

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Not a bit.

Mr. CLEAVER: I shall just take up one short matter and leave the rest for another occasion.

Mr. HOMUTH: Give us one more gibe.

Mr. CLEAVER: It is quite obvious that the word has gone out that this measure must be beaten at all costs. Articles have appeared in the press directly contrary to the fact, throwing out the idea that Great Britain is opposed to family allowance, at least, based upon the Beveridge plan. To anyone who wishes to look up the matter I would refer them to the parliamentary debates of the House of Commons of February 16, 1943, which entirely repudiates that statement. That statement has appeared editorially in many papers in Canada. I do not know how they could all be infected at once were it not for the fact that this information emanated from one source. I suggest that it was the Bracken House.

Mr. HOMUTH: Prove that.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): You might have said it yourself.

Mr. CLEAVER: A long article was written by—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Your time is up.

Mr. CLEAVER: —Miss Charlotte Whitton. In this article there is an analysis of what will happen with respect to two different incomes. The first income taken is that of a married man earning \$1,500 a year, and after a long-winded explanation—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Your time is up.

Mr. CLEAVER: —the article purports to show that that person will be out \$68. I say that is a deliberate untruth.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Your time is up.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. CLARENCE GILLIS (Cape Breton South): It is a difficult task to make a speech on this particular measure at this stage of the debate, because so many good speeches have been made and the subject matter has been pretty well canvassed. The thing that makes it most difficult is the lack of opposition to the measure, particularly vocal opposition. We know there are a lot of hon. members to the right who are ready to oppose the measure as indicated by the statements of their leaders in the house and in the country, but so far as taking part in the general debate is concerned they are conspicuous to-day by

their silence. However, I did not rise to quarrel with them, but I should like to have some idea of the particular angle of the measure on which they base their opposition.

In opening the debate on the bill I think the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) struck a keynote that is long overdue in Canada. It was gratifying, to the members of this group at least, to hear the Prime Minister make the categorical statement that our human resources were more important than our natural resources. That is a trend of thought that is long overdue in this country. It is the basic philosophy of the movement that I represent in this house. In his statement the Prime Minister elaborated that philosophy to some considerable extent. I think the time has come in Canada for us to decide definitely on two matters in allocating the wealth of this country in the future. I think, and the members of this group think, and have so expressed themselves on many occasions, that the first charge against that wealth should be the care of the aged. The people who are responsible for whatever measure of success Canada has had since confederation, the old pioneers of the country, the people who are responsible for giving us the democratic institutions through which we discuss and bring forward legislation of this kind should be our first care. The first charge on the wealth of the country should be adequate provision for those who made the nation possible and gave us what we have to-day. In line with the Prime Minister's thoughts in expressing the sentiments he did when presenting this measure to the house, I think it is a matter on which we must come to some definite conclusions in the near future. There must be more adequate care for the aged people of this country. Second in importance to that is, I think, the measure now before the house, and the basic principle upon which it is framed. The second charge against the wealth of the country should be the care of the young children, those who are going to take this country forward in the future.

If we are to have in the future a nation that we can be proud of, then we shall have to correct the mistakes of the past with respect to the treatment of the young. One of the reasons why we are supporting this measure is that we feel it is a step in the right direction. It is at least a general recognition on the part of the government of Canada that we definitely have a responsibility to the youth, to the future generations, to our future citizens, to those who will be running this country in the future. It is our duty to see to it that they