

Family Allowances Act, 1973

not attempt to use your money for trade. It is fine perhaps if you are a citizen of a little island, totally insulated or if you are perhaps on the moon. That is the policy of the Tories. If there is to be the slightest impact from the six and five, if there is any evidence that you must suffer a little because of inflation, the answer is to index. That is the answer of the Opposition. Cut out somebody's trip to Paris. That is a waste. Restore full indexing on Family Allowances, full indexing on old age pensions and full indexing on the Public Service salaries. But the Opposition lacks the courage of its convictions. Opposition Members get up on second reading and support the six and five program. At least the New Democrats, whom I respect, philosophically said, "We don't support it." The Conservatives said, "We support it in general, but we are against every single segment and practice of the program."

Mr. Taylor: You are in bed with the NDP.

Mr. Mackasey: The Tories said, "We are for the six and five, but don't dare touch the salaries of the civil servants."

Mr. Taylor: Why don't you move over with the NDP?

Mr. Mackasey: The Hon. Member from Ottawa said, "Don't dare attack the Family Allowances that go to people whose income is over \$25,000. Don't attack old age pensions, including those that go to people who do not need it because of the GIS." In other words, it is typical Conservative policy. They say, "We support the program but we are relating to every single person who is affected by it." They wonder why they have been in the wilderness for so many years. They have been in the wilderness because there has been no sincerity in their arguments. They underestimate the intelligence of the Canadians. They underestimate the sophistication of the people watching this program. Their argument that somehow you can eliminate inflation by indexing everything, that somehow inflation is no longer a problem or never was a problem, is not acceptable. If inflation was never a problem, why is it that day after day after day in this House the Opposition, carrying out its legitimate role, hammers at the Government because of inflation? If we were blamed when inflation was 12 per cent, 13 per cent and 14 per cent, then we have a right to take the credit when inflation has been reduced to 7.2 per cent because of the success of the six and five program.

Mr. Taylor: Yell louder, it is a weak point.

Mr. Mackasey: Anybody who cares about the under-employed, who cares about the working class, who wants to see this country prosper, knows that we have to get inflation down if we are to continue being a competitive nation in the field of exports.

Mr. Taylor: Spending \$800 a day?

Mr. Mackasey: Do you think we can compete, Mr. Speaker? The Hon. Member over there always makes good speeches on his seat. If he would turn the other way and talk to himself, we would all be happy.

Do you think for a minute that we can continue to compete with other countries that are mineral-wealthy, Mr. Speaker? Do you think we will be priced out of existence because built into our export prices is an abnormally high level of inflation? Does anybody here think we can regain our markets in the United States, as that country recovers, in the field of copper and mineral wealth? You would understand that better than most of us, Mr. Speaker, representing your riding if, built into the price of copper per pound, or into the price of lead, wood or lumber, or whatever we export were, X number of cents or dollars because of the inflationary factor in this country. No one in his right mind would suggest that 18 months ago inflation was not the number one issue in the country, just as no one in his right mind today would deny the fact that unemployment is the first issue before us now.

I appear angry, but I am not. However, I do get angry when I see the callous efforts of Members opposite who prey on the fears of those people less able to speak out for themselves in this Parliament. I feel very angry when Parliamentarians leave the mistaken impression that somehow we are restricting Family Allowances when, in fact, every single person who needs that Family Allowance, as evidenced by their income, will be better off at the end of the year because of the combination. Two out of three will be better off because of the combination of their indexed Family Allowance—not indexed quite to the extent it used to be—together with the Child Tax Credit allowance of \$50, and every single recipient of Family Allowance will be better off.

I should not be impatient with the arguments of the Conservative Party. I heard them last year, I heard them three years ago, I heard them five years ago and I heard them 15 years ago. Sooner or later the classical right wing of that Party emerges, not only in the House but in caucus and in conventions. Those few in that Party who think progressively, who do care about people and who understand what I am trying to say—that we have a responsibility to people—are subjugated, shoved aside and their spokesmen come forward. There is only a minority in that Party who come forward and suggest that somehow inflation would have disappeared if we curtailed trips to Paris, lessons in French or something else that appeals to the prejudices of people.

Miss Bégin: That's it.

Mr. Mackasey: That is the unspoken thing that bothers me.

I want to say in conclusion that we who concern ourselves with people, particularly the Minister of National Health and Welfare, have come out of this whole exercise much greater, in my opinion, than when it began. We have been able to reduce inflation in this country from over 12 per cent to 7 per cent. Never mind the reason.

Mr. Keeper: Never mind the reason?

Mr. Mackasey: It is unfortunate that unemployment had to grow as it did, not only here but also in Tory Great Britain, astronomically in that country, in Germany, in France, in the