

Family Allowances

age is fourteen years of age or under, and the children are earning money; what is the situation then?

Mr. CLEAVER: I will let my hon. friend worry himself with the answer to that question.

Mr. HOMUTH: I am not worrying.

Mr. CLEAVER: I am just going to refer him to something that happened 110 years ago.

Mr. HOMUTH: Oh, listen, we are looking to 1947.

Mr. CLEAVER: In 1833 the first factories act was passed, and the government of the day thought they were making very good progress when they passed that act, which provided that no child under nine years of age should be employed in a factory, and provided further that the hours of labour for children from nine to thirteen years should be limited to forty-eight hours a week, and those of children from thirteen to eighteen should be limited to sixty-nine hours a week. I would suggest that my hon. friend read *Hansard* as to what took place when that act was passed. I am going to let him answer his own problems.

Mr. HOMUTH: That was before we were born.

Mr. CLEAVER: I should like to place on *Hansard* a record as to the maximum amounts which different sized families could receive under the family allowances bill. The amounts are as follows:

No. of children in family	Maximum amount received yearly
1	\$ 96
3	288
5	444
7	552
9	624
11	684
13	732
15	780

At this point I should like to answer one argument advanced in opposition to the measure, an argument which has been suggested by a question asked by the hon. member for Waterloo South. It will be noticed from these figures that the maximum amount the large family of fifteen could obtain, the large family we have heard so much about, is \$780 a year. If we go to the province of Ontario and take the normal family of five children found in that province, and divide those fifteen Quebec children I have just been talking about among three families of five in Ontario, what would they receive? The payments in respect of those same fifteen

[Mr. Homuth.]

children in Ontario would be, not \$780 a year but \$1,128, or an increase of \$348. I think that has some bearing on the argument.

Mr. HOMUTH: It has no bearing at all; what are you trying to get at?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. CLEAVER: It is also provided in the bill that family allowances are not income for purposes of income tax. The estimated cost of the plan is somewhere between \$250,000,000 and \$260,000,000 annually, from which it is estimated that there will be a rebate of \$50,000,000 in round figures.

Mr. HOMUTH: By taxation.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member must allow the hon. gentleman who is now speaking to speak without interruption. I must insist that the hon. member do not interrupt again.

Mr. HOMUTH: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, but he is so wrong that I felt I ought to correct him.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman will have an opportunity of making his reply if he so wishes, but the hon. gentleman who is now speaking has the floor and must have it uninterrupted.

Mr. CLEAVER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, but if any hon. member at any time wishes to ask a question and has the courtesy to rise in his place I shall be glad to answer it.

I was saying that the total cost will range between \$250,000,000 and \$260,000,000 annually, and it is estimated that roughly \$50,000,000 will come back by way of income tax, so that this amount should be deducted in order to arrive at the net cost of the plan to Canada.

I want to say right here that nothing has taken place since I first came into this house after the 1935 elections which has given me greater pleasure than the opportunity which I now have of supporting this family allowance measure. When I think of the benefits in the form of human happiness that will flow from this bill I feel that the entire nine years would have been well spent if I had done nothing other than simply be here in the ninth year to support this measure. Those of us who are in this house are past the age when anything can be done to benefit us by way of improved nutrition, further education or anything of that sort; but the young children of to-day—and I have in mind particularly the very young—are at an age where, if they do not receive sufficient nutritious food, their lives may be ruined. Any child who is denied the benefits of modern educational facilities starts