

Mr. HOMUTH: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order and I ask your ruling on this. There is at least some semblance of order in this house, even though some of us are out of order once in a while. The hon. member made an accusation against another hon. member, and he must either justify the truth of that accusation or withdraw it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has called attention to what he considers is an accusation against another hon. member. I think the fact of his drawing the matter to the attention of the house will bring to the notice of the hon. member who is accused that he may of his own volition take the steps which are usual in such cases.

Mr. CLEAVER: As I was saying when I was interrupted, what annoyed me last night and what caused the interruption was the fact that I thought the hon. member was reading a speech which someone else had written, coupled with the fact that the speech had the contents which I have just read. So far as I am concerned, I am not going to sit idly by and let any member of this house, not even the member for Waterloo North—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Waterloo South.

Mr. CLEAVER: —attempt to raise racial—

Mr. HOMUTH: Waterloo North would be very proud of that.

Mr. CLEAVER: — attempt to sow discord and disunity in this country. There is one party in Canada whose leader, outside the house to-day, is doing a lot of that kind of thing, and the infection has spread and reached the House of Commons. What do you think, Mr. Speaker, of the leader of a party, on a social measure such as family allowances, dragging in the racial issue? He called attention to the fact that the birthrate in Quebec was higher than the birthrate elsewhere.

Mr. HOMUTH: What leader outside the house did that?

Mr. CLEAVER: Were those words uttered for any other purpose than to raise racial fire, racial hatred? If they were uttered for any other purpose I will give my hon. friend the opportunity right now to give the other reason. I say that it could not have been for any other reason.

What are the facts in regard to this legislation? The present measure with its reducing scale, after you reach the family of four, obviously takes the family of four as the typical Canadian family. When the family is larger than four in number the monthly payments per child drop sharply, with the result that in the province of Quebec the total

cost of this family allowance measure monthly, it is estimated, will be \$6,709,000. Then, when you move into Ontario, what is the cost? The same—\$6,068,000.

Mr. HOMUTH: Will my hon. friend permit a question? Has he also taken into consideration the amount of income tax returns from those two payments, \$6 million in one province and \$6 million in the other?

Mr. CLEAVER: No; but thank you for reminding me about the income tax.

Mr. HOMUTH: I thought I would help your speech.

Mr. CLEAVER: My hon. friends opposite are very much interested in raising these points periodically about the means test and what-not, but I have yet to hear any member of that party advocate that the children's allowance with respect to income tax, to the man earning \$25,000 a year, should disappear. Think that one over.

Mr. HOMUTH: Knock that straw man down.

Mr. CLEAVER: It is quite apparent, from the terms of this bill and the resulting cost, that an honest effort has been made to hold the scales level with respect to all the provinces, and it is most unfair that criticism should be made in that regard without a statement of the facts. My hon. friends in the Conservative opposition, I say, raised this racial issue for one reason, and for one reason only. They have nothing to lose in Quebec. Why, bless you, this time they will not even lose their deposits!

Mr. HOMUTH: Well, you certainly will. Don't worry.

Mr. CLEAVER: They have no candidates in Quebec. They have nothing to lose in Quebec, but they think that by raising this racial issue they are going to gain a few votes in Ontario. What do you think of a major party which would have utter disregard for unity in Canada, in a time of war, just in order to make a few votes at a coming election? The family allowance scheme, I submit, has been justly and fairly thought out. Every province will benefit and benefit fairly by it.

I now come to the next point raised by the opposition and that is another objection raised by the hon. member for Peel. Listen to this: "9. It denies the basic principles of social justice", because it treats everybody alike. We are told that we have a new Conservative party, that they have a new name, a new leader and a new platform. They would lead