

It is important to review the conclusions of these researchers. The change was attributed by them to the "radically different social climate", which the latter group of women had experienced. It had enabled them to escape the fate of their "briefly, premaritally, liberated mothers who had become quickly reined-in and subdued by the traditional halts of male dominance". In most cases the researchers reported most women growing up after the twenties "never again reverted to unquestioning acceptance of the submergence of their identity and autonomy with that of their husband and their own domestic role." If the connection is sustained, Dr. Srole and Dr. Fischer concluded that between the higher rates of well-being in later life and the sense of opportunity prevailing among women in childhood and adolescence, this would add weight to the case for extending women's rights to live their lives on a basis equal to that enjoyed by males. This is the very point the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre was trying to make.

It seems to me we must let the families choose their divisions of responsibilities. Children need both mothers and fathers. We do not automatically assume that one is the breadwinner. In my opinion that encourages the exploitation of women who are in the labour force, suggesting that they should not be there in the first place and therefore they are not entitled to equal pay and to equal opportunities. I am sure it is obvious to all in the House that only women can bear children and bring them into the world. But children benefit from parental guidance and attention by both parents when they are fortunate enough to have both parents.

Even if one looks at situations where divorce has occurred, one will find there is increasing evidence that divorced parents, in choosing who shall have custody of the children, both feel they have an important role to play in the life of their children, despite the divorce proceedings. Why should the government tell a mother it is only her job to devote herself to the care of her family? Are we trying to discourage young men and young women from training to fulfil their vital roles in society, telling them it is a waste of their time because the government will only recognize the housewife role as the legitimate one? I do not think that is the reality of today.

I would like to say, with great respect to the hon. member for Bellechasse, that recognition of the vital role women play in the family as mothers, grandmothers, wives, sisters or daughters cannot be given by the token gesture proposed by the hon. member. Young people of both sexes, and fathers, need more encouragement in the training and care of the young, of the infirm and aged, and all household tasks so that responsibilities for the care and well-being of family members and household tasks can be shared and enjoyed with pride of contribution, rather than by loading all of these duties on a woman no matter what else she may do, whatever else she might like to do or no matter what her interests may be.

In my view the majority of women are not asking for wages for housework, but they are asking for equal opportunities and for recognition and support service to families.

### *Borrowing Authority*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCain):** The hour provided for the consideration of private members' business having expired, I do now leave the chair until 8 p.m.

At 6 p.m. the House took recess.

● (2000)

### AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### BORROWING AUTHORITY ACT, 1979-80

#### SUPPLEMENTARY BORROWING AUTHORITY FOR 1979-80

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Crosbie that Bill C-10, to provide supplementary borrowing authority for the fiscal year 1979-80, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

**Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, before the five o'clock adjournment I pointed out that the present ministers are now following the policies previously carried out by the former Liberal government, policies which they opposed vigorously when they were in opposition. The Prime Minister (Mr. Clark) and the present Minister of Finance (Mr. Crosbie) attacked the former government for permitting higher interest rates. They attacked the former government for not implementing a program of tax cuts to the extent of \$2 billion, as proposed by the present Prime Minister, for low and middle income earners. These are policies that are now being forgotten.

If I remember correctly, the present Minister of Finance indicated that in his opinion the people of Canada should not take promises made by political parties when they are in opposition too seriously. In other words, he was indicating that a very large number of the promises made by his party when it was in opposition would not be implemented by his government.

The Conservatives were opposed to deficit financing. It seemed to many of us, not just those of us in the NDP, that Conservative members of Parliament had not read a thing about economics since Adam Smith wrote his very good book on economics more than 100 years ago. Now they come here and ask for permission to borrow \$7 billion.

We are not opposed to deficit financing. Indeed, we have spoken frequently about the need in certain circumstances to follow a policy of deficit financing, indeed a policy which has been followed for many years by many of the provincial Conservative governments. I need just point to the Ontario