

*Family Allowances Act*

taxes. I am not saying that I would be for or against such a step, but at any rate it would be the measure of our leaders' sincerity. I might favour a general social welfare tax plus the present income tax, modified of course to take care of the changes brought about by the new tax. I do not wish to leave the impression that I am suggesting this particular levy but I do wish to point out the importance of making a difference between the income tax proper and that part of it which goes to welfare purposes.

It seems to me that it would be wise and advantageous to introduce a motion along that line, in order that the government might be allowed to consider the advisability of such a measure. I am not prepared, however, to commit myself upon the value of such a motion.

Going back to what I emphasized a moment ago, it should after all be realized that we cannot adopt, without some reservation, this resolution in its present form, before the minister concerned has given us his opinion on the matter. I have much more confidence—and it is not by way of flattery, nor in the hope of receiving anything in return that I say this—in the hon. minister at the head of the Department of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Martin) than I have in those people who preach a certain policy in their province but who find it wiser, later on, not to implement it. I shall fall in therefore with the explanations of the minister.

On the other hand, it must be recognized that there is a difference between parliament and a city council. With your permission, Mr. Speaker—and I think I am keeping within the rules of the house in so doing—I will show the difference which exists between moving a resolution in this parliament and moving a similar resolution before a city council, that of Montreal for instance.

Formerly, we would move a motion as follows: "It is moved by alderman so-and-so, seconded by alderman so-and-so, that the executive committee consider the advisability of adopting this or that measure". That did not necessarily mean that the executive committee was bound to carry the motion, but it meant that we were all agreed that the proposed resolution deserved the attention of the executive committee, which was in that case, if I may be permitted such a comparison, like the municipal cabinet of the day.

Then, when we came back before the city council, we could not be accused of having ignored the unanimous stand of the council members, for we simply admitted that such

and such a measure was excellent, but that the executive committee had simply decided to postpone any further study of the matter. Thus the executive committee was never upbraided for not taking into consideration the unanimous opinion of the members, who had presented a motion asking the executive committee to consider the advisability of presenting a particular piece of legislation.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) vented his discontent, the other day, against a government which took no notice of his motion concerning the Income Tax Act and the abolition of the 4 per cent floor in connection with medical expenses. The hon. member voiced his protest in the name of sound democracy; he accused the government of taking no heed of a unanimous vote in the Commons, nor of the judgment of their own supporters, and asserted that they were anxious about one thing only: the possibility of doing just what they pleased.

I would not like to be caught in the same position. If I decided to vote in favour of the motion, I would have to blame the government for not having respected the unanimous opinion of the House of Commons.

On the other hand, following certain explanations supplied by the government I might find that it could not grant wishes expressed in this motion.

I believe that there is a very great difference between a motion calling for consideration of the advisability of adopting such and such a measure and the enforcement of that same measure.

To sum up I want to say this: considering all the things done so far by the government which for many years now has been at the helm in our country; considering the happy disposition of the hon. the Minister of National Health and Welfare; considering all that the government has accomplished in the social field, I do not hesitate, for one moment, to rely on the Prime Minister and his colleagues to decide whether it is possible, under the circumstances, to grant the increase asked for in the motion. I say once more that this motion thus presented on the eve of an election is nothing but eyewash. I am sure that if I asked for the opinion of my colleagues, they would say one after the other: Certainly, we also have feelings. We know that many families cannot afford to live as we would like them to live and we are eager to help the needy wherever they may be. However, we take into account the responsibility which our government must assume. We know that they must find the necessary funds in order to give what is