

Family Allowances

those children were looked after and brought up and to-day two of those boys are overseas fighting for their country.

I do not know of a single pensioner or returned soldier who is in receipt of money from the government in the way of pensions or war veterans' allowance, where practically every bit of money that came into the house did not go to look after the children, to procure food and clothing and provide education and who has not been grateful for that assistance. I think the money paid by this country in pensions to returned soldiers of the last war, apart from the fact that it was an obligation to those men, has already borne fruit in this war in the type of children brought up in those homes, where there was a measure of gratitude to the country for looking after them when they needed looking after.

The Prime Minister dealt eloquently in his speech with this aspect of the matter, and I do not think that people who are in receipt of a good income, or who have confidence in their ability to earn a good income, can have any appreciation of the haunting fear that stalks a household where a man has to live on casual earnings and where very often, if he does not earn even \$5, the question presents itself, where will they be able to provide for the children the following day? I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that in a country as rich as Canada that sort of situation is not good enough for the kind of people that we have here, people who have shown themselves to be capable of almost measureless self-sacrifice in connection with this war. Canada owes something better than that to the kind of citizens we have in this country, as they have shown themselves to be in the last war and in this war. I rejoice that now there is going to be given to all citizens of Canada some measure of security such as was given in the war veterans' allowances or to those in receipt of pensions in the past few years.

We see that striving for security on the part of some of the highly placed citizens of our country. We see that on the part of the judges who wanted to see that their families were looked after. This parliament does not hesitate to take steps to see to it that people placed in those positions receive a certain amount of security. We see it with regard to the civil servants who serve their country in the civil service. We do not hesitate to appropriate money to see to it that they are looked after in their old age. Surely the average taxpayer who is not in receipt of an income from the country but who, in fact, helps to build up the nation and contributes toward the income of the country, is entitled to the minimum standard of living.

[Mr. Tucker.]

In addition to the benefit which this will give to the children of the nation, there is that element of the banishing of fear from the homes, the banishing of fear from the hearts and minds of the parents of the children and from the children themselves. That alone is a great step forward. After all, in this country we do not let our people starve to death. I have wondered why it is that we have not before this given them some measure of security by telling them that they can rely upon us, not as a matter of charity, but in this wealthy country of ours where we produce ample food, clothes and shelter for all our people we could tell them that if, through no fault of their own, they are unable to earn these things themselves they are going to have it as a matter of right; and to the extent that this measure does not give that minimum standard of livelihood to the people of this country I would hope that it would be supplemented by other measures which would give that minimum standard of life.

One of the arguments that have been used throughout the country against the present system is that we have want in the midst of plenty; that we produce more food than we can possibly use ourselves, more clothes, more shelter, plenty of doctors to look after the medical needs of our people, plenty of teachers to look after their educational needs, and that if we do not then give a reasonable standard of living to all our people our system is not functioning properly. That is a reasonable argument. The organization of the state exists to serve the people, and it must be so organized as to serve the people. If it is not organized to serve the people and give them what they are able to produce as a people, give them security, give them that minimum standard of living, then they will change the organization of the state. Some people ask "Why was not this done before?" My answer to that is that we live in a democratic state, and while there may be far-sighted people who perhaps many, many years ago would have liked to give this minimum standard of welfare to our people, we know that throughout the country there were the fearful ones who said: "Where is the money to come from?" and all that sort of thing. They thwarted the will of those who realized that these things were possible. I rejoice that at last that bogey has been laid to rest once and for all; that never again will it be used as an argument against giving the standard of living that this nation is able to provide for its people; that we cannot find the money to do it. To those people who worry about the \$200,000,000 that is to be spent per year on this measure, I say that the only limitation upon the good things of life