

as they presumed that by relating in this way family allowances to the tax system we intended to strip—what spite—the most underprivileged of whatever small amounts they manage to scrape here and there by forcing them to report their income. Is our society so sick that any time any government tries to rationalize its administration or help the community and those who need help the most, that government should be taken to task and charged with having spiteful intentions? I was disappointed to read, for example, an article by Michel Pelletier in *Le Devoir* of Thursday, October 25, 1978, and the previous one on Wednesday, October 25. I think it is a great disservice to be charging the Advisory Council on Social Welfare with being biased, if not blind. I think it is a great disservice to mothers to have them believe that they are going to lose something when facts show that they are going to gain, at least up to a family income of \$25,000. I think it is dishonest to presume that with an income of \$25,000 a family does not have enough for the purposes of this bill and that in any event the only solution is to just open up the system and provide for everybody.

I think it is a very serious matter when a government is being accused by reporters, in this case an economist, of playing the game of nineteenth century capitalism, and I think that perhaps the hon. member for Broadview wanted a little while ago to insinuate something along those lines when we all know—and once again the evidence is there—that, on the contrary, the House—and I even include for the purposes of my demonstration the opposition parties and especially the official opposition—has as its objective the promotion of the interest of all Canadians and not only insuring the survival of multinational corporations.

Reference was made earlier, I believe, to Imperial Oil, for example. It is so easy to accuse the multinational companies. They do not have a forum like the hon. member has to dismiss the charges that are made against them. Of course, it is easy to blame the multinationals, to blame our society, to blame capitalism, to blame everyone, to blame the government. But people should stop doing this whenever a piece of legislation is good, when it offers possibilities for the future and is aimed at the redistribution of wealth, when it would allow less fortunate Canadians to partake a little more of the national wealth. Whenever a government tries to help the poor, people should stop seeing spiteful intentions and asking for more and charging that it is not doing enough when it is precisely trying to do more and expresses the will to go on doing more.

● (1702)

Let us encourage those who fight to protect the weak and help the poor instead of attacking them and blaming them for everything. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of National Health and Welfare has introduced a bill which is frankly progressive in the circumstances since it would have been quite easy when a majority of Canadians would want us to cut back, to justify, for instance, at least in the eyes of the public, the elimination of family allowance indexation without taking any other cor-

Family Allowances

rective action. This would have been the easiest solution. The government did not choose to do so. The minister did not choose to do so. The minister decided, within the very narrow restrictions that she had to apply, to find a formula which, we admit it, may seem a rather lame one to some people, but which will at least help those whom we all want to help, that is the underprivileged Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage the House to discuss social policies. I am always happy to do so. The more discussions on this subject, the more chances we will have of establishing equality. However, when a bill seems at first glance and even after study to favour those in need, we should support it. And in this regard, I make a special appeal to the New Democratic Party. They should be the first, Mr. Speaker, to rise to applaud the efforts of the government and the minister to help the poor. They do rise, but only to denounce capitalism, multinational companies, and so on, and to pass judgement on society, the minister, the government, and members on this side of the House. In short, Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand that in discussing a bill which will certainly help tens of thousands of Canadians, some choose to attack capitalism and denounce a society which, we must admit, has served Canadians well to a large extent and remains one of the few societies in this world where life is good.

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): I am very eager to make a few remarks, as briefly as possible, on Bill C-10. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that, after hearing two very different but still very interesting speeches, I must congratulate those speakers who preceded me for taking part in the debate on a bill whose purpose is to redistribute wealth. We recognize the principle of that redistribution, we approve of it and will have no difficulty in supporting the bill. We believe that additional help to low-income families is a must, and we are conscious of their needs.

Figures were quoted and I note that the minister herself said that families whose income is less than \$18,000 will benefit from it fully while, over that amount, the credit will be reduced by 5 per cent of the amount by which the family income exceeds \$18,000, that is, by \$50 for every \$1,000 of additional income.

A family with two dependent children and an income of less than \$18,000 will receive \$400. The tax credit will be \$300 for a family with an income of about \$20,000 and \$200 if the income falls within the \$22,000 bracket. But if a family with two dependent children earns \$26,000 or over, there will be no tax credit.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the government has made a few changes. We are not contesting this legislation to which we are going to give our approval but I think it is equally important to clarify a few things and to make some comments. Many members of parliament have addressed themselves to this question and had a lot to say about it.