

soon there will be no more talk about Quebec having less people in the income tax paying class than any other province. Give them the same opportunities and the same capital Ontario has had, and they will do just as well; there will be no more suggestions that one group is inferior as compared with another.

All right, Mr. Speaker. We are partly responsible for the past, too, in an indirect way; I am one of those quite ready to admit that fact. For a long time we lived in a shell, as it were; but discussing the history of those conditions and of that period would, I am afraid, take me far beyond the scope of the question now under consideration. We have been late in developing proper standards of education for the masses. Not having outside capital, we have progressed more slowly in the economic and financial fields. We have not been helped by the immigration of people of our own stock, as others have been helped. We have had no outside capital. Being less self-sufficient financially, the public treasury of our province could not devote the money that should have been spent on health services and in the advancement of educational facilities. I admit all that, but great improvements have been made in the past fifty years. The days of road and bridge building have gone; the period of the harnessing of our water powers and the exploitation of our resources has paved the way for the developments that have been observed in Quebec during the last few years, including improvements in health services, compulsory education, the expansion of technical and trade education and other measures the ultimate results of which will greatly benefit the whole population. Therefore, if perchance the margin of benefit accruing to one province seems higher in the aggregate than that accruing to another province, it is partly due to the conditions I have described and partly due also to the fact that the average number of children per family is much larger in Quebec than in the other provinces.

Is there anything unjust about this? A country cannot be said to be prosperous when one part of it is not prosperous. The lack of purchasing power of one part of the population reduces the chances of the other part to better its own standards. We are interdependent more than ever. Nations are interdependent; provinces are interdependent; individuals are interdependent. The advocates of immigration say that we need more population to meet our needs. Let us first improve the lot of our own people, and we shall be sufficient unto ourselves.

I do not think the fears of labour that this treasure may adversely affect salaries are substantiated by the facts. Experts on family allowances connected with the French labour unions in France have all been

witnesses to the fact that that has not been the result of the granting of such family allowances in France. We have the evidence of the secretary-general of the C.G.T.—that is the federation of workers in France—who has stated repeatedly that this had not been the effect over there. We believe the same thing will happen here.

Some people have said that this is an impracticable adventure, and that many of the countries which had it at one time have had to abandon it. It is to be noted that the eight countries in 1940 which paid family allowances were Belgium, Italy, France, Hungary, Chile, New South Wales, New Zealand and Spain. In addition to these, there are quite a number of countries which paid family allowances on a smaller scale. These were not paid by the government, but rather by the industries themselves. Or, if paid by the government, they are paid solely to the civil service. The civil service, the railway workers, and provincial and municipal employees in Holland receive 2.5 per cent of their salary per child per year with a minimum of 50 and a maximum of 200 florin per head per year.

In Switzerland some industries have instituted family allowances for their own employees. Sixty-five thousand families of employees of the federal administration receive an allowance of 120 Swiss francs per child per year.

In Germany certain industries have had it for a long time, especially the mining industry. Civil servants and day labourers employed on public works, bank and insurance employees have also benefited. The allowances in Germany are uniform for each child.

In Poland the civil servants enjoyed family allowances before the war.

In Czechoslovakia the workers in the coal mining industry received family allowances.

In Austria government employees have benefited from family allowances since 1926. In private industries payment of allowances has been in effect since long before that time. This has applied to mining, steel works, printing establishments, and so on.

In Sweden we find something contrary to what has been said in the house. Sweden never had a government-operated plan of family allowances. Therefore it could not have abandoned such a policy, as has been said. But during the last war the cost of living bonus had taken the shape of subsidies proportionate to the importance of the family. When peace came and normal conditions were restored this cost of living bonus disappeared in 1923.

In Great Britain the greatest objection of the independent labour party is to the fact