

books forward measures like this one. I am glad to say that the younger elements of the party have not joined in entirely in the opposition of the older elements, and I congratulate them a second time; but compare the petty objections that have been raised by certain hon. members of the opposition to the general tenor of the Prime Minister's speech, and I think it will stand as an outstanding pronouncement of far-sighted statesmanship.

The attitude of the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation party was sound and progressive in so far as this measure is concerned. Although it was introduced by another party, he supported it as a forward move. Apart from some minor criticisms of the technicalities of the bill or with regard to its application, his remarks were to the effect that it should have been done before or that we have stolen part of the plan or programme previously advocated either by him or his predecessor in the same post. We should remember that the measure does not come as a result of pressure from leftist groups. It is the normal sequence of a number of progressive measures foreseen and announced years ago by the Prime Minister as being part of his vast programme for the advancement of the masses. His book "Industry and Humanity", which has been quoted in this debate, foresaw these measures. Only the circumstances of four years of war and political impediments prevented it from being implemented before. This measure is part of a vast programme that this government—and I mean this government—will put into effect for the betterment of post-war conditions as soon as it is returned to power after the next election.

The most interesting appeal in many ways that has been made against this bill was, unfortunately, in the form of an appeal to parochial prejudice and group discrimination. It is contained in item 3 of the statement of the house leader opposing the measure, and in the less diplomatic terms used by the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Bruce) who did not fail again to take the occasion to exude more venom on the minority in this country, as he has done before. This is not the time or the occasion to refute his insinuations. I will let facts speak for themselves. When our sons are fighting side by side in Italy and Normandy after having shared side by side the glories of the Dieppe adventure; when some of our own members of parliament from this side and my own racial group are in the vanguard of the Canadian army in France, it ill becomes anybody in this house, no matter how distinguished his past career, to come in the late hours of his advanced life and use the prestige of his respectability, of his

eighty years and his white hair, to cast aspersions on those of a different racial descent from his own. Both his attack and the more carefully-worded item 3 draw wrong conclusions from right premises, or base their conclusions on entirely wrong premises. The premise partly right is that of item 3. It reads as follows:

There is but one province which has maintained the high birth rate and large family which was so characteristic of Canada's pioneer strains.

The words are diplomatic. Is there anything wrong with that? Is it not to the honour of these people to have kept the characteristics of Canada's pioneer strains? Yet the item fails to present the facts of demography in their true light. If we look at the figures contained in report 5 of the eighth census of Canada we shall see that there are 589,950 families in Ontario who have 1,370,720 children under the age of twenty-four. Unfortunately, the totals have not been analysed to give for each district the accurate figure of those under the age of sixteen. Quebec with 443,660 families has 1,510,740 children. But I would not say that the discrepancy is such that we should cast upon Ontario the bad name that the hon. member for Parkdale wanted to give it, that of not being able to reproduce children, because in a way many of them will benefit by this measure. It would take too long to go into the details of these figures, but if we could take it for granted that all the Ontario children will come under the measure, if certain material conditions of which I shall speak later were not such that a larger number there than elsewhere will not have the benefit envisaged by the measure because they are more self-sufficient; if all the children of Ontario came under this legislation it has been figured that this province would receive \$104,440,000. Of course that is not the amount it is expected will be required to carry out this project, because by no means all those children will benefit under this provision. However, on the same basis, if all the children of Quebec should come under this measure they would receive an aggregate amount of \$109,000,000. So that the two amounts would not be so disproportionate as to cause all the wailing we have heard in this house. If all children were in the same social circumstances Ontario's share would be about the same as that of the province of Quebec. However, financial conditions are not the same; opportunities have not been the same, and therein lies the source of the complaints of those who invoke this argument. I also find in item 3:

That province's contributions to the general revenue will be out of proportion to the heavier