

tion of the children of Canada which would not in any way belittle the mothers.

All we need do is pick up the newspapers any day to become aware of cases of children not receiving the benefits. This provision is included to protect the children of Canada. I do not think the hon. member who placed this amendment on the order paper had any idea of belittling the mothers of Canada. He feels that from time to time cases may arise where children will need the protection of this amendment.

This minister is not one who is prone to accept amendments from anybody. We have had experience with him for a long time starting with the Canada Pension Plan when he was a parliamentary assistant. There are other ministers who are much more amenable than he is in respect of amendments. I remember when the legislation in respect of the Canadian Transport Commission was being put through the House. The minister piloting that legislation accepted amendment after amendment. Of course that bill never should have been passed. It was similar to this bill. Here we have an amendment the substance of which has been on the law books of Canada for 20 years. I do not know of any case in which it has been abused. It is there as an assurance in cases where there may be abuse created by the parents, that the children will receive the benefit of the legislation. I think the minister would do well to accept this amendment.

**Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming):** Mr. Speaker, I think I would disagree with the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) in respect of this amendment.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Peters:** I am aware of the difficulties which arise—

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** You are not a Tory lawyer.

**Mr. Peters:** —in supervising the use of the money. I would agree with those who say that money paid under family allowances no doubt in some cases has been substituted for money that should have come from other sources. However, I suggest to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre that by the time this legislation is in effect the computers which will be developed to handle it will be complicated and advanced enough that they will also be able to make house calls. I think this can probably be supervised in the home by the computers.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order, please. Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion? All those in favour please say yea.

**Some hon. Members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** All those opposed please say nay.

**Some hon. Members:** Nay.

*Family Income Security Plan*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** In my opinion the nays have it.

**Mr. Marshall:** On division.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** The motion is defeated on division.

Motion No. 4 (Mr. Marshall) negatived.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order, please. We have now reached motion No. 5 in the name of the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe on which Mr. Speaker made some comment at the outset concerning its acceptability because of the financial implication. I wonder whether hon. members would be ready to accept the suggestion made by Mr. Speaker that because both motion No. 5 and motion No. 6 in the name of the minister have the same implications it might be simpler to consider motion No. 6 for which there is a royal recommendation and at the same time eliminate the difficulty with which we are faced in respect of motion No. 5. The Chair would welcome at this time a comment from the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe.

**Mr. Marshall:** Mr. Speaker, we are agreeable to proceeding with motion No. 6 in the name of the minister, and in the interest of getting on with the bill I withdraw motion No. 5.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Does the hon. member have the consent of the House to withdraw motion No. 5?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Motion No. 5 (Mr. Marshall) withdrawn.

**Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare)** moved:

That Bill C-170, an act to provide for the payment of benefits in respect of children, be amended by striking out lines 18 to 30 of Clause 6 at page 6 and substituting the following:

"(1)(a) or (b), as the case may be."

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I rise merely to suggest that the minister might say a word or two on this motion so that what we are doing will be on the record. This is the change that would do away with the earlier arrangement which provided for only half the amount of the allowance being paid in certain circumstances. It is a welcome change, but I think the fact that the change is being made should be on the record.

**Mr. Munro:** I would be pleased to do that, Mr. Speaker. In the committee I indicated that the government would be pleased to consider an amendment of this kind when the appropriate stage arrived. As the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) suggests, the bill, prior to this amendment, provided that one-half the maximum benefit would be paid in cases where the care and custody of a child were in an institutional environment. This proposed amendment, together with that which has been made already in respect of clause 5 in the committee, will result in the maximum payment being made in respect of all children in the care of agencies and institutions when the benefit is used only for the good of the children. I believe this not only meets the objection