

name, namely, Friedrich von Logau who lived from 1604 to 1655. In a work called *Retribution*, he is reported to have said:

Though the mills of God grind slowly, yet they grind exceeding small.

Senator Doyle: I think the honourable senator will find that it varies according to which version of *Familiar Quotations* is used. There are several attributions for this. There have been several versions of it, and I would be delighted to be the author of one of them.

Motion agreed to and bill read second time.

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Honourable senators, when shall this bill be read the third time?

On motion of Senator Doyle, bill referred to the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs.

EXCISE TAX ACT EXCISE ACT

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING—ORDER STANDS

On the Order:

Resuming the debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Simard, seconded by the Honourable Senator David, for the second reading of the Bill C-80, intituled: "An Act to amend the Excise Tax Act and the Excise Act and to amend other Acts in consequence thereof".—*(Honourable Senator Leblanc (Saurel))*.

Hon. Royce Frith (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, I should like to ask that this order stand in the name of the Honourable Senator MacEachen.

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Is it agreed, honourable senators?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Order stands in name of Senator MacEachen.

[Translation]

FAMILY ALLOWANCES ACT, 1973

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING

On the Order:

Resuming the debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Tremblay, seconded by the Honourable Senator Murray, for the second reading of the Bill C-70, intituled: "An Act to amend the Family Allowances Act, 1973".—*(Honourable Senator Thériault)*.

Hon. Norbert L. Thériault: Very briefly, honourable senators, I would like to explain my position concerning Bill C-70 which, in my judgment, will have the effect of totally destroying the family allowances system as we have known it since 1943.

[English]

First, I wish to apologize to the government members in the Senate and to the Leader of the Government if I am respon-

[Senator Frith.]

sible for delaying the sending of this bill to committee for study. Nevertheless, I cannot, in good conscience, let this kind of legislation go through without making my objections known.

• (1510)

Honourable senators, over the years the federal government, along with the provincial governments, in a complementary way, has established in this country what has become known as the social safety net for the poorer residents of Canada. That took a long time, and, while the great majority of social legislation that exists today at the national level was passed or enacted by the federal Liberal Party when it was the Government of Canada, nevertheless, I am convinced that many of these measures were urged upon the government by the New Democratic Party. For that reason, I believe that that political party deserves credit. I think that that has been recognized by a number of people, as it has been recognized by me.

Honourable senators, I am speaking about the principle of providing people with the means for a decent, or at least a half decent, way of life—of providing the poorer people with food, shelter, clothing and education, the necessities of life. Naturally, as a liberal thinker and as a supporter of the Liberal Party, I grew up thinking that the Conservative Party of the days when I was young or before I was born was a right wing party which did not believe in social measures. I thought that the Liberal and New Democratic parties were the opposite and believed that the state should, at times, interfere to assist those people who could not fend for themselves. Over the years, I have had to recognize that this was not necessarily true. The records are there to show that the Conservative Party of the day opposed the establishment of the family allowance because, in its thinking, the country could not afford it. Nevertheless, after 1957 when the Conservatives formed the government under the leadership of the Honourable John Diefenbaker, there were some social measures passed by that government.

I remember clearly how, during the campaign of 1956 or 1957, Mr. Diefenbaker accused the Liberal government of being niggardly because it increased the old age pension by only \$6 a month; he called them the "six buck boys." And people listened to him. When Mr. Diefenbaker became the Prime Minister, he did increase the old age pensions by a larger amount, although I do not recall exactly what that figure was, and he did introduce other social measures at that time.

Naturally, the Liberals came back into office in 1962 under the leadership of Mr. Pearson. We then saw an avalanche of social measures, which almost completed the much needed welfare or social security system that is necessary in a country like ours. I recall that, in my own province in 1970, I was a member of the government. There was an election; we were defeated and the Progressive Conservative Party came into office. Because of the experience that I had during those years from 1957 to 1963, I felt that the government of the day would continue with the social measures that we had established in 1956. In fact, we had instigated what was almost a revolution in the distribution of social measures to the people of my