

for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie), indicated in his remarks; he felt it would be more fitting to provide something closer to the average in order to compensate for what has been lost in buying power as a result of inflation in this country.

In short, we are supporting this bill in order to help those who have been hurt by inflation which is at least in part due to this government's mishandling of our economy.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Stevens: From you, gladly.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): You are very kind. In view of the hon. member's statement, and he said it last night as well, that his party is supporting this bill mainly because inflation has made it necessary for these payments to be increased, may I ask if that means they do not support in principle the idea of family allowances as a means of redistributing income?

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the minister is not in attendance to hear my answer to that question. I personally support the bill in principle, and to prove my point I should like the hon. member to read my column sent out on August 15.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): 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?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not see the House leader or the acting House leader, but I believe there was agreement among the four parties that this bill would be referred to the committee of the whole House rather than to the standing committee.

Mr. Lalonde: Mr. Speaker, there has indeed been consultation through the usual channels and I understand there was agreement to consider this bill in the committee of the whole House. If the appropriate amendment could be made to the motion, I would appreciate it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Does the House give unanimous consent to modification of the motion in order that the bill may be referred to the committee of the whole House?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Laniel in the chair.

On clause 1—*Monthly allowance*.

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry the minister was not present in the House as the hon. member for York-Simcoe finished his address. One wants to have as

Family Allowances

broad a degree of good will and unanimity as one can on these matters, and I think a courtesy would have been extended had the minister been here. I hope he was not behind the curtain smoking, which would be a most terrible thing for a Minister of National Health and Welfare to do.

● (1540)

Also, I deplore the sour note that was added to the discussion of this measure when the minister, last night sought, on a point of order, to take the floor from the hon. member for York-Simcoe. I know the minister has not been in this House very long and may not be familiar with the ways here, but this is not good form by any means and does not add to the good will which can permeate this chamber if the House decides on the passage of legislation. There are some in the press gallery, if they are ever here, who regard this chamber as something between a large courtroom and a small circus, but when parliament is performing well it is in fact neither. So I deplore what I would have to describe as the ill-mannered performance of last night. I want to say that in the interest of a supportive House in respect of this measure—and I pledged that on behalf of my party long ago—members of my party made interesting and valuable speeches, as did members of all parties.

In my opinion there has been a good discussion of this important matter. I listened to every speech made by the minister and members from every portion of the House. I think this is the way we should conduct ourselves, having due and proper regard for the rights and indeed the views of others, and not imputing motives. I even heard the minister say that the member had a right to speak. Of course he had. That is what this place is all about.

So far as I am concerned, we on this side of the House have conducted a careful examination of the measure and if it is the disposition of other parties to field one speaker on the matter I am prepared to pledge my party to do the same so that we can put this measure forward. We have given it our blessing and our criticism. I suppose the minister will pay as much attention to one as to the other. But at this particular stage we are prepared to play our part to advance this legislation. Faint though it be, we will not blot out such light as it may bring to bear.

Mr. Knight: Mr. Chairman, I respect, as usual, the remarks and the call for unity of the hon. member for Hillsborough. I find that somewhat unique in light of the remarks of the hon. member for York-Simcoe last evening. The members of the Conservative party must have had a long conversation in caucus to make sure they knew how the hon. member would vote when the vote finally came around.

An hon. Member: Did you hear the part about manners?

Mr. Knight: Some Conservatives made disparaging speeches but they sent their noble statesman from Prince Edward Island to clear the air. So we accept his statement. However, I wish to make a few remarks related to the principle of the bill and to clause 1 and what it is all about.

I am one who was brought up in the environment of a working-class home where the mother always looked with