

Family Income Security Plan

this way, personal income tax exemptions and day-care exemptions will have their full effect for the working wife. Let us take a look at the man who receives a raise of \$1,000. He pays taxes, unemployment insurance and pension contributions. The single man earning \$7,000 would lose 33 per cent of that raise in tax payments; the man with a wife and four children earning the same salary would lose 47 per cent; and the man with a wife and four children earning \$11,000 would lose 33 per cent.

In closing, I want to say to the minister that I think he and the other ministers concerned should get together on this measure because they do not seem to know what they are doing. They look at the various schemes, but they do not blend them together. I am not blaming the minister. Perhaps these ministers commune with somebody higher than parliament, I don't know, but if they do only God knows!

Mr. Munro: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Does the hon. member agree to accept the question?

Mr. Rynard: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Munro: I have some difficulty detecting from the hon. member's speech whether, in terms of principle, he is for this legislation or against it. Which is it?

Mr. Rynard: Well, Mr. Speaker, this is typical of the minister, and the way in which he established these allowances, because nobody knows how much he wanted to help the poor people. I suggest that he made a very poor attempt at giving them something. We are a lot more affluent today than we were in 1945, but that has not helped the poor very much. I have been trying to urge the minister to see that these people are looked after in a better fashion, instead of having a lot of money going into administration expenses. The ministers in charge of welfare and of manpower ought to get together to discuss this thing and come up with something to really help the poor.

Mr. Munro: Are you in favour of it in principle or not? Which is it?

Mr. Rynard: Mr. Speaker, I do not think for one minute the minister is so dense that he does not know I am in favour of it.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard) made a few references to the history of family allowances which, as he pointed out, came into effect on July 1, 1945. Some of us have to be careful that we do not paint ourselves too far back into history, but these references recalled to my mind the debate in 1944 when the Family Allowance Act was passed. There are only three of us still in this House of Commons who were members of the House in 1944. I refer to the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), the hon. member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. McIlraith) and myself. My good friend, the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas), had been here before that but had gone to the province of Saskatchewan so that he could take certain

[Mr. Rynard.]

steps which would force other governments of this country to give more favourable consideration to social security legislation.

• (1450)

The debate of 1944 was a dramatic one. I was just thinking earlier how times have changed. This afternoon the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro) had to wait for a number of minutes before he could continue his speech. He had to wait for a quorum to arrive in the chamber. Back in 1944, the attendance during that debate was greater than usual. There were a number of dramatic occasions. Perhaps the one most remembered by many around here was when a distinguished and greatly respected member of the House, the late Dr. Bruce, was named and put out of the House for the balance of a day's sitting because he had refused to comply with the Speaker's request to withdraw the word "bribery", which he had applied to Mackenzie King's action in bringing in the Family Allowances Act.

Another moment of drama arose when the then Prime Minister, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King, referred to the humble poor. That phrase, coming from his lips, produced laughter on this side, and actually occasioned a remark, recorded in *Hansard*, by the hon. member for York East, who then was Robert McGregor. He had the reputation of having sat silently in this House perhaps longer than any other member. At any rate, in that debate a remark by Mr. McGregor got on the *Hansard* record. The other dramatic part of that story involved the recorded vote on second reading. When the Speaker called for the yeas and nays, some ventriloquist made a noise which sounded like nay. So, the government members stood up and a recorded vote was taken. It turned out, when the vote was taken, that everyone present voted yea. It was one of those unanimous recorded votes. Liberals, Conservatives, CCF members, as our group was then known, and Social Credit members from Alberta all voted yea. Mr. William Golding, the late member of this House who later went to the other place and, still later, to another place, said afterwards that he was paired with the hon. member for Parkdale, who then was Dr. Bruce, but that if he had voted, he would have voted for the measure. That, of course, implied that Dr. Bruce who was then not present, would have voted against the measure. He never confirmed or denied that.

That was one of those interesting occasions when a measure was passed at second reading on a recorded division, with no one voting nay. When we got to third reading and the vote was called, *Hansard* merely recorded the bill as carried. No one said nay at that point, or even "on division". So, there we passed a piece of legislation that was very contentious and about which there was a great deal of feeling. Hon. George Drew was making noises in Ontario about this being done for Quebec; some threatened to take the bill to court, and so on. Some even charged on the floor of this House that the bill was an election gimmick. Mr. King dealt with that insinuation in the typical Mackenzie King fashion. By the way, I agree with one remark that Charles Lynch made in one of his columns a few days ago. He said that we should not forever be likening the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Laing), and the President of the Privy Council (Mr.