

Family Allowances

confirmed in my statement. In this war certain measures were necessary to carry on the war effort. I would say that if in the future some measures of control are necessary, if those controls will be in the interests of the people, the people will accept them. That is the only way to look at the problem. What the people want are measures of reform. If those measures of reform mean that the people will have to pay a little more in taxes, they will pay them if the reform brings social security. They will accept, if necessary, a certain amount of rationing if that is in their interest. That is the way we must regard the problem. The period of freebootery, as Vice-President Wallace calls it, is not now; that period is over. Government intervention will be necessary in order to fill the gap, to give jobs and security to the people. I consider family allowances as one of the finest means to create employment.

The people who receive this money will not put it away in the bank. The people who receive this money will not spend it on travel overseas or for luxuries. The money they receive will be paid into the stores. It will be paid into the tailor shops to buy clothing. Then the tailor will pay it to somebody else and the money will circulate. That is the best part of it all, and that is why it will create more employment than would \$200,000,000 spent in any other way.

Family allowances will strengthen rather than weaken national unity. It will not weaken it, as the house leader of the Progressive Conservative party has said. Why will it strengthen it? There cannot be national unity when one group does not enjoy the same privileges as a group somewhere else. National unity is not something you can play with. You cannot create national unity by just talking about it. You will not get it in that way. We need new ways that will make our people feel that they are equal to the citizens of Ontario or the citizens of British Columbia. That is the way to get national unity. Give the people an opportunity to feel that here is a government that considers their plight and is taking measures to remedy it. That will give them faith in democracy. That is the way to approach the problem of national unity.

It is unfortunate that we have people who say that family allowances are being used to subsidize Quebec. It is not to subsidize Quebec; it is to subsidize Canadians who need these subsidies. What do the large families of Quebec do? Do they sit back? Do they play around all the time? Do they not produce for Canada. Have not the farmers' sons and daughters of Quebec gone

into the factories to produce the weapons of war? Who has filled the most shells in this country? It is the sons and daughters of Quebec. Who has built tanks and guns for our army? The sons and daughters of Quebec. They are doing useful work. Why try to divide the country and say that these family allowances are to subsidize one province? We must think of our people as Canadians and stop thinking of them as people of Ontario and people of Quebec.

I do not want to speak much longer on this point. I came across a very fine editorial in *Saturday Night* dealing with family allowances and referring to those people who say that family allowances is a sop to or a subsidy for Quebec. I do not know who wrote this editorial, but it sounds like Sandwell's language. He has a very fine approach toward the problem of the unity of Canada. The editorial reads:

We shall have a Canadian nation only when we can feel, pretty generally, that a Canadian child is a Canadian child and entitled to certain economic advantages, whether he is French or Scottish or Ukrainian by racial origin, whether he is in Quebec or Alberta, whether he is the son of a Roman Catholic or a Lutheran or even a Marxian communist. We can hasten that time, or we can defer it, by our attitude on this legislation.

I agree wholeheartedly with the attitude expressed in that editorial.

There are a few things in the bill I am not too sure about. The hon. member for North Battleford (Mrs. Nielsen) referred to the different rates for different ages. I have one child and I know that a young child needs special food. Younger children require entirely different foods from those required by grown-ups. Special canned foods that are put out for small children are quite expensive. Codliver oil is expensive. I was surprised the other day when I had to pay \$4 to \$5 for a pair of shoes for a small child. And then a small child will kill a pair of shoes in no time at all. Considering it from that point of view, I cannot understand why \$5 should be paid for younger children and \$8 for the older.

A complicated accounting system will be necessary. Considering it from all angles, I would say it would be worth while to have a flat rate of \$8 for all children. In supporting this measure I make an appeal to all. We should put the measure through as soon as possible and let the people of Canada feel that no group in Canada stands in the way of a measure so necessary for the welfare of the country.

If anyone has any doubt as to the effect of family allowances upon health, I should like to give some figures which were furnished me

[Mr. Rose.]