enzie King's absence in London. He said that the agreement existing between Canada and the United States regarding the bases in Newfoundland....

Mr. Chairman From what are you intending to quote, sir?

Mr. Starkes I am quoting official records, sir.

Mr. Chairman What are the official records?

Mr. Starkes Mr. St. Laurent...

Mr. Chairman You're quoting an extract direct from the speech, supposedly by Mr. St. Laurent, in what circumstances?

Mr. Starkes In the absence of Mr. Mackenzie King, he made this statement.

Mr. Chairman In the House of Commons?

Mr. Starkes Yes.

Mr. Chairman Well, are you quoting direct, are you quoting from *Hansard*?

Mr. Starkes No, I'm not.

Mr. Chairman In that case, I can't...

Mr. Starkes Well I won't quote from the papers...

Mr. Chairman No, no, you can't quote from papers.

Mr. Starkes No, I won't quote from the paper, I'll just explain it. Mr. St. Laurent said that the agreement existing between Canada and the United States regarding bases in Newfoundland would not in any way be affected by confederation.

Mr. Chairman You're quoting....no, you're not quoting newspapers.

Mr. Smallwood Mr. Chairman, to a point of order. Why can't he quote? He's not quoting from the newspaper, he's quoting a statement made by Mr. St. Laurent. He's not saying where he's quoting it from. We've been doing that every day, quoting what this man said and that man said.

Mr. Chairman No, I approve...

Mr. Smallwood He's not quoting from newspapers.

Mr. Chairman You are not to quote from the newspaper.

Mr. Smallwood He's not doing that.

Mr. Chairman If you are referring to a speech, or paraphrasing a speech made by Mr. St. Laurent, that's in order. I permitted the same latitude to other people here and I must of course do the same now.

Mr. Cashin Mr. Starkes said Mr. St. Laurent said this in the House of Commons when Mr. King was absent. I'd say the House of Commons wasn't open when Mr. St. Laurent...

Mr. Chairman My only point was that if he was quoting from *Hansard*, of course I'd allow him to do so. But otherwise, he's not permitted to quote from the newspaper as such.

Mr. Starkes Therefore Mr. Chairman, the United States would still maintain bases in this country, for at least the next 99 years.

Mr. Cashin Because it would be up in 93...

Mr. Starkes For at least 99 years.

Mr. Cashin No, it will be up in 92 or 93 years.

Mr. Starkes Not for the next 99 years, for at least 99 years.

Mr. Cashin For the next 99 years, you said.

Mr. Starkes You're a bit hard of hearing. Here again I'd like to refer to Mr. St. Laurent when being questioned regarding the assertions of Mr. Duplessis that the provinces had not been approached before terms of confederation were forwarded to the Governor. He said it was not necessary to consult the provinces as provision had been made in the British North America Act for the inclusion of Newfoundland in confederation. How can we negotiate on terms that are provincial if the British North America Act provides the conditions under which a province can enter the union?

The family allowance immoral! It is strange that 22 nations have adopted these immoral family allowances. Can it not be realised that there's a very great principle behind government assistance for children of families? If we will not admit the justice of these monthly grants, so that our future men and women will be brought up better by being able to buy more food, we must condemn progress and social justice. If we cannot recognise that as a progressive step, it would be just as well to go back to the cave man days. Here it is in a nutshell: a greater distribution of the produced wealth to benefit children of fathers in lower earning classes. Even in Great Britain, they are endeavouring to provide money to pay family allowances as outlined in the Beveridge plan. Not so long ago I read in the *Canadian Yearbook* that family allowances were introduced for the purpose of equalising opportunity for the children of Canada. What is immoral about this, Mr. Chairman?

War veterans — we have the Canadian War