

Family Allowances

and all these other things—we have effected a more equitable distribution of the national income in time of war, and that is why we appear to be reasonably prosperous to-day; whereas in the depression, with very little more national income, we were having very difficult times and hundreds of thousands of our people were going through experiences quite as distressing as, or more so than, war.

For these reasons I have a suggestion to make to the government. I should like to see the government go the whole way and collect by way of excess profits tax the money required for family allowances. I am not suggesting that the Excess Profits Tax Act, which is a war measure, should be continued in its present form, but I suggest that it be revised and brought into shape as a permanent peace-time measure, and I would use the money that would be taken from big companies and others under the Excess Profits Tax Act to pay family allowances, so that we would know that we were doing what we planned to do by this measure. It is simply a transfer of wealth to the tune of \$200 million from the pockets of those who do not need it to the pockets of those who need it very badly. I would go farther. I would keep that tax in a separate fund, and, as it increased, as it would with the increased prosperity of this country, I would increase family allowances to the full extent which the excess profits tax returns would permit.

May I turn for a moment to some of the arguments which have been advanced by two members of the Progressive Conservative party in opposition to the present measure. The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon) stated yesterday, as reported in *Hansard*, at page 5342 as follows, in enumerating the various objections which his party has to this measure:

3. It adds a further strain on our national unity. There is but one province which has maintained the high birth rate and large family which was so characteristic of Canada's pioneer strains.

I wish also to read from the speech delivered by the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Bruce). I am sorry he is not in his seat at the moment, because I have something to say to him, but I must say it whether he is here or not. He made this statement—

Mr. HOMUTH: What page?

Mr. CLEAVER: *Hansard*, page 5365:

This bill will result in many cases in bonusing families who have been unwilling to defend their country.

Further, on the same page:

Why should a hard working man who has planned a normal sized family have to curtail
[Mr. Cleaver.]

his wishes because he is heavily taxed in order to help to support a large family of shiftless people . . . ?

Then, referring back to page 5363:

That province—

Referring to Quebec.

—because of its large families will derive the greatest benefit from this measure, at the expense of the other provinces, particularly Ontario, which pays one-half of the taxes of Canada.

I think the time has arrived when we must face up to this sort of thing. I have never done anything knowingly to light racial fires, to stir up disunity in this country, and from time to time I have taken from the other side of the house quite a bit in that regard that I did not like. Last night I interrupted, because I thought the hon. member making a speech of that kind should at least conform to the rules of the house and make his own speech, instead of reading one which somebody else had written.

Mr. HOMUTH: Now wait a minute. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The hon. member whom the member for Halton (Mr. Cleaver) is accusing of having read a speech which someone else had written for him is not in his seat at the moment. The hon. member has no right to make that accusation unless he has proof of the fact. Either he must produce proof that the hon. member was reading a speech which someone else wrote, or withdraw the statement.

Mr. GARDINER: You are not in your seat, either.

Mr. CLEAVER: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. HOMUTH: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I ask the hon. member to do one thing or the other.

Mr. CLEAVER: There is no point of order about that.

Mr. HOMUTH: The point of order is that the hon. member has made an accusation against another hon. member. He should either prove his statement that the hon. member was reading a speech written by someone else or withdraw the accusation.

Mr. GARDINER: Under the rules you cannot speak from that seat at all.

Mr. HOMUTH: I speak for a lot of people.

Mr. CLEAVER: On a question of privilege to-morrow the hon. member, if he says he wrote the speech himself, can rise in his place in the house and say so, but there is no point of order other than that.