

*Family Income Security Plan*

this yesterday—that in the Quebec National Assembly a bill has been tabled that would amend the Quebec Pension Plan in such a way as to put it out of line with the Canada Pension Plan. I think the Canada Pension Plan was a particularly good piece of legislation and I think the arrangement under which the Quebec Pension Plan was passed at the same time was an outstanding example of co-operation between the federal régime and the Quebec provincial government. It was an outstanding example because that plan works in full co-operation with the federal plan and there is full synchronization. The Quebec government has full control over the Quebec Pension Plan. Individuals can leave Quebec, go to other provinces of Canada and move back again without any harm being done.

I see you are becoming somewhat agitated, Mr. Speaker. Let me say why my remarks are relevant. I do not think it is good for the political health of this country when some people threaten: If you do not do this to family allowances or to the old age security program we, in Quebec, will change the Quebec Pension Plan and cause trouble. The trouble would be very real because it would involve various employers and different arrangements would need to be made. I shall finish in a minute or two, Mr. Speaker.

It should not be inferred from what I have said that I am simply deploring that Quebec has done. I deplore the fact that this government, which gave notice in December, 1970, of the amendments it would bring in with respect to the Canada Pension Plan, has not moved more vigorously with respect to those amendments. If those amendments with respect to the Canada Pension Plan had been introduced, I think we would perhaps not be in our present trouble. The various programs I mentioned are being traded against each other. I think that this should come to an end. I hope the discussions that will take place between Ottawa and Quebec with respect to FISP—you see, Sir, my remarks are now in order—will be the kind of discussions in which there will be an attempt to bring about a harmonious understanding with respect to all these pieces of social legislation.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Is the House ready for the question? Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Gilbert:** On division.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** I declare the motion carried on division.

Motion No. 8 (Mr. Munro) agreed to.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** The House will now proceed to Motion No. 9 standing in the name of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)** moved:

That Bill C-170, an act to provide for the payment of benefits in respect of children, be amended by deleting therefrom Clause 24, being lines 31 to 37 on page 24 of the said bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, at the outset I wonder if I could make a deal with the minister and with the House. If I must speak until one o'clock so that we do not mess up the

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

lunch hour with a vote or two, of course I can do so. On the other hand, if there could be an understanding that any deferred votes will take place this afternoon after the question period, which I think is the course of common sense, I would be prepared to make my speech much briefer than might otherwise be the case.

**An hon. Member:** You are on.

**An hon. Member:** Blackmail.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I am told this is blackmail, and I am also told this is a good idea.

**Mr. Munro:** I agree to the suggestion, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** I wish to thank the House, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Bell:** This is a good sign for the rest of the week.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I am aware of some of the difficulties that might arise if this amendment were carried and if this bill were carried without clause 24. The result would be that the new FISP program would be in effect but the old Family Allowances Act and the Youth Allowances Act would also continue to be in effect. Some people would like that. They would not say it is ridiculous, because it would mean that people would get both payments.

**Mr. Alexander:** Where would the money come from?

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** We should then be doing something similar to what is happening under the old age security program, under which all people are paid the basic \$80 but under which some people get GIS as well. So, people would be getting family allowances under the old act and, in cases where they pass the means test, they would also get the new family income security plan payment under the new act.

My reason for moving this amendment, Mr. Speaker, was to provide a last opportunity for saying before we reach the third reading stage that I do not like to see the Family Allowances Act being repealed. I had the privilege of being in the House in 1944 when it was passed. I was one of those who voted for it. Incidentally, it was one of those recorded votes that was unanimous.

**An hon. Member:** The hon. member voted for the BNA Act.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** I am talking about the Family Allowances Act, not the British North America Act which was passed at Westminster. I was never in that Parliament.

**An hon. Member:** The hon. member was away that day.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** As I say, that vote in 1944 was unanimous. There was one member who said he would vote against the bill but he was not present when the vote was called and the vote was unanimously in favour. I still think it was one of the better pieces of social legislation passed by the Parliament of Canada. I think