Old Age Security Act (No. 2)

- (e) the legislative powers of Bands and their relationship to the powers of other jurisdictions; and
- (f) the accountability to Parliament of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development for the moneys expended by or on behalf of Indian Bands;
- (g) all items referred to in section "H" of the report of the Sub-committee on Indian Women and the Indian Act;

and make recommendations in relation to the above questions in regard particularly to possible provisions of new legislation and improve administrative arrangements to apply to some or all Band Governments on reserves, taking into account the various social, economic, administrative, political and demographic situations of Indian Bands, and the views of Indian Bands in regard to administrative or legal change.

That the Committee, in carrying out its review, take into account:

- (a) the jurisdiction of the Federal Government under section 91(24) of the Constitution Act, 1867;
- (b) the recognition and affirmation of existing aboriginal and treaty rights of the aboriginal peoples in section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982;
- (c) the current economic restraint program of the Government;
- (d) the fact that a First Ministers' Conference will be held for the purpose of identifying rights of the aboriginal peoples.

That the Committee have all the powers given to Standing Committees by Section (8) of Standing Order 65;

That the Committee have the power to retain the services of expert, professional, technical and clerical staff as may be deemed necessary;

That the Committee have the power to adjourn or travel from place to place in Canada and the United States:

That, notwithstanding the usual practices of this House, if the House is not sitting when an interim or final report of the Committee is completed, the Committee may make the said report public before it is laid before the House, but that, in any case the Committee shall report to the House finally no later than the first Monday following Labour Day and,

That all the evidence adduced by both the Sub-Committee on Indian Women and the Indian Act, and the Sub-Committee on Indian Self-Government during the first session of this Parliament, be referred to the Committee.

Provided that alternates appointed pursuant to temporary Standing Orders be name later.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

OLD AGE SECURITY ACT (NO. 2)

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-131, an Act to amend the Old Age Security Act (No. 2), as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs; and the motion of Mr. Dantzer (p. 21795).

Mr. Paul E. McRae (Thunder Bay-Atikokan): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have given up a couple of minutes to have the foregoing motion adopted, because it is extremely valuable. I hope good things come out of it, as I know good things have

come out of the Committee which has been working on it of late.

To return to Bill C-131 and the amendment before the House, the notion of universality has not been debated to this point. Of course, I am speaking about Bill C-131 specifically, but generally my remarks apply to the other three Bills. Universality is the fundamental issue. There is a large, particularly vocal segment of our population in particular industries that would like to see the notion of universality dropped. Some people would like to see it dropped in all cases; some groups would like to see it dropped in certain cases. In one sense they see that Government money goes into these kinds of things. Those who think that the Government can cut its spending without touching big programs are foolish, because basically 70 per cent of our money is transferred to other Canadians. The big areas in this regard are Old Age Security, Family Allowances and other major expenditures of Government. This is the case for all Governments, whether they be provincial or federal.

The point of universality is that we all benefit from a universal program. It seems to me that this is a fundamental matter with old age pensions. We have to say to Canadians that everybody is involved, whether or not they are well-to-do. If they are well-to-do and have large incomes, we can tax some of it back; but the point is that 90 per cent to 95 per cent of Canadians base their future on the old age pension. They base it on what they can see, on the OAS and the GIS. The supplement is not universal, but they base their futures upon the basic pension which is part of their retirement program. It is extremely fundamental that it be retained.

• (1740)

It is the same when we are talking about the Family Allowance. Some people need it very badly. We have arranged that in terms of the Child Tax Credit. The basic situation is that most families, particularly when one member of the family is at home, usually the woman, find that this is the major source of income and require it to maintain the family and to give the woman some freedom. It is extremely important these programs be retained in their original shape.

In a Party convention here a month ago, someone praised me for speaking in terms of Family Allowance universality because it was necessary, and then said: "But, of course, I think there are a lot of senior citizens who do not need it". It is that kind of thinking that puts the programs in some quandary. Sure, there are some senior citizens who do not need the old age pension, and sure there are some families who do not need the Family Allowance. But if you are going to have these kinds of social service programs, you have to keep them in all cases. The real pressures that are on us today to get rid of universality because it is not necessary are what really concerns me. I wish we had spent far more time supporting the need to keep these programs in a sound way and in play and not to take away parts of them. I wish that is what the debate were about