for one's child if one's gross income is approximately \$40,000 a year. If one's gross income is \$40,000 a year, all of the pieces of legislation in place will give support of about \$800 per child. If one's gross income is \$12,000, it will be closer to \$700 per child. We have a system which peaks at a gross income of \$40,000. I think the taxpayers of this country would prefer that those people with incomes of \$12,000 received more for their children than those with incomes of \$40,000.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hawkes:** This Party believes in that kind of a system, and it is incredible that so many Members of the Liberal Party do not. It is incredible that so many Hon. Members will stand in this Chamber later this day and vote for a piece of legislation, followed by the next one, Bill C-139, which would guarantee that those with gross incomes of \$40,000 would receive the most from the tax and benefits system for their children, not those with incomes of \$10,000, \$12,000 or \$16,000. That most clearly exemplifies the fact that we have a Government which has gone absolutely berserk in terms of its social and spending priorities.

I would like to repeat my plea. I have an amendment to move, and the force of that amendment would simply be a signal to Cabinet that this Chamber and all the Members in it have had enough of this perversity. It is time to reconsider the social priorities and do what is just and right. It is time to bring that perversity to a halt.

Therefore, I move, seconded by the Hon. Member for Oxford (Mr. Halliday):

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

"Bill C-132, an Act to amend the Family Allowances Act, 1973, be not now read a third time, but that it be read a third time this day six months hence".

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Reid, Kenora-Rainy River):** At this time I should inform the House that there is a ten-minute period in which the Hon. Member, who has just taken his seat, can be questioned, but first I will read the motion.

● (1150)

There is an amendment to the order for third reading of Bill C-132 as follows: moved by Mr. Hawkes, seconded by Mr. Halliday:

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

"Bill C-132, an Act to amend the Family Allowances Act, 1973, be not now read a third time but that it be read a third time this day six months hence".

**Mr. Schroder:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Hon. Member would explain how you can have "this day" one year hence?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Reid, Kenora-Rainy River):** I apologize, that is the Chair's fault. The motion reads "that it be read a third time this day six months hence". I might say to the Parliamentary Secretary that that is a standard motion taken directly from Beauchesne.

At this point we have the ten-minute question period. Are there any Hon. Members who wish to question the Hon. Member?

**Mrs. Mitchell:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Hon. Member for Calgary West (Mr. Hawkes), since he has been the key spokesperson for the Conservative Party on this Bill, what the official policy is of the Conservative Party regarding universality as it applies to Family Allowances. We are very confused about this because when the Tory Government was in power, the Minister of National Health and Welfare at that time refused to give any commitment at all to universal Family Allowances. I understand that there was a poll taken of Conservative Members and 62 per cent of the Hon. Members wanted to dismantle universal Family Allowances and reduce Family Allowances. I would like to hear now officially on behalf of the Conservative Party what its position is on universal Family Allowances. Are they for them or against them?

**Mr. Hawkes:** Mr. Speaker, this particular piece of legislation is an attack on the principle of universality and we are voting against it. Every speech we have made is in accordance with that principle. I guess the translation of the truth which has come out of the New Democratic Party's propaganda machine, and did so about three and a half years ago when the then Minister of National Health and Welfare was the Hon. David Crombie, is a piece of propaganda which has lived on with a sense of truth in the NDP.

I believe it is wise to review the fact that in Committee in the month of December, the current Minister of National Health and Welfare gave us a sense of the contribution to family and child care in this country which comes from the tax deduction, the Family Allowances and the Child Tax Credit. That particular presentation made it crystal clear that the support system peaks at \$40,000 a year.

I would remind the NDP that a study was put in place by the Conservative Minister of National Health and Welfare, and what the Minister did was to ask the officials in the Department to conduct a study of the economic support for children, all parts of the system, so that we would have a data base which a committee of Parliament could look at and make recommendations to the Minister.

The principles involved in that approach are, first, the gathering of facts; second, a belief that Parliamentarians can deal with the facts, that they will do it with sensitivity, and they will make recommendations to a Minister instead of having a Government where the Minister says—

**Mr. Manly:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, could the rule of relevance apply in asking the Hon. Member to answer the Hon. Member's question, which was: What is the official policy of the Tory Party with regard to universality?