

teed income is related to what it will buy in the market in food, shelter, and the other necessities of life. It is obvious that this will vary in different parts of Canada, and under many different circumstances in individual cases.

The idea of guaranteed income raises all sorts of questions yet unanswered. In what manner should the level of the guaranteed income be set? The Economic Council of Canada has been widely quoted with respect to its assessment of what the poverty level should be. I have not seen how that level was arrived at, but obviously it is only one person's or a few persons' opinion. Obviously, it will be open to all sorts of opinions and variations. Will it reduce production significantly and, if so, will the benefits received be an adequate compensation for the degree of loss of production should this occur? Will it cause the freezing of workers in areas or jobs, when they should move either their location or their occupation?

In the proposed guaranteed income supplement with the modest built-in incentive to earn more money, there will be an attempt to keep the older worker productive. As such it will be of some interest and value in the assessment of what effect a guaranteed income can have on our productivity as a whole. But it will only be indicative of a segment of our population who, at the end of their productive years will be induced to continue in work habits that they have been used to over the years. Experience here, I would emphasize, will be of little value in the experience rating of incentive poverty programs as a whole, mainly because of the age group to which it will be applicable. There are some other features of the guaranteed income supplement proposals with which I would be in general agreement, and will study them more fully in committee.

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I certainly wish that the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro) were here today so that he could hear the remarks of the different members, but I understand he is away on government business. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) says he is meeting the provinces. However, we have the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Isabelle) here, and I will direct my remarks to him with all the fire and brimstone of a Methodist preacher, so I am sure the hon. member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton (Mr. McBride) will listen attentively.

I would have said to the minister that he has made a mistake with regard to the title of Bill C-202, which it is said is an act to amend the Old Age Security Act. I would suggest it is an act to redistribute old age poverty. I suggest the minister should make the appropriate change in the title because really the government is playing a game of charades with the Canadian people.

The minister is saying, "I am going to give you a Christmas turkey," when in fact he is really giving our senior citizens an old pigeon. It is not costing the government one penny to bring forth this bill, Mr. Speaker. Here we have a government that brings forth a white paper on income security for Canadians, and then takes a

Old Age Security

so-called bold first step with regard to implementing its recommendations. All Canadians should be told that Bill C-202 is not costing them one penny. What it really is doing is redistributing poverty amongst senior citizens.

I would think the Parliamentary Secretary would not be happy if he really knew the impact of this bill. Yesterday, in rather glowing terms, he said, "You know, this white paper on income security for Canadians is a masterpiece." I would say it is a masterpiece of deception. It is really a social fraud that is being committed on Canadians.

I notice that the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Foster) is in his seat, Mr. Speaker. This morning he directed a question to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) seeking to learn the intention of the government with regard to changing the income tax exemption for children in families earning over \$10,000. The hon. member knows that the government was clever enough to put through amendments to the Income Tax Act recently, which will mean that families earning over \$10,000 will not be able to claim \$550 per child exemption as they were able to do if they did not get family allowance, and instead will only be able to claim \$300. Mr. Speaker, I will be delighted to complete my remarks this afternoon.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. It being one o'clock this House stands adjourned until two o'clock this afternoon.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Speaker, prior to the luncheon recess I mentioned that I was sorry the Minister of National Health and Welfare was not present but apparently he is away on government business. However, he is ably represented by his Parliamentary Secretary.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gilbert: I shall therefore direct my remarks to the hon. Parliamentary Secretary, and I am sure he will pass along my words of wisdom to the minister. I said, Mr. Speaker, that Bill C-202 should not be called an act to amend the Old Age Security Act but should have a new name; it should be called an act to redistribute old age poverty because that is exactly what it is. I maintain that the government is playing a charade with the Canadian public and in trying to play the part of Santa Claus, instead of giving turkey for Christmas it is giving crow.

The Parliamentary Secretary claimed yesterday that the white paper on income security for Canadians is a masterpiece. I contend that it is a masterpiece of deception, and that the government really is committing a social fraud on Canadians. Bill C-202 is the first step in an attempt to implement this masterpiece of deception on the Canadian public, Mr. Speaker.