

Family Allowances

by a prominent French-Canadian doctor in Montreal. They give the rate of infant mortality in the different parts of the city. In the east end, where the poorer people live, the rate was 81.2 per hundred thousand live births. In Notre Dame de Grace, where we have the middle-class, the rate was 49 per hundred thousand live births. Then in Westmount, where the wealthy live, the rate is 30. The difference in these rates is due to the difference in incomes. I hope that family allowances will help to make up part of those differences. Family allowances is just one of the many measures that should be passed to give everyone in Canada a greater opportunity to live and live happily.

Mr. HUGHES CLEAVER (Halton): Mr. Speaker, before entering into a discussion with respect to the arguments which have been advanced by two members of the Conservative party in opposition to family allowances, I should like to take a moment to outline the nature of the plan. Under this plan it is proposed that cheques will go monthly to the parents of all children under the age of sixteen years. These payments will be \$5 a month with respect to all children under six years of age; \$6 a month with respect to children under ten years of age; \$7 a month with respect to children under 13 years of age, and \$8 a month with respect to all children over 13 years of age. These monthly cheques for family allowances are to be paid to every parent in Canada. Rich or poor—everyone is to receive his cheque.

Mr. HOMUTH: No, no; it is predicated upon their income position.

Mr. CLEAVER: I wonder if the hon. member for Waterloo South will be content to wait a moment. It should be said at once that those who do not need the family allowances will not profit financially from the cheques they receive. This result will, I believe, meet with almost universal approval in Canada, even though it may not meet with the approval of the hon. member who interrupted me a moment ago.

Mr. HOMUTH: I just wish to keep the record straight.

Mr. CLEAVER: You just wanted to talk, I fancy. As I view the situation, the government had two options. One option was that everyone would receive a payment, and that no means test would be required. No one would be placed in the embarrassing or uncomfortable position of having to account from time to time with respect to his financial position, or need for the payments. All of that was brushed aside in the forthright scheme

and proposal we now have before us. Under it everyone is to receive payment; and so far as the family allowances bill is concerned, there are no restrictions in that regard.

Mr. HOMUTH: No, no, no.

Mr. CLEAVER: But when the taxpayer makes up his income tax return and when he asks for dependents' allowance with respect to his children, then he must deduct from the amount of the dependents' allowance which he claims under the income tax law the amount he has received by way of family allowance cheques. I do not know of any finer manner in which the desired result could be obtained. We are not subjecting anyone to a means test. This money is not, however, being wasted. It will be paid to everyone, but will be kept only by those who need it.

There has been quite a little discussion in the press, some of it very misleading, as to just what the benefits are. I should like to take time for a moment or two to place those benefits on record. Much has been said about large families in Canada. I should like, therefore, to place upon the record the maximum amount of family allowances payable with respect to a family of fifteen children which, I take it, would be the maximum family, unless there were dual or triple births. This is a table showing the amount of payments to the fifteen children at their respective ages:

Child	Years of age	Payment per month
No. 1.....	15	\$8
No. 2.....	14	8
No. 3.....	13	8
No. 4.....	12	7
No. 5.....	11	6
No. 6.....	10	5
No. 7.....	9	4
No. 8.....	8	3
No. 9.....	7	3
No. 10.....	6	3
No. 11.....	5	2
No. 12.....	4	2
No. 13.....	3	2
No. 14.....	2	2
No. 15.....	1	2

The total monthly payment with respect to that family of fifteen amounts to \$65.

I should like next to put on the record—and I am coming back to this for the benefit of my hon. friend who has interrupted—

Mr. HOMUTH: I do not wish to interrupt my hon. friend, but would he answer a question? I believe it is pertinent to what he is saying.

Mr. CLEAVER: I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. HOMUTH: Supposing that family is in a province where the compulsory school