

Status of Women Study

between work and home. Many of them have spent a whole day at work, then they must come home and in the evenings try to take care of the family and do their housekeeping.

Why do these women work? According to the 1967 figures, the latest ones I could get, about a quarter of the women out working who have children of under school age were married to men with incomes of \$3,000 a year or less. Therefore, a quarter of these women were out working for the sole reason that they had either to support their families—they were the sole support—or because their husband's income was so low that the woman's pay cheque was necessary if there was to be enough for the family.

Dr. Reuben Baetz, of the Canadian Council of Social Development, said a little while ago:

We suffer from a kind of double vision in Canada: people appear to approve the enrolment of children of the affluent in nursery schools and to disapprove the enrolment of the children of the poor in day nurseries.

Why is this so? Why are there objections to day-care centres for the children of people on low income? I believe our choice today is between caring for the child or neglecting the child. That is our only choice. No, there is another. I think we ought to be prepared to do what I have suggested in this House. Where there is a woman with small children, I think she ought to be given the choice of staying home and looking after them, as opposed to being forced out to work because the family income is too low.

I have proposed twice in this House that we do as they do in France, pay a salary to that mother. This would enable her to stay home and care for those children. However, in Canada we are apparently deciding not to follow that way. Therefore, we shall have to take the day-care way, which has proved to be a very good way indeed where it has been tried. We have lots of precedents for this. For example, England now has a variety of programs for pre-school care and a three-year training program for pre-school teachers. Sweden's pre-school centres are very well equipped. France has pre-school institutions directly under government control. Crèches, boarding nurseries, day nurseries, baby-sitting centres and counselling centres are under the ministry of social affairs. Nursery schools and kindergartens are under the ministry of education. In Denmark, day-care facilities are available to children from birth, in Britain from the age of one month, in Sweden from six months and in France from early infancy.

● (8:20 p.m.)

It is evident that Canada is far behind in the provision of services for pre-school children. I think that behind every objection is the expense. It would cost the taxpayers money to have child-care centres. But I quote Jerome Kagan, Harvard child psychologist, writing a few days ago:

—if the family is to survive as the central unit in western society many billions must be spent for a system of day-care centres for children of working mothers.

[Mrs. MacInnis.]

Otherwise, the family is headed for disintegration and deterioration. I picked up the latest copy of *Chatelaine* magazine which is well known to Canadian women. I wish to quote as follows from an editorial entitled, "Yes, dear governments, we can afford day care":

We are the second most affluent country in the world but away behind other western countries in day care. Yet we can afford to spend \$17 million refitting an aircraft carrier we didn't need.

Almost 40 years ago we found the money to set up a national broadcasting system. After the war we got around to subsidizing ballet, opera and the arts. We spent \$50 million on the Seaway, and \$375 million on a pipeline. We've also managed to set aside \$10 million to help develop Canadian films. Isn't it about time we found money to spend on our children?

I believe that it is. That is the reason we are pushing this recommendation. I wish to deal briefly with the need for family planning and its various aspects of birth-control, abortion and sterilization. I am not going to be drawn into debate on abortion, not that I am not tempted to go down that particular garden path, but we have been promised time to discuss that subject in the House on another occasion.

We in Canada are deplorably slow in acting on family planning, birth-control information and contraceptives. We need to consider this from many angles. As I have stated previously, birth-control and the widespread knowledge of contraceptives are the proper and sensible first line of defence against unwanted pregnancies. To those people who are always speaking about the awfulness of abortion and its dreadfulness, I say that if they are serious about wanting to cut down on the number of abortion cases in this country, legal and illegal, they should get busy and push a great deal harder for the dissemination of birth-control information and contraceptives. That is the only way to keep down abortions.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mrs. MacInnis: As far as I can learn, and I believe this is in the report of the status of women, out of the 900 large general hospitals in Canada only three have birth-control clinics attached to them. I would be glad to learn that I am wrong. I am not happy at the speed with which the Department of Health and Welfare is proceeding on this matter. There is too much everlasting planning and not enough everlasting action. In an editorial in this morning's *Vancouver Province*, the minister responsible for housing was complimented on saying:

We can't research forever. We have to move, even if still somewhat crudely, in some direction.

One area in which we have to move is birth control and family planning. We have to move to implement the recommendations of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women. I am glad that the minister has appointed a task force. Esther Greenglass, a member of the task force, stated:

First we must have changes in the law and then the changes in attitude will follow.

I think the changes in attitude are coming. However, there is nothing like changing the law to help those who