

Child, One Chance", refers to a recent survey conducted by Statistics Canada. The council stresses in its report the importance of food costs to different types of families. For instance, a family of four with an income of \$12,000 spends about 15 per cent of its disposable income on food, whereas the same family of four with a yearly income of \$4,000 spends 32 per cent of its income on food. Since controls in a world shortage situation can only lead to reductions in output and to rationing, it seems clear that the most rational course of action is to adopt measures which will lead to increases in agricultural output, which will lead in turn to lower prices and in the meantime to put more dollars into the pockets of Canadian consumers so that they may face increased food costs.

● (1610)

If we wish to have a stable and growing agricultural industry, farmers must be able to make investment decisions with the assurance that they will receive reasonable rewards in return for their labour and investment. Stable prices will lead to rational investment decisions. But it is incorrect to believe that farmers will produce in abundance if their investment decisions are to be made in a situation where prices vary wildly from year to year, and if they cannot have some certainty that when their produce is marketed they will not be subject to extreme highs or extreme lows in prices.

The increase in family allowances to \$12 is good news for the 3.5 million Canadian families responsible for the 7.5 million Canadian children. This measure, along with the reduction in taxes announced in February which average out to about 12 per cent, reductions in tariffs on imported foods, the substantial increases in universal old age pensions from \$82 to \$105 within a few months, subsidies for milk and bread, the full indexing of pensions paid by the government of Canada, are important and effective measures.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to pass in silence over the magnificent work carried out by the Minister of National Health and Welfare in the area of family allowances. Not so long ago, some newsmen saw in this federal program the stumbling block for Canada. They nearly wanted to bring this country to an end because the federal government suggested increasing the amount paid to the people of this country. Thank God ridicule does not kill for otherwise Quebec would have too few editorialists. The discussions held between federal and provincial authorities in this area show instead that following discussions and bargaining, although points of views may differ on some questions, the real interests of our people shall prevail over jurisdictional disputes, while respecting the necessary autonomy of each level of government.

Once these disputes have been settled, editorial writers no longer mention them. They prefer looking for other issues which they may consider again as as many stumbling blocks for Canada. We may some day come to realize that a certain level of dynamic tension in federal-provincial relations is only normal and healthy, when this tension reflects differing points of view which are finally reconciled in the light of universally acceptable solutions.

Family Allowances

The minister, in agreement with his provincial colleagues, has succeeded in that field in devising a formula benefitting the Canadian people, while complying with provincial government priorities and interests. This is no victory of one level of government over another; it is only a victory for all those who believe in a Canada whose main objective is to afford development possibilities to all its citizens.

[English]

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, I have made several speeches on family allowance legislation in the five years that I have been in this House. Along with the number of questions and motions that I have put forth, I am sure this results in a lengthy listing in the index to *Hansard* under my name. I hope therefore, that this will be one of the last occasions on which I shall have to ask for the passage of all stages of Bill C-223 as quickly as possible so that we can get on with the new bill that will give increases up to an average of \$20 to all children in Canada on a universal basis. We hope, as the minister promised, that this will be implemented in time for the cheques to go out in January. The hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie) has indicated the co-operation of our party on all social security measures introduced in the House this week which will help relieve some of the suffering of those who must rely on the government for assistance. I am sure that all hon. members who speak will confirm this co-operation.

I do not think I have to remind most hon. members, but I feel it is necessary to point out that this is the fourth bill which has been introduced on family allowance legislation. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have had four bills since the government introduced its first white paper on income security almost three years ago, in November, 1970. Since that date, we have had a white paper and an orange paper; we have had numerous studies to point out what should be done under social security programs for the country and we have had four bills. At this stage, three years later, the needy children of our country have not seen, nor have the mothers of those children seen, one additional copper to the amount afforded under the family and youth allowance measures which were introduced back in 1945. Bill C-264 and Bill C-170, which were introduced in the last session, are now commonly referred to as the FISP fiasco. I could spend many long hours reviewing the circumstances which we faced over many long months in dealing with those two bills which came to nothing through the incompetence of the government, but in order to speed up second reading I will await the opportunity to elaborate when second reading of Bill C-211 comes before the House again.

I should like to remind the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) what happened to the FISP bill. He can say what he wants, but if I understood him correctly, he indicated that it was the New Democratic Party which prevented the bill from becoming law. At that time, the New Democratic Party, along with our party, tried to introduce many amendments to the FISP bill which contained many inequities. It was a bad bill, but I can confirm that the majority of our members were prepared to vote for it because at least it would have helped the many children in the country. It was the hon. member for Trini-