

The Budget—Mrs. Grace MacInnis

amusement in the past. If we are going to protect the homes in this country, until such time as we have decent allowances for families, we should make available to mothers who make a full time career of raising their children a decent allowance to enable them to do so. France has been able to do this.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mrs. MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): I am glad there are one or two people who applaud. France has found this to be one way of protecting homes there. We badly need protection for our Canadian homes. If a woman could go out and earn another pay cheque to enable the family to live with a moderate standard of living but deliberately stays at home and puts her effort and energy into raising fine citizens from the standpoint of physical, mental and moral development, then in my opinion she deserves a salary as much as the woman who goes out and sells soap and shoes and sealing wax at some store or other establishment. I think the time is ripe for this.

My next point is number five. It is my last point, my royal george. This is a long range plan. While we are overhauling these pensions and giving these allowances we should realize that all these things are like a crazy patchwork quilt which should be placed in the museums with the lanterns, side boots, ox carts and those other things that belong to the 19th century. We do not need these things now.

If I had a little more faith in the Prime Minister than I have I might hope that he had one more card up his sleeve. I might hope he would clear the ground by stating that the government is getting out of medicare and other cost sharing programs in order that it can adopt a real program whereby the federal government could control the finances and know whether it was building up deficits. I would hope the Prime Minister could say that he is clearing away this patchwork quilt legislation in order that we here in Ottawa can build a good guaranteed annual income program for Canadians.

Perhaps I am doing the Prime Minister an injustice by thinking that he does not have this in mind. I hope he will come here tomorrow afternoon and tell us this is what he had in mind all the time. Since the election last June it has become fashionable to declare that such a thing as a guaranteed annual income is impossible. I have heard estimates of between \$2 billion and \$3 billion as the cost. It has been said that it would bankrupt the country and is quite impossible. But it

[Mrs. MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway).]

was only a few months before the election last summer that several hon. gentlemen who are now occupying the government benches were pushing for a guaranteed annual income. I should like to read from the *Globe and Mail* of August 13, 1966. It indicates that western Liberals meeting in Saskatoon called for full government study of a guaranteed annual income program. The article then states:

The resolution said a guaranteed annual income program would be a substitute for Canada's current maze of welfare and assistance programs. Liberal M.P. Ronald Basford (Vancouver-Burrard), a member of the British Columbia delegation, urged adoption of the resolution, saying the concept is new but promising.

"We want to see if this will be a way to break the cycle of dependency which nowadays often keeps people on welfare all their lives."

• (5:50 p.m.)

I agree. I think that is good sense. I hope he will echo those sentiments now. I daresay I shall find out in a little while whether he will. He was not the only one to push for this. The then minister of national health and welfare, the minister of agriculture, the minister of justice, the leader of the opposition and quite a few others were pushing for a guaranteed annual income. I think the arguments for it are every bit as good now as they ever were.

If and when we get a guaranteed annual income, I ask hon. members to remember that tremendous savings will be made in other social security programs. These savings can be made whether at the federal or provincial level. Please do not forget that it is the same John and Mary Doe who put up the dough when it comes to taxation, no matter which government does the collecting. A guaranteed annual income is not all financial loss. The economic council at page 105 of its annual review says:

It has been estimated in the United States that one poor man can cost the public purse as much as \$140,000 between the ages of 17 and 57.

I would add that he never does get out of his poverty. So we are putting out thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money recklessly to try to rehabilitate people who have fallen into the trap of poverty; and no matter how much we rehabilitate them they will never be in as good a situation as they would have been had we kept them out of the mess in the first place. The things I have proposed should be done now through wisdom about the future of our country and care for the people of our country. If we do not do