

Family Income Security Plan

been criticized throughout the land by business, corporate and resource company interests. I do not think it nearly approaches the kind of equity proposed by the Carter Royal Commission on Taxation. It is interesting that within the same period of months, almost in the same breath, the government has moved towards selectivity in old age pensions and family allowances, and in terms of collecting money has moved toward universality. I have in mind the Unemployment Insurance Commission. The government has moved toward universality in the collection field and toward selectivity in the payment field. I consider this to be at least mildly anomalous.

An hon. Member: What about taking them off the income tax rolls?

Mr. Rose: Don't give me that boloney about cutting people off the income tax rolls. We argued about that for months. You know as well as I do that an increase in exemptions helps the affluent far more than it helps people at the poverty level. Do not try to confuse the House with that kind of nonsense and sophistry.

I have a great personal regard for the minister. We borrow cigarettes from one another behind the curtains. I know he is concerned about people and I thought he had a similar set of values to my own, being concerned with humanity. I always felt he chose to be a member of the government party in order to satisfy his political ambitions rather than on philosophical grounds. I felt he did this in order to be in a position to do things for people. I know he is concerned about medical training and the constitutional problems of getting the provinces to have three or four semesters per year in their universities in order to train doctors rather than steal them from other countries, as Canada usually does. I even suggested the setting up of medical centres in areas where there are no provinces, such as in the Yukon Territory. Perhaps he is so concerned he will make a proposal to abolish fees for medical services and put doctors on salaries such as we pay school teachers and parliamentarians. I am sure he is bold enough. He was recently described in *Maclean's* magazine as being pudgy and rumped. In addition to being such a pleasant man, he is that way because he is working so hard. I am sure when he considered this legislation he went over it for hours and hours without rest. I think what happened to him was that he forgot his basic principles.

I am not going to speak any longer on this matter but will say in conclusion, and this is usually when I get some applause—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Even when you have to ask for it.

Mr. Rose: This particular policy is another example of increasing the burden of the middle income earner. The government is not assisting the man who is in the middle income group and, in order to support a family in that kind of middle class life style television leads us to believe most people in Canada and the United States enjoy, both parents have to work. The minister knows that many people do not enjoy that life style. Many of them in this

[Mr. Rose.]

social economic class find it necessary that both parents work. This is not a case of a wife having the right or wanting to work, but a case of her being required to work in order that her family may have a decent kind of living standard with provision for the education of her children.

Minimum wages are too low. Certainly, the organized worker is doing fine. Professional people in our society including doctors, lawyers, school teachers and professors are getting along all right. Many of the people in what we describe as the middle income group find it necessary that both parents work to achieve this standard of living. I oppose the legislation on the ground that it lacks universality and I support the amendment put forward by this party. I should like to conclude by saying that I am disappointed that we have been required in this House to deal with this kind of thing at all.

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): The question is on the amendment to the main motion. All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Call in the members.

The House divided on the amendment (Mr. Lewis), which was negatived on the following division:

• (1650)

(Division No. 13)

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alexander
Alkenbrack
Baldwin
Barnett
Bell
Benjamin
Blackburn
Brewin
Broadbent
Burton
Cadieu
Carter
Crouse
Danforth
Dionne
Douglas

Gauthier
Gilbert
Godin
Grills
Gundlock
Harding
Horner
Knight
Knowles (Winnipeg
North Centre)
Knowles (Norfolk-
Haldimand)
Lambert
(Edmonton West)
Latulippe
Lewis
Lundrigan