

report of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women which made some very specific proposals in this area. The minister made no mention of the National Council on Welfare. I do not know whether he consulted that body. It seems to me that the points of view of organizations such as I have indicated should be brought to bear on this subject before a final decision is made.

I suggest there is a gap between the selectivity approach to which the minister seems to adhere and the approach of the Canadian Council on Social Development which came closer in its statement to a position of universality, relying on a fair income tax structure as a means of seeing to it that the wealthy do not get allowances they do not need.

In addition to the comments I have made about the uncertainty of this statement and the failure to take into account points of view of organizations in the field which I think are better than the minister's, I feel I must point out that it is still the kind of document, as are many of the government's documents in the field of social policy, that is geared to the concept of poverty as something that will always be with us. The minister talks about doing something for the working poor and the children of the working poor, but he seems to have no notion of getting rid of poverty altogether. I realize that we must not talk about the other place or its committee on poverty—the one that some four employees left—but having gone that far perhaps I can say that the conflict in that case was over this whole issue, whether to relieve poverty or to restructure society to abolish it.

Do we assist the poor by giving something to people because they are poor or do we adopt over-all social policies that get rid of poverty altogether? What I do not like about this selective approach of giving people allowances because their incomes are low is simply that you give money to people because they are poor and you give them so little that you keep them poor. It is time that a program like this and other programs such as old age security and all the others were geared to an over-all income program, not just income security, not just enough for people to live on because they happen to be young, out of work or poor, but a program that makes sure that all the people in this country share in the abundance which it is our capacity to produce.

I thank the minister for making this progress statement and keeping the issue out in the open. However, I suggest a great deal more thinking must be done if we are going to achieve a program which will enable all our people to live decently in a country which, after all, is a land of abundance.

[Translation]

**Mr. René Matte (Champlain):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro) has outlined very good and most welcomed projects. Indeed the government finally seems concerned about family assistance. The matter should have been discussed long before abortion, homosexuality and birth-control devices.

The realization of the just society starts with the family. It is useless to look after a score of problems

### *Opportunities for Youth Program*

without first thinking about the precious value that is the real strength of a country: children.

The timid measures that were announced will undoubtedly make things a little easier for thousands of Canadian families. But once again, we must say that it is too little too late. There should have been a re-adjustment of family allowances years ago because the ridiculous pittance which was being granted up to now was almost an insult. Adequate adjustment should therefore have raised allowances for children under 12 years old to some \$25 a month and those for children of 12 to 17 up to \$35. Since the major expenses come at the time the adolescent is attending secondary school and university, a family income security plan should already include a pre-salary for students so that they may all avail themselves of the rights and privileges of academic training.

Without questioning the sincerity of the minister, I accept with reservations his assertion as to agreement with the provinces, more particularly the province of Quebec, at a time when, unanimously, the Quebec National Assembly is demanding total take-over of the whole social security field. The minister would have scored a great victory by having Mr. Castonguay, Quebec Minister of Social Affairs, accept a plan. That is also in contradiction with Mr. Bourassa's thundering "No" after the Victoria conference.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, we hope that other more generous and appropriate measures will give greater help to families. We will support every measure to that end, whether it comes exclusively from Quebec, as a result of the federal government's withdrawal from that field or whether it is the result of a federal-provincial agreement. One thing is sure: families must not suffer from the sterile quarrels that too often paralyze the administration.

If our suggestions are felt to be exaggerated, we are willing to prove the contrary, as soon as the Canadian people have entrusted the administration of our country to us.

\* \* \*

● (11:40 a.m.)

[English]

### YOUTH

OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH PROGRAM—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

**Mr. Mac T. McCutcheon (Lambton-Kent):** Mr. Speaker, I ask the unanimous consent of the House to present a motion under Standing Order 43 to consider a matter of major and pressing importance. In addition to other misgivings relating to the government's response to the student unemployment crisis, the parliamentary secretary revealed yesterday that the Opportunities for Youth program has no stated criteria for helping students finance higher education through summer employment. In total, \$67 million of public money is being spent without inten-