

country who depend on youth allowances—unfortunately, there are many of them—that we have a policy to meet the problem, not just a policy that adds to the inflationary picture. We must tell them that they do not need to look to governments all the time, but that they can become self-sufficient. We must tell the heads of families that there is an end to increasing prices and to the crush of inflation. We must tell members of unions and, more importantly, workers in this country who are not members of unions that they can expect that the dollar they bargained for in 1973 will be worth something in 1974.

This is the challenge that this government had on September 4, 1973, and it is the challenge on which the government turned its back. Instead we have to deal, rather than with a policy of firm foundation, one of lasting worth, with yet another Trudeau band-aid measure.

**An hon. Member:** What would you suggest?

**Mr. Baker:** If the hon. member was not in the House when my leader spoke, then I suggest he read *Hansard* for that day. I would then ask him to consider my leader's speech in the quiet of his room and to balance it against the speech of his own. If he is an honest man, I think he will come to the proper conclusion.

I do not intend to prolong this debate much longer, I am sure you will be delighted to know, Mr. Speaker, but I do want to say to those who would care to listen, and to listen with their ears rather than their mouths, that there is something that can be done in this country. All the wisdom in this country does not end with the treasury benches. There is an alternative to stopgap measures to fight a problem that the government of the day has decided, with the support of the NDP, cannot be fought. I do not believe that in this land of plenty, this land of such great potential, we should be saddled with a government so devoid of imagination and compassion that the only thing they can offer the people of Canada is a stopgap attempt of the sort described in the *Financial Times* which I have quoted.

In an effort to bring this matter on, and knowing that the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) is interested in getting his band-aid plastered on a sickly patient, I shall sit down. In the interests of those who must be protected from the inadequacies of this government, I intend to support this legislation.

**Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this bill. Like everybody else, I suppose I am in favour of motherhood, too. In fact, I am not sure whether any of us has the intestinal fortitude to vote against the bill. In any event, I listened with astonishment and amazement to the hon. member—I am sorry, but I cannot remember his riding—who suggested that a reasonable alternative would be to raise—

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Edmonton-Strathcona.

**Mr. Leggatt:** Yes, Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Roche)—who suggested that we should raise the minimum wage as a solution to the problem of inflation. About 10 per cent of the workers of this country are governed by federal minimum wage legislation, and almost all of them are above

### Family Allowances

the minimum wage. So this would be a completely useless step. Talk about band-aid! That is not even a band-aid; that is a piece of scotch tape.

There are a couple of things in the bill about which I am a little concerned and have some reservations. One is the non-taxable aspect of this emergency measure which will last until the January, 1974, provisions, when the family allowance will go up to \$20 per child. Frankly, I cannot understand why this could not have been made taxable and put at a higher level on the same principle. I think most hon. members accept the principle of taxability. The concept of universality with taxability seems to me to combine the element of fairness with the avoidance of an unnecessary bureaucracy to manage the system.

The major reason for my support of this bill, and I think for the support of many members of my party, is that it really means a redistribution of income next year of about \$800 million. That is a significant figure in terms of social justice and equity in this country and I welcome the bill on that basis.

The other reservation I have is one about which I think we should all ask ourselves, namely, whether increasing family allowances encourages larger families. I think it should be perfectly clear that larger families in this country are no longer a worth-while social goal. In fact, in view of the finite resources of this planet, I think having a large family should be classed as an anti-social act. I am delighted to see the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lang) present in the chamber this evening; he can contemplate that particular thought. After all, there is only so much to go around, and the Minister of Justice must be consuming a fairly large section of the resources of his own family at the present time.

The best scientific opinion today tells us that this country and every other country in the world is seriously overpopulated. We can take two basic assumptions which the vast majority of people everywhere will agree with and which will persuade us there is an overwhelming case for reducing world population. The first of these assumptions is that it is desirable for every industrial society, with all its benefits, to continue to exist for more than a few decades. Certainly we will not exist for much longer unless we control world population. The second assumption is that every child born into this world should have the opportunity to obtain enough to eat and to enjoy a decent standard of living. For these goals to be reached it is essential that the total demand on the world's resources be reduced.

Per capita world demand must increase if we are to get anywhere near avoiding poverty in most countries of the world. To some extent this family allowance legislation does allow per capita demand to increase; money will be made available to buy food and clothing in areas of real need. We must remember, however, that the population of the world is doubling in a period of 35 years. There are 3.8 billion people in the world today; there will be seven billion people in the world by the end of this century. The problem of inflation is clearly related to over-population. In fact, you can relate the increase in the crime rate and a great many problems that are dealt with in this chamber to this oppressive, overwhelming problem of over-population.