

*Supply*

inspiring outlook on immediate possibilities. In short, we have all the required powers to act in a positive way.

First of all let us think of children and teenagers. Let us at least grant \$1 a day for children and \$2 a day for teenagers. Let us enable this class of citizens to enjoy an annual guaranteed income so that they may contribute to an adequate purchasing power. This will maintain the economic equilibrium. In fact, this category of citizens should have priority over all others.

The hon. Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) said in his speech that efforts should be made to establish income security programs which would attain objectives within the related interdependence of the tax system itself.

He also said that it is important to recognize that there are several aspects to the redistribution of income in Canada and that social security legislation must be envisaged in the overall system of tax legislation. He said at the same time that if Canada wants to attain its objectives in social security better ways to set up components must be found. Finally he said we must take into account the virtuality of a conflict between, on the one hand, the natural reluctance of Canadians in the face of the rising level of taxation and, on the other, the concern the governments should feel in the name of all Canadians to increase assistance to the underprivileged.

Nothing can be done without the necessary resources and we have not yet discovered a magic wand or an alchemy formula. So many complicated words to say that much is wanted but that the means are lacking. Still more time is required to explain that the Canadian taxes will have to be increased.

A substantial rise in old age security pensions has been promised, not only a symbolic increase. But there is never any mention of family allowances which are still at the 1944-45 level when that plan became effective.

The minister and the political parties have completely ignored family allowances in the list of the various appropriate programs worked out by the Canadians aware of their responsibility toward their fellow-citizens unable to work.

Mr. Speaker, why should we have one law for the elderly and another for the young? In the course of his life, each individual experiences a basic need for breathing, eating, sleeping and clothing. Therefore, why do the same hon. members vote pensions for the aged with an escalation clause related to the cost of living, and do they fail to follow the same course as concerns family allowances?

Why do the same hon. members vote themselves higher salaries up to \$26,000 per annum, to take into account the cost of living, while, at the same time, refusing to do the same with respect to family allowances, to young people quite unable to earn a living?

The minister himself stated that wages generally do not take into account family responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, I would therefore suggest that family allowances, under the legislation now in force, be increased for all children up to the age of 18 under the guaranteed income program.

[Mr. Latulippe.]

Since 1944 Canadian production has increased by \$102 billion, and none the less there is not enough money for Canadian children. There is money for everyone. Children suffer from hunger and cold and their parents are ashamed of such a situation.

If we find means to increase the cost of living, we must also find means to provide a decent living for Canadian families. Family allowance should have increased at the same pace as old age security benefits, as salaries of members of Parliament and senators, as should have kept pace with increases in all sectors of the economy. Family allowances alone have not gone up.

I am not against the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) when he strongly advocates that old age pensions be increased. However, I would ask him to be kind enough to support us, to remember the Canadian families because, at the present time, their needs are greater than those of the aged. The children ask the people of Canada to treat them at least as well as all the other institutions or sectors of our economy.

Mr. Speaker, we owe a lot to families. We owe them justice and some security. It is good to give the old some security but if we do not allow Canadians to renew our society through births, if we commit all possible errors and work against the family, the time will soon come when there will be neither young nor old people. There will be no need for old age pensions or family allowances because society will have disappeared.

Mr. Speaker, we must face up to our responsibilities and open our eyes and all together we should recognize the injustice that we have done to the family in opposition to the normal development of the Canadian people. At present, our legislation, all the restrictions and the economic worries are prompting parents not to have any more children.

This, Mr. Speaker, is where we stand; we are witnessing the near-complete disappearance of the Canadian or Christian civilization.

• (1520)

[English]

**Mr. Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question on the motion by Mr. Drury for concurrence in respect of Votes 35a, 40a and 45a of the Department of National Health and Welfare?

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 10a—DEPARTMENT OF MANPOWER AND IMMIGRATION

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (for Mr. Drury)** moved:

That Vote 10a, in the amount of \$292,263,037 of the Department of Manpower and Immigration for development and utilization of manpower in supplementary estimates (A) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, be concurred in.