

*Registered Charities*

Fisher) has said in the contradictory remarks he has made on this very important topic. We have heard from the community bulletin board of the Hon. Member for Mississauga North and I did not think that was the intention of this particular piece of legislation.

The 1960s and 1970s were the golden age of Government programs. If there is anything we should have learned from that golden age of Government programs it is that Governments fail. Contrary to what the Hon. Member for Mississauga North said, the problem with Government programs is that you cannot depend on them, rather than that you can. It depends upon the caprice of the Government. On the one hand, the Hon. Member for Mississauga North says one can depend on them. On the other hand, he says that the problem with these community agencies is that they should not depend on Government grants. The Hon. Member does not have it straight. The problem with Government programs, I say again, is that you cannot always depend on them.

It is ironic, Mr. Speaker, that Government programs grew at the time of greatest prosperity. It was in the mid-60s to the 1970s that Government programs grew. Is it not ironic that it is during the times of recession that the Government programs fail? The Government programs pull back, and the people who need help the most get the least during these times when they ought to be able to depend on them. Therefore, it is a time like that when the voluntary agencies and charitable organizations are most necessary. They should not have to depend on the caprice of the federal Government to feed them.

● (1730)

I cannot understand the audacity of the Hon. Member for Mississauga North in listing such organizations as New Horizons and Canada Works as voluntary agencies, when in fact they are Government grant programs, just the thing that we think ought to be avoided.

First, I would say that we need to encourage voluntary agencies and charitable organizations because they are most capable of reaching the most needy. They are the ones that are out there in the community, meeting the people where the needs are the greatest. All one must do is look at the agenda of people's law school, trying to help those who cannot help themselves because they do not have the mechanism. Government cannot do it.

Second, Government is not the cheapest way of doing it. Lest people think that I will attack Canadian Government programs, I want to give an illustration by way of our neighbours to the south, the United States. It is no accident that the highest per capita income in the United States is in the community surrounding Washington, D.C. Who lives in those communities? They are the highly paid administrators of Government programs. I think I have my history right when I say that those Government programs sprang up during the years of Lyndon Johnson, and rightly thereafter, with his war on poverty. He did wage a war on poverty. It was a poverty of Government administrators, because they are well paid, thank

you very much. Government agencies are simply not very cheap.

If one wants to have the work done well, and if one wants to have it done economically, one must turn to the voluntary agencies, to these self-help organizations. That is why the Hon. Member for Waterloo has been promoting in this House a very good program called the "Give and Take". We use that same principle for political parties. We seem to think it is good for political parties to be able to get a tax reduction so that they can operate in an accountable way. If it is good for political parties, why should it not be good for charitable organizations and self-help agencies, the voluntary organizations? As the Hon. Member for Waterloo can attest, the "Give and Take" program has been shown to be a more accountable, cheaper way of funding agencies than the grant system. Why should the Government not take the best way of doing it and do it through the "Give and Take" program?

Finally, I want to mention a point raised by the Hon. Member for Mississauga North. He complimented, by heaping encomiums on the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Evans), the way the Bill would be dealt with in committee.

**Mr. McGrath:** Would you repeat that?

**Mr. Friesen:** Encomiums, yes; it is a great Latinized English word!

**Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich):** Tell us what it is!

**Mr. McGrath:** Spell it!

**Mr. Friesen:** He heaped these praises, these great praises.

Now that I have taken 30 seconds to define the word, may I have 30 seconds more in which to say what I wanted to say? He heaped too much praise—I know the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre can take a lot of compliments, but even he had a hard time handling these—saying that the Bill would be dealt with expeditiously in the committee. I want to say to the Hon. Member for Mississauga North that almost to the day four years ago I presented a motion to the House that was unanimously passed dealing with tax breaks for the parents of handicapped children. It passed on to the Finance Department. That motion has not as yet been dealt with by the Department of Finance. We have had an Obstacles Committee submitting two reports, but it has not yet dealt with the motion. Regardless of how efficient and interested the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre is concerning the work of this particular committee, and the necessity that he may see in dealing with the report, I want to see some action before I believe all of those encomiums that he has heaped on the Hon. Member.

**Mr. McGrath:** I am not sure that that is parliamentary language!

**Mr. Friesen:** Again, I want to close by complimenting the Hon. Member for Waterloo on the work that he has done and by saying that this Bill turns the attention of the Government in the right direction and, hopefully, will encourage the Government to see the value of voluntary agencies so that these