

actively support this legislation. However, I am somewhat saddened by the posturing which has been engendered by that party. Indeed, the posturing was very well expressed by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) in the debate of October 15 when he claimed complete credit for this piece of legislation. He said the following, as recorded at page 6881 of *Hansard* for October 15:

If some of my friends in various parts of the House think that I am being too generous—

Indeed, he was most agreeable to the legislation.

—in welcoming this legislation, it must be obvious that the reason we welcome it is that we know we are responsible for it.

He expressed those words with great relish. However, I would point out that the day after, yesterday, he was promptly corrected by one of his own backbenchers. The hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. Harney) indicated that he recognized—indeed, he recognizes it because it is an historic fact—that our social security legislation is a product of Liberal governments and is a Liberal philosophy. As recorded at page 6909 of *Hansard*, the hon. member for Scarborough West said:

As a final compliment, Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the minister and the government on his and their return to the policies of the late Right Hon. Lester B. Pearson and the late Right Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie King.

Of course he is right historically. We accept the commendation. We accept the recognition by the party to the left—I stand with my back to you, Mr. Speaker, when I say “to the left”—that the Liberal Party has generated socially conscious legislation. I refer to the old age security legislation, the unemployment insurance legislation, the veterans allowance legislation and the family allowance legislation. All these pieces of legislation which have evolved, and have been consolidated, improved and approved throughout the years were introduced in this House by a Liberal government. There have been some improvements. There have been contributions from private members of other parties. There is no doubt of that. I will not deny there have been contributions from Conservative members in respect of this legislation. I have seen in committee how effectively they work. However, their principles have not changed; they are still there.

No one pretends to know everything about any given topic, so every piece of legislation when it is introduced is not invariably right and can be improved by this House. This is indeed a parliament and it can work only if the government introduces legislation. It is recognized in our parliamentary system that the government is responsible for this legislation, so, for members of the NDP to claim they are responsible for it is indeed misleading and most inaccurate.

The minister said that there will be an increase of \$840 million in total capital expenditure for this program. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that is because the economy of the country can absorb this additional expenditure. This is the time when family allowances should be increased. Indeed, the government chose this time since the economy is booming; our productive capacity is up to 94 per cent. There is demand for a greater quantity of Canadian goods. There is need for additional investment in manufacturing and processing, and indeed in the

Family Allowances

extraction industries. No one can deny this. We have a very rich economy. The tax revenue is proof of this. The indexing of income tax announced by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner) is another indication of the substantial revenue available to the Canadian government and the Canadian people. Now is the time when this legislation should have been introduced.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party—and I would like to emphasize the word “new”—was not even here when the Liberals were legislating on these basic principles.

And I should like to point out to the House that they are now claiming responsibility for the bill before us. This reminds me, Mr. Speaker, of a fable by the great poet of two hundred years ago, Lafontaine, who, with his pen, reached across two centuries to describe these people to the left of the spectrum. I quote:

Climbing a hill through sand, as though the load were lead,
Scorched by burning sun directly overhead,
Six horses dragged a coach with a lurch.
Women, a monk, as well as old folk were walking,
Yet the sweating, blowing horses were balking
When a fly buzzed toward them determined to perch;
Convinced that noisiness could goad the horses on,
Stung one, stung all, sure that what she had done
Could move the weight at a bound.
She rode on the coach pole; soon the driver's nose smarted,
As the wheels were turning round
And the vehicle started.
Then insisting that credit be laid at her door,
She would rush to and fro like a sergeant till spent,
Who must urge his men forward wherever they went,
While claiming the honor of winning the war.
The fly complained that what she had done,
Was a task for them all and not for her alone.
Heavy work each should do had been left to her.
The monk had let matins be his share;
They took a long time. A light heart overflowed,
But song can't move coaches along the road!
Pestering each ear, Dame Fly must incommode,
Buzzing in foolhardihood!
At the top of the hill the tired horses delayed.
“Better stop for a time! Take a breath,” the fly said.
“Since I've guided you up to the level again,
My good horses, admit that I've been under strain.”
So consummate boors, too brash to be lessoned,
Making disturbance everywhere,
Worry themselves with a world of care—

As pests whose departure one longs to have hastened.

This, Mr. Speaker, is an accurate description of the situation and of the position taken by the New Democratic Party. This fly wants to claim all responsibility for the legislation brought before this House.

● (1540)

[*English*]

I have heard that a number of times before. I have been told by all members of that party to whom I have spoken that they are responsible for the legislation which is now