

Whether you apply for the guaranteed income supplement, for veterans allowance or any other means tested program, there is a stigma attaching to it which a good many people are reluctant to accept. We have discarded universality in the case of the old age pensioner, and I hope we will not do so in regard to our young people today. The minister did not give the House one legitimate reason for not raising the payment from the \$6 and \$8 initially set to \$15 and \$18 instead of involving us in the complications of a computerized society and dividing people into categories.

The regulations that would be established to administer this complex and confusing program of youth maintenance will at the same time bring with them additional problems. I would have thought the minister would have given the House facts and figures instead of trying to make the argument that if you supported universality you were only concerned to give those in the middle income class, as he called it, those earning \$7,000 and up, the rights they have had for a period of time when Canada's gross national product was considerably below what it is today. Certainly, today we are in a position to give our young people a decent and reasonable family allowance program at the levels indicated.

I hope those other members of the House in favour of universality, who have voted in the past for universality and have seen the merit of universality in Canada, will again vote to retain universality and will support not only this motion but the increase that is long overdue to the youth of this country.

---

## MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

### POWER

#### EFFECTS OF JAMES BAY HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

**Mr. Speaker:** Before recognizing the hon. member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Rose), perhaps the House would allow me a moment to refer to the motion made earlier today by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken) under the provisions of Standing Order 26.

The Chair indicated that consultations were to take place later on. These consultations have been proceeded with, and as a result it was suggested, and is now decided, that the debate should take place tomorrow afternoon at two o'clock.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### FAMILY INCOME SECURITY PLAN

#### MEASURE TO PROVIDE BENEFITS IN RESPECT OF CHILDREN

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Munro that Bill C-170, to provide for the payment of benefits in respect of children, be read the second time

### *Family Income Security Plan*

and referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Lewis (p. 1448).

**Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West):** Mr. Speaker, hon. members opposite need not fear that I shall prolong this debate. However, as an elected member I do feel I have an obligation to speak, on behalf of the people I represent, on this very important bill. I realize, of course, that at this stage of the debate the ground has been pretty thoroughly raked over and any convincing that might have been done of hon. members opposite has perhaps already been accomplished.

I, as I suppose are many other Canadians, am a little tantalized by the prospect of selectivity when the explanation for it is that we are going to deny this extra money to those who really do not need it and in turn use the money to benefit those who do. This would be a program that might bear some public support. On this basis the minister, through this particular legislation, is attempting to seek the approval of many Canadians who are concerned about what I consider to be faulty administration and lack of equity in some of the programs we have at the moment. However, after thinking the matter over I have rejected the concept of selectivity, though I admit its initial appeal, on the ground that the purity of the concept of universality—and I feel the same goes for the old age pensions—should not be tarnished in one area just because there is a lack of equity in another, namely in the field of taxation.

• (1640)

I think the argument goes something like this: Why should H. R. MacMillan or some other magnate get the old age pension? He does not need it because he has millions of dollars. The answer by members of this party has always been that if these benefits were applied on the basis of a means test, an application for old age pension or family allowances would be undignified and would label people as being poor, or at least unsuccessful. It is also suggested that we will get the money back in income tax in any event, and we will not have to employ an army of snoopers and bureaucrats. I believe that is the main argument in respect of universality as opposed to selectivity. The fact is that the affluent in our country have far more means at their disposal to avoid their fair share of equitable taxation than the poor. Therefore the argument of universality tends to break down because it is quite easy for these people to avoid taxation. I am certain that many members of the other place are quite familiar with the business of setting up dummy corporations, foundations and other kinds of financial manipulations to avoid taxation.

If you give \$80 a month to "Mr. X", and I will not name any affluent individual as I am not personally acquainted with any, he will not pay it back in taxes. I was initially moved by the fact that we, in fact, have a tax structure and perhaps this was the way to get at the situation. I am no longer convinced of that because I do not think it is worth destroying the purity of the concept of universality and its efficiency just because some other area of government policy, particularly on taxation, happens to have some weaknesses in terms of equity. The so-called tax reform was rammed through at Christmas time, and has