

devotion not enabled them to save enough money to enjoy a decent life and why are most of them compelled to depend only on public charity?

Is it not enough to convince us that we must condemn the present system which has kept for itself their property. Surely their dependents did not inherit these assets for all they have inherited is a lot of debts and mortgages.

Mr. Speaker, government debts now exceed our citizens' ability to pay. How logical it is that so many members of Parliament pretend to be experts! Do they not care to know why there is so much poverty, unemployment, so many debts and bankruptcies? Once more, I suggest that when we are at grips with such economic unbalance, amateur sports should be let aside.

Last Friday, when the House adjourned, I was saying that we should identify the most urgent needs, those which can give to the Canadian economy the appropriate boost to meet essential needs. I suggest that our efforts in the economic and social areas should be primarily based on family, for this is where basic needs are to be found. The family needs clothes, housing, furniture, schools, hospitals, drugstores, teachers, doctors, fuel, policemen, city councils, restaurants, cars, hotels and household help. Finally, one can say beyond a doubt that it is the greatest consumer, that it contributes most to the general trend of the economy. It is also the most forgotten in the minds of our leaders, the most heavily taxed. Generally, it has only one salary, that of the father, to provide food, clothing and shelter to one or several persons despite the fact that its salary is being eaten away by taxes of all sorts.

Families are without the necessary purchasing power and they are the ones which suffer most from the increase in the cost of living; they are the ones which are the hardest hit by economic imbalance and the nonsense in the present diabolical system.

Yet it is the family which is the foundation of society, which builds and maintains it. It has to carry the major part of the social and economic responsibilities, and we also rely on it to upgrade and continue the species.

• (1510)

Mr. Speaker, the prerogatives and rights of the family are being denied consideration; its existence is nearly being denied. You have to be young before you get old. Family allowances were set up in 1944-45. Their rate has remained the same while all other sectors of society have kept pace with the increase in the cost of living. Old age pensions followed an upward pattern but family allowances which stood at \$6 to \$8 in 1944-45 remain at the same level today while the cost of living increased by over 100 per cent.

I am not against increasing old age security pensions, Mr. Speaker. In fact, I support all increases. However, I am opposed to increases which are without positive effects, which lead to nothing, which only serve to increase the cost of living which is going up continuously.

Mr. Speaker, the question is whether it is worthwhile to increase family allowances and old age security pensions before other ways are explored for giving the economy the upsurge it needs.

Supply

Mr. Speaker, national production approximated to \$12 billion in 1944. In 1973, it will amount to \$114 billion of which \$8 billion will be derived from personal income tax and \$40 billion from corporate taxation.

On the other hand, family allowances still being down at only \$6.00 and \$8.00 in 1973, no wonder that we are witnessing an unprecedented decrease in own birth rate while we should be having a greater family expansion. Coupled with this economic expansion, there is a decrease in the number of children. We are closing our eyes on these tragic events and we are looking for consumers abroad. This is the worst administrative mistake ever made by our governing bodies.

With such a national production, Canadians should enjoy renewed prosperity. And yet, all we have is unemployment, poverty and inflation which indicate that our off-centred national economy is still affecting the whole population.

Mr. Speaker, it is only by restoring an economic equilibrium between people, families and companies that poverty, unemployment and inflation will be eliminated.

Only the government is capable of quickly restoring and maintaining the economic stability which would rub out poverty, unemployment and inflation for the benefit of all Canadians provided that specific and efficient decisions are taken.

However qualified they may be, no civil servants, no university professors, no professional bodies, no trade unions, no federal or provincial economic councils, no religious groups, be they Roman Catholic or Protestant, no ethnic groups, whether English, French or whatever you like, no political parties, no party bagmen, no bank or company presidents or directors, are empowered to pass legislation for the Canadian Parliament. The power to vote is the exclusive privilege of the 264 members of Parliament, a privilege which they must exercise on behalf of 22 million Canadians.

It is therefore in 1973 that this problem should be solved by the government. If the constitution, monetary, economic and political systems enable the people of Canada to achieve a national production of \$114 billion i.e. \$5,000 per inhabitant or an average of \$25,000 per family of five, these same institutions should also enable us to accomplish an equitable sharing among the 22 million citizens living in 6 million homes, residences or slums, throughout our country.

All hon. members, the 30 ministers, the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and primarily the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner), together with the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury) and the leaders of the three opposition parties are the only Canadians responsible for restoring national balance. But how should the government go about this? That is the great question.

I have before me, Mr. Speaker, the findings of the four major commissions of inquiry created over the past decade on banks, taxation, poverty and the status of women in Canada. There is no need for further study. Everything has all been said and studied; every recommendation has been made. There is nothing left but legislating. We know exactly what the present situation is, we know the logical evolution of technology and we have an