

*Family Allowances Act, 1973*

I would like to quote from a survey by the National Citizens' Coalition in 1976, because I have been listening to the Official Opposition's speeches, led off by the Hon. Member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald). All these candidates for the Conservative Party leadership were surveyed in 1976 by the National Citizens' Coalition. The survey reads: "Question: In the case of universal welfare, should any of the following plans be altered to provide for the needy only, unemployment insurance, medicare, Canada Pension Plan and baby bonuses?" The Hon. Member for Yellowhead (Mr. Clark), the Leader of the Opposition, said it should apply to the needy only in the case of unemployment insurance and, would you believe it, baby bonuses. The Hon. Member for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser) said it should apply only to the needy, UIC and baby bonuses.

A former Member, one James Gillies, said it should apply to UIC and baby bonuses.

The former Liberal Member cum Tory, now cum Liberal, one Paul Hellyer, said it should apply to the Canada Pension Plan. He was a blue Tory. The first three were supposed to be red Tories. He is a blue Tory and he said it might be simpler to tax off the excess on baby bonuses rather than introduce another means test.

Then we have the Hon. Member for Kingston and the Islands. She said there was only one program which should be provided for the needy only, and I listened to her speech carefully about universality. Would you believe, Mr. Speaker, she said the program was baby bonuses.

Then there is the former Tory cum Liberal cum Chairman of the CNR, Jack Horner. He said, UIC and baby bonuses.

Then there was another gentleman who came out of the woodwork or from under a rock by the name of R. C. Quitten-ton. He said all four should be restricted to the needy only.

Another blue Tory, the Hon. Member for York-Peel, who, some have said makes Genghis Khan look like a raving left-winger, was the one who had the real radical left-of-centre proposal. He said, "Universality is preferable to a means test. Means tests are demeaning." That was the Hon. Member for York-Peel, can you believe it? He said, "Income tax tends to equalize all programs."

Out of those eight names of the leadership candidates for the Tory Party, the Hon. Member for York-Peel (Mr. Stevens) was the most progressive, and he can quite justifiably get up and vote against this Bill. And if Mr. Hellyer were here, he could justifiably vote against this Bill. But if the Hon. Members for Yellowhead, Vancouver South, Kingston and the Islands have had a change of heart, have changed their minds, then I wish they would get up and say so. Everyone has a right to change their mind, but, as my colleague said earlier today, this business of continually trying to work both sides of the street has to be shown up for what it is, the worst kind of hypocrisy.

Some Grits are saying, hear, hear. These are the ones who like to brag about how they brought in the law for these universal programs. There were several of them. They had to be politically blackmailed by the CCF and the NDP and J. S. Woodsworth, to get them in. In fact, in the famous elections of 1945 and 1949, when Mackenzie King and the Liberal Party campaigned on the CCF platform, we found it very frustrating, but we are glad they did those things. But in their efforts to get back up in the polls, Mr. Speaker, these so-called Liberals, these middle-of-the-rovers, these progressives who say they have inaugurated these untouchable universal programs, are implementing the Conservative programs. Who is it that is agreeing with the Hon. Member for Kingston and the Islands, the Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead and the Hon. Member for Vancouver South? It is the Liberal Party and the Liberal Government, Mr. Speaker. Universality of social welfare programs, Mr. Speaker, has always been a foundation of our party. Improvements in these programs has to be a continuing objective of any government, whatever its political stripe, in this Parliament.

• (1510)

I think there is general agreement amongst all political Parties that to equalize, paying the cost for benefits of those universal programs, we are years behind in having a fair income tax system. I will not repeat the remarks of my colleague, the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap, but surely there is something wrong with an income tax system which allows tens of thousands of Canadians to avoid and evade paying their fair share of the cost of running this nation and its universal programs from which they also obtain benefits. Yet the old line so-called free enterprise governments insist on reducing expenditures at the expense of the aged and retired, including retired civil servants.

Later we will be dealing with a Bill concerning retired federal civil servants and their pensions, and I was very interested to hear at a meeting a week or so ago the replies of Members of Parliament from the Tory and Liberal Parties on that one. It is so obvious, Mr. Speaker, that our income tax system needs a thorough overhauling. We need to blow the dust off the Carter Royal Commission report of 1966. Carter started to go public in support of his report, but the poor man died of cancer. However, there again is the most definitive job which has ever been done on our tax system. We collect taxes from Canadians based on the income they earn, no matter how they earn it, in order to pay for universal programs so that our aged, sick, disadvantaged and children are treated with some amount of civility.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, people are more important than profits. Decency has a priority over dollars. If that principle is incorporated in our universal programs and our income tax system, we can then be really proud; we can take our place amongst the nations of the world as a leader. We need not use