

The sober truth is that never was there a more moral piece of legislation, for family allowances are a strong bulwark for the strengthening of family life. The family, sir, is the foundation of society and civilisation, and anything that fosters and strengthens the family is not immoral, but highly moral, and family allowances are the finest system so far developed by any government anywhere to strengthen and encourage the family. New Zealand has family allowances, Australia has family allowances, Great Britain herself has family allowances, but Major Cashin says family allowances are immoral. But, after working himself up into a lather of moral indignation against these immoral family allowances, Major Cashin cools down again and reassures us that we need not worry any more about these family allowances, and why? "Because", says he, "they are going to be done away with soon." What is his reason for believing this? He forgot to tell us. Why does he think they are going to end? He did not think we would need any more proof than his bare word.

Mr. Chairman, if I were to tell you that the Commission of Government were soon going to close down our entire railway system; that the United States government is soon going to do away with their army, navy and airforce; that the British government is soon going to invite Joe Stalin to come from Moscow to London and take over the governing of Great Britain; if I were to tell you that and ask you not to ask for proof, but to take my word for it, what would you say? But without any proof Major Cashin says that these family allowances are soon going to be done away with. Whether he meant minutes, days, weeks, months or years or decades, he did not say, but just "soon". Now, sir, people can talk till they are black in the faces against family allowances. They can call them immoral, and say they are à la Hitler, they can twist and distort them, and when it is all said the simple truth remains, that we have 120,000 children in Newfoundland today, 120,000 children, sir, under the age of 16 — over one-third of our whole population. Every one of those children, under confederation, would receive the family allowances — \$5, \$6, \$7, or \$8 a month, according to the child's age. The parents may be rich or poor, high or low, sick or well, working or unemployed, it makes no difference; all the children will get the

family allowance every month of the year, rain or shine, winter or summer, good times or bad times. Into every nook and corner of this island and Labrador these family allowances will go every month, into 1,300 settlements to those 120,000 children. With confederation our children under 16 will get family allowances. Without confederation what will they get?

Sir, you will notice that up to the present time I am only replying to Major Cashin, that is because being the good speaker he is, being the experienced public man he is, and the ardent and enthusiastic anticonfederate he is, Major Cashin has for three days arrayed all the facts and arguments he could think of against confederation, and I, sir, one by one, am knocking these arguments on the head and throwing them under the table. That is why I am taking so long. It was worth a reply, it was a good speech. He is a fine fellow and I like him. Nevertheless, sir, he is an anticonfederate, God help him.

Well, he had a fling at the income tax in Canada, and was very careful to point out that here in Newfoundland a single person must earn at least \$1,000 a year before any income tax has to be paid by him, whereas in Canada it is \$750 a year. Now before dealing in any detail with this question of income taxes there is one general observation I want to make. Before the late war, the income tax in Canada was not very different from ours here in Newfoundland, but during the war Canada put up a very mighty war effort. Her taxes rose higher and higher and higher. That was during the war. But since the war ended Canada has reduced her taxes, not once, or twice, but three times, and it is believed throughout Canada that Finance Minister Abbott is bringing in further reductions in taxation when he brings down his new budget next month or the month after. Members of the Ottawa delegation will remember my joking attempt, at one of our plenary sessions, to draw Mr. Abbott out as to what reductions in taxation he is likely to bring down in his new budget this winter. He, being very well aware of the fact that a finance minister must keep that deadly secret till the last minute, refused to be drawn, but it is believed that there will be reductions again in the next budget a month or so from now.

Well, sir, to get back to that single person, that that means a person with nobody in the world