

in the experimental stage in Canada. It is costing a fabulous sum. It has yet to prove itself. But at the moment it is the chief selling point of the confederates, and its basis is that the people will get something for nothing. That argument has been tried in other places besides Newfoundland. Here is what a semi-official Canadian publication supplied to the members of this Convention says in this regard:

The family allowance is a broad raise in wages for many people. To those of fixed income, especially those who derive little or no benefit directly from the bonus, it is quite injurious. As an example, it has been found that part-time and other jobs which for various reasons do not pay fancy sums, are being turned down by those who regard the allowance as a convenient dole system.

Thus it not only encourages unemployment, but forces wages up in certain industries which in turn raises costs on manufactured articles. The general public, therefore, not only pays for the family allowance, but pays again in increased prices.

The government's estimated \$250 million cost, means that over \$20 in extra taxes now has to be raised for every man, woman and child in Canada. It has been said that the plan is economical when it is considered that the annual expense is only equivalent to two weeks' average expenditure for war. On the other hand, the war has put us tremendously into debt, and it seems reasonable to believe that family allowances will send us further into debt. Particularly is this probably in view of our commitments to heavy post-war expenditures which have hitherto not entered into the picture.

Mr. Chairman What are you quoting from?

Mr. Harrington *Quick Canadian Facts*.

Mr. Chairman There is nothing official about that.

Mr. Harrington It has already been quoted from.

Mr. Chairman It should not have been.

Mr. Harrington The idea was to give something for nothing. That is the gist of this article. They give the idea that it is a bonus to those in need by a direct cash grant, and that creates a further illusion. The theme is, "soak the rich and get family allowances". But just how far can the

rich be soaked? And just how many rich are there in Newfoundland to soak? You can soak them to the limit of the law, and you still won't get a fraction of the money needed to run the tenth province. And you can only soak them by income tax, and that goes to the federal government.

Old age pensions. Everyone agrees with old age pensions. As I said in the debate on the Economic Report, what we pay in in old age pensions is not, should not, be a matter of dollars and cents, but a matter of conscience and justice. We cannot wait until we have a surplus to increase old age pensions, and there should be no restrictions as to a means test, involving the signing away of rights to property or anything else. When Bill 339 on old age pensions was brought into the Canadian House of Commons on June 18 last, a few days before our delegation arrived in Ottawa, here is what the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Bracken, said: "This government promised two years ago, in this public document I have read, a pension plan which would provide for the elimination of the test.... This government then proposed to eliminate the means test. Now they are bringing forward a measure which retains the means test. They promised old age pensions at 70, all to be paid by the Dominion. They now bring forward a measure in which they leave 25% of the cost to be paid by the provinces. And the proposed old age pensions for people between the ages of 65 and 69, half to be paid by the Dominion and half by the provinces. Yet there is nothing of that in this bill...." And further on in the debate, M. J. Coldwell, leader of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, spoke in the same strain: "I want to make a plea again this afternoon, for the complete abolition of the means test. I see no reason whatever for continuing this humiliating test, which is entirely unnecessary. In another act the government has recognised the validity of not applying the means test. They have recognised this in connection with childrens' allowances."

Mr. Smallwood spoke of Canadian social measures as though no other country in the world had ever heard of them until Canada made the first move. He referred to Canadian thinking in these matters, and I might just for the record, inject here, that whereas old age pensions were introduced in Canada in 1927, Sir Michael Cashin in his budget of 1911-12 earmarked a vote