

Mr. Frith: Polluted.

Mr. Hawkes: Deluded, Mr. Speaker. I have heard the New Democratic Party respond to some six to eight Budgets in my time here. It has a standard line; before that Party even sees the Budget, it says: "It favours the rich and hurts the poor".

Mr. Keeper: That is the fact in this Budget. Do you want the truth?

Mr. Hawkes: "That is the fact in this Budget", hollers some dishonourable Member from across the floor.

Mr. Keeper: The Budget hurts the poor and favours the rich. That is the truth.

Mr. Hawkes: In December, 1979, in this Chamber, on a motion from that Party a Budget was turfed out, the Budget of the Hon. Member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie). The National Council of Welfare, which the Hon. Member for Vancouver East is so fond of quoting, stated unequivocally at that time that it was the fairest Budget to the poor people of the nation in the decade of the seventies, and they threw it out.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hovdebo: Why didn't you keep it?

Mr. Hawkes: They sit in the Chamber and do not talk about the reality that a poor mother in Canada today, as of January 20, 1986, will have more money in her pocket for her children because of the family benefits policy of the Government than they were to have before my Party came into office.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hawkes: Let us talk about the mothers today who need to buy food and skates for their children to participate in hockey.

Mr. Keeper: What about the excise tax?

Mr. Hawkes: They are to get more money as a consequence of the family benefits policy than they were to get before.

Mr. Keeper: What about the excise tax?

Mr. Epp (Provencher): What about the highest income tax in Canada?

Mr. Keeper: You raised that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Could we listen to the Hon. Member for Calgary West (Mr. Hawkes) put his question or comment, please?

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, my question is a very simple one. It strikes at the heart of the delusions of the New Democratic Party and the Hon. Member who just spoke. I believe that that Party has deluded itself into believing that a penny a day slower growth in family allowance benefits is the most important part of the policy of the Government. I would like to be clear on its belief. Does that Party believe that that is more

Family Allowances Act, 1973

important than 500,000 more Canadians working, 1,000 more each and every day since the Budget was brought in? Does that Party think that a penny a day is more important than the over-all policy thrust which is to take from the rich and give to the poor where they need it and to stimulate the economy so that the really poor without jobs can have jobs? We were elected on jobs, jobs, jobs; reconciliation and justice. Taking from the rich and giving to the poor is justice; reconciliation is working with the economy—

Mr. Keeper: But you give to the rich.

Mr. Hawkes: —and jobs come out the other end of that process. One thousand more people per day are working in the country since the Budget was brought down. Is that not more important than a penny a day?

Ms. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, I know the Hon. Member is enjoying his rhetoric. I appeal to him as a rational person and as a person who has been involved in social work as I have myself. I am sure he really knows the social situation of people. Over a hundred groups, most of which were very well qualified social policy groups with lots of data, unanimously disagreed with the Bill and said that it was harmful. How can he, as a person who taught in a school of social work in Alberta, not believe what they are saying?

Mr. Frith: He is stubborn.

Ms. Mitchell: It is very difficult to understand. As I answered this morning on the question of jobs, of course we are all for jobs. I wish there were many more full-time jobs at decent rates of pay for the very mothers about whom we are talking. They are lucky if they get part-time jobs. Many of them are being phased out of work into part-time jobs. He knows as well as I do that it is the children about whom we are talking. When a worker with no children gets x dollars and a parent, a mother or father, gets the same x dollars and has to support several children, surely it makes sense that the Government recognize those children. Surely it makes sense that they are recognized adequately. It is an insult and it goes against an appreciation of family values and children to say that that amount will be deindexed. They cannot tell me that the Government could not find \$50,000 or a little less than that to cover full indexation for this year. I do not want to use rhetoric again, but the Hon. Member knows perfectly well that they did not hesitate to find over \$1 billion for the banks, to get new uniforms for the Armed Forces or to give all kinds of bonuses to the oil companies. Surely the children, the next generation, are just as important. Why be so miserly, so inhumane as to reduce the indexation on family allowances? I am very disappointed in the Member.

● (1550)

Mr. Speaker: Question and comment period is over. We will resume debate. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mrs. Bertrand).