

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

PROPOSED STANDING ORDERS TO GOVERN CONDUCT OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

On the order: Government notices of motion:

October 30—The Deputy Prime Minister and President of Privy Council—The following proposed motion:—That the document entitled *Proposed Standing Orders of the House and Rules of the Senate* tabled Monday, October 30, 1978 (Sessional Paper No. 304-7/2), be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. I believe I overlooked, under government notices of motion this afternoon, that pursuant to section 2 of Standing Order 21 the notice of motion standing in the name of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Chrétien) is transferred to and ordered for consideration under government orders later this day or at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It is the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. MacEachen).

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry. Is it in the name of the Deputy Prime Minister?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Yes.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

INCOME TAX ACT

AMENDMENT TO PROVIDE FOR CHILD TAX CREDIT

The House resumed, from Tuesday, October 31, consideration of the motion of Mr. Chrétien that Bill C-10, to amend the Income Tax Act to provide for a child tax credit and to amend the Family Allowances Act, be read the second time and referred to committee of the whole.

Mr. David Crombie (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, first of all let me thank you once again for the opportunity to speak on this matter. For those members who are unaware of it, I had the opportunity for four minutes last night to begin my speech. I took that opportunity to pass on my thanks and my compliments to those who have assisted me in the past. I also indicated that I was very happy to be able to speak today with respect to Bill C-10, particularly within the context of the guaranteed income supplement debated last week and the forthcoming discussions with respect to Bill C-2. As I indicated last night it allows me to talk about two nations. I recognize that this caused some difficulty because some people felt I might engage in a constitutional debate. Of course my purpose is otherwise.

I wish to talk about two other kinds of nations. In fact I steal the phrase from a book by a former prime minister of Great Britain in the nineteenth century, Benjamin Disraeli, who was not only a politician, as you recall, but was also a

Family Allowances

novelist. He used the novel in the way many people in the nineteenth century did, and that is to say, to make social comment. He wrote a novel called "Sybil." In that novel he described the England of his boyhood. He described two nations. They were two nations that had almost no intercourse one with the other, and had very little sympathy one with each other. Indeed, they were two nations that were ignorant of each other's habits, ignorant of each other's thoughts, and ignorant of each other's feelings. It is as though they were dwelling in two different time warps and on two different planets.

In fact the two nations were formed by different breeding, different upbringing. They were fed by different food. They were ordered by different manners and different mores and they were governed by different laws and different regulations. They were, indeed as he called them, the nation of the rich and the nation of the poor. They had very little connection except in two ways, one in the work-place where they met basically on the staircase, one coming from upstairs and one coming from downstairs. They also met socially through the institution of charity because, in the nineteenth century, at least in England, the institution of charity was the basic way in which they followed biblical injunction to look after the poor, the lame, the halt, and the blind.

Today, in this country, as the hon. Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin) indicated happily, Canadians need not starve or beg in the streets for food, for shelter or for clothing. Our old people do not die because they are deprived of proper medical attention. Medical care and sickness are not the catastrophe they once were in terms of wiping out a family's lifelines. So we have come a great distance. We have gone far in developing not only a social conscience, but also in realizing the importance of social security. But, like any long journey, it is wise to pause to see what we have built and to reflect on what it means to the people for whom the benefits are supposed to be forthcoming. I think now is a good time to do that, particularly in light of the comments made by both ministers yesterday.

I believe the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Chrétien) indicated that this was a bill involving major social reform, a major restructuring. I believe the Minister of National Health and Welfare called it a revolutionary bill. So perhaps now is a good time to talk about where we have been and where we might want to go.

My own view is that we have two nations still with us. That is an oversimplification, and indeed it is not helpful to call them the nation of the rich and the nation of the poor. But it is helpful to understand them as the nation of the haves and the nation of the have-nots. When I say that, in order to appreciate the point as I do, it is necessary to understand that being a have or a have-not in Canada is not only an economic condition, it is in fact a condition which is moral, psychological, emotional, and indeed spiritual.