

dren are immigrating to this country. Experience has shown it to be highly desirable to reduce the number of years during which these newcomers must wait before entering fully into the benefits of citizenship, and it has been proposed to reduce the term of three years to one year.

The effect on newcomers of making them feel that they have become beneficiaries under this Act within one year of their arrival can hardly be over-estimated. I submit to honourable senators that no kind words that a government or its spokesmen may utter, no certificate of citizenship or any other document that may be issued, can be nearly as effective as a family allowance cheque in making a newcomer realize that he has become in fact a Canadian. I should like to see the residence requirement wiped out entirely, if that were practical, but of course it would not be. We do not want to pay family allowances to summer visitors or other transients. In my judgment a minimum residence of three years is too long, and we should look upon a child who has lived here for one year as a permanent addition to our population.

May I point out that one of the specifications in the agreement for the union of Newfoundland with Canada was that the Family Allowances Act should immediately after the union extend to eligible people within the new province. I sense that nothing has so impressed the people of Newfoundland with the fact that they are now Canadians, and part of this great nation, as the receipt of monthly family allowance cheques from the government at Ottawa. That is a very substantial and real testimonial to their inclusion in our citizenship. Some 45,000 Newfoundland families, with 110,000 children, are now beneficiaries under this Act. The cost of providing family allowances for these children is about \$700,000 a month, and I am sure we agree that we are getting good value for our money.

The extra cost resulting from reduction in the residence requirement from three years to one year will not be great. The effect of the amendment will be to enable certain children to qualify two years sooner than they otherwise would. From 1927 to 1944, both years inclusive, we admitted to Canada only 94,000 children under 16 years of age, an average of approximately 5,250 per year. Some of these children passed the age of 16 before having resided in Canada three years, and in future some who are under 16 when admitted will have exceeded that age before being here one year. For purposes of calculation we might take it that there will be admitted annually about 5,000 children under 16 years of age, and if we multiply

this number by two we see that the number of such children likely to become eligible every year because of our reducing the residence requirement by two years is 10,000. At an average of \$6 a month, the total extra expense would be \$60,000 a month, or \$720,000 a year. I chose those eighteen years because, during that period, immigration was perhaps normal, and that may be the kind of period to which we are returning.

Hon. Mr. Kinley: No.

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: It may be, but I hope not. During the past two years immigration has been much heavier, and it is estimated that the annual extra cost resulting from the proposed amendment will be about \$1,000,000 a year.

In view of the very obvious advantages of the two amendments in this bill and the relatively small additional cost that will result therefrom, I have no hesitation in recommending the bill to the favourable consideration of my fellow senators.

Hon. Cyrille Vaillancourt: Honourable senators, I have only a few words to say in answer to my honourable colleague. I feel peculiarly qualified to speak on this subject because I was the fifteenth child in my family.

The family allowance law has been described by some people as socialism.

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: It is nothing of the kind.

Hon. Mr. Vaillancourt: To my mind it is a social and economic law. At the bottom of the prosperity of our country is the organization of the family: if the family is prosperous the country at large is prosperous. There is no reason why the children of the Labrador coast, Newfoundland, the Pacific coast or elsewhere in Canada should have a lower standard of living than those in the large cities. If we investigate, we will learn that many of the big men of our day came from the country and the small towns. I say the Family Allowances Act is a social and economic law, because in order to maintain production it is necessary to maintain consumption, and the increased family means increased consumption. I have only eight children, but when I go to the store to outfit them I am obliged to buy eight pairs of shoes, eight suits of clothes and so on. We require food in the home for ten people, and we consume considerably more than a family of two.

Canada's Family Allowances Act is the best law of its kind in the world. Some twenty-six countries adopted similar systems, starting in 1926 in New Zealand, and later in Belgium, and then in France. In some countries contributions are made by the government, the employer, and the employee. I know of certain countries where employers have tried to employ only labourers without families. One