

*Family Income Security Plan*

Mr. Speaker, the government could also say to the family head who has a small property saddled with municipal and school taxes: We are going to help you by allowing you to deduct a certain amount of your municipal and school taxes from your income tax, so that you will have a little more money to meet necessary family expenses. I feel this would not be a mere statement of intent, but rather facts which would prove that the government is trying to help low-income heads of large families.

The government could also have said on the same occasion: We are going to help senior citizens. This government of the so-called "just society" has not yet indicated what it intends to do to alleviate the burden of senior citizens. I know that this bill does not deal with this matter, but I think this is an opportunity which the government could use to demonstrate that it really wants to implement its policy for a just society by giving more assistance to this class of citizens, elderly people, who only receive a pittance and who cannot, nowadays, make both ends meet.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the important impact of this bill is concealed by several sections which are so complex that they make it difficult for anybody to understand the meaning of the bill and the way in which it is going to be administered. For instance, clause 6(2) of the bill clearly states that where a person receives a pension or any other assistance from a lower level of government or within the meaning of a plan approved by the provinces where this legislation would apply, the amounts of the benefits payable by the federal government will be one half of those amounts which would allegedly be paid to families, as stated in the bill. I think I understand the bill quite correctly, but explain it to me if I do not. How is it possible for the minister to tell the people that he is paying \$20 a month in respect of a child of from 12 to 18 years and \$15 in respect of another of up to 12 years, in the event that the child's family receives any assistance from the municipality within the meaning of a plan agreed upon by the province?

The government is lying when it tells the people that it is going to pay these amounts. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Health and Welfare might repudiate my arguments, but the government will only pay \$10 in respect of one child and \$7 in respect of the other. This is clearly established in clause 6(2) of the bill and I quote:

(2) The amount of a benefit that is payable in respect of a person referred to in paragraph 3(1)(b) in respect of any benefit year is the amount set out in paragraph (1)(a) or (b), as the case may be—

The government is once more creating the impression it is going to pay sensational and stupendous amounts, something that will at last enable families which face difficult economic conditions to extricate themselves from their stagnation, when this is not true. Once more, Mr. Speaker, this bill tries to mislead—

**Mr. Ouellet:** Speak about it to the minister.

**Mr. Valade:** —Canadians by hiding the real intent of the government in the sense that it is obvious that this piece of legislation will be gradually and systematically self-

[Mr. Valade.]

defeating within a few years, due to the conditions with which the government has stuffed it.

• (1610)

**Mr. Ouellet:** Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member for Sainte-Marie answer a question?

**Mr. Valade:** I will answer any sensible question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

**Mr. Ouellet:** While opposing this bill, is the hon. member for Sainte-Marie aware that through this government measure almost 80 per cent of the families in his riding will see their allowances doubled or tripled?

**Mr. Valade:** Mr. Speaker, this is not only false but another lie which must be emphasized because I know that it will be used by the Liberal party to defeat a Quebec member—the member for Sainte-Marie—because in Montreal it has been found out that the Liberals have betrayed the people, that one person is trying to set the record straight—the member for Sainte-Marie.

The Liberal party has only one thing in mind: to use all means available to stifle, to knock out the member who, even though he can speak on behalf of the people, is subjected to this government's demagoguery and dictatorship.

Mr. Speaker, I will reply to the question of the hon. member for Papineau. Not only will the people of my riding not see their benefits doubled or tripled—because in Sainte-Marie some people do not or barely earn the minimum required under the law—but the 33 per cent deduction on each \$100 above \$4,500 will automatically deprive most large families of the benefits that the member for Papineau is saying the law will give them.

In fact in Sainte-Marie, not one father of four, five or six children does not earn at least \$5,000 or \$6,000 a year. He could not make both ends meet otherwise. And when it comes to \$5,000, \$6,000 or \$6,500, the 33 per cent deduction clause for each \$100 excess income means that the possible income of large families will decrease by that much. In my opinion, it would be wrong for the parliamentary secretary to say flippantly that the entire population of the Sainte-Marie or Saint-Jacques constituencies or of the Montreal constituencies as a whole will profit from the legislation. It is untrue, because due to inflation, the increased cost of living, the wage raises which have been added to the income, the inflationary pressures, this new system will not enable the heads of large families in labour constituencies such as mine to receive more than they do now. The parliamentary secretary knows it quite well and his intervention is only meant to alter the interpretation of the present legislation.

**Mr. Ouellet:** Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask another little question to the member for Sainte-Marie.

His comments show that he does not understand the legislation at all. I ask him if he would be kind enough to invite me in his constituency at the next elections; I would