

*Family Allowances*

At the outset I wish to congratulate the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) on the broad outlook he took when he treated the question, and I would direct the same remarks to the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green). Had the other members of their party adopted the same attitude, perhaps I would not have had to make the remarks I intend to make on this occasion.

To my mind, Tuesday was a very important day in the history of our political parties. The cleavage between the attitude, the mentalities and the tendencies of the parties was shown more clearly than ever. However, I cannot agree entirely with the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Reid) that it was the first time that we had seen the real difference between the two parties, because I cannot see any possibility that the party led and inspired by the Prime Minister could be assimilated to a party characterized by the tendencies and views of Mr. Bennett, of Mr. Manion, of the present hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson), of Mr. Meighen, of the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon), and of the last leader—by the way what is his name, I have forgotten—that is right—the forgotten man. We hear his voice, but it comes from nowhere. You do not see him when you look where he is supposed to be. He is the absent leader, or rather the absentee leader, the worst case of absenteeism we have in Canada; while at the moment we are blaming the war workers for absenteeism, he is giving the worst example of absenteeism from the line of duty.

Like all spirits, he cannot be seen, but sometimes he can be heard. Like spirits he is sometimes heard through a medium. Sometimes it is the medium McTague, another absentee with powerful lungs. Sometimes if we peel the veil from the medium we find it is the body of our hon. friend, the leader in the house, who speaks for the absent leader. The unseen leader speaks oftentimes through the medium of the press, and that is what he did in this particular case. We have his statement and from that statement we can clearly see that he does not approve the measure, although at the end of last year he expressed his views on the policy to be followed if he headed a government of this country. Those views were contained in fourteen points. The attitude of his party in respect of this measure comes in conflict with at least three of those famous points. The third point says that "it is the right of every individual to be rewarded not on the basis of equal pay for all, but on a basis which recognizes the values of the service given." I think that applies to a father of a

large family whose work may be the same as that of another man and who may be paid accordingly, but whose services to the nation in providing human capital is not rewarded in any way. They will be rewarded by this measure.

Point 7 of the fourteen points says:

The right of every child and youth to equal opportunity to the maximum education suited to its capacity that the state can provide.

Here is a measure that will help to reach that point, and it has been opposed by the outside and the inside leader of the Conservative party. Point 12 is:

The right of future generations to a world of plenty.

This measure will help. The house leader's remarks may be found at page 5339 of *Hansard*. His nine points may be found at pages 5342-3 of *Hansard*. Some of them have already been answered by previous speakers. I shall deal later with point 3, since it is directed more particularly at my own province. I know that when the Prime Minister winds up the debate he will satisfy the house and dispose of all the other objections, but I wish to point out that the attitude of the Conservative party—whatever name has been given to it does not matter—is evident again. Whatever new tag is added to the word "Conservative", whatever new denomination is given to it, we have the same attitude throughout our parliamentary life. It is quite evident that the Progressive tag added to the Conservative wagon did not mean that it would give it more speed in the direction of a forward and constructive policy to better the conditions of the common man. This new tag did not even remove the brake that stopped the car on the road to progress generations ago.

According to Conservative speakers Liberal measures are always unconstitutional. I find that in these points of the house leader here. They are always unconstitutional, dangerous, unfair, threatening. They go too far and they do not go far enough. The time is inappropriate. They are costly, wasteful and inefficient. I defy anybody to look at the speeches from that party when any of the important forward measures were introduced into this house, and not find the same words, or the same ideas expressed in different words on each and every occasion. When such a measure was introduced or a new important step was taken in the way of social legislation, we had the same wailings as to their danger and their untimeliness. It is never the right time. Yet the experience of the past has proven that the Liberal party has never been wrong when it has put on the statute

[Mr. Picard.]