

The WITNESS: I will put it in another form then. The documents that have been circulated in connection with family allowances make the admission that this plan would be a substitute for a payment that would enable the worker to have a decent living and perpetuate his group. I think that that is correct. If it is not correct I certainly do not insist on it as a point.

The CHAIRMAN: Of course, we are anxious as a Committee to get evidence on the different angles of the question.

The WITNESS: The fact at any rate, I think, is clear that you cannot, whether it is through your employers fund, or in any other way, pay a subsidy to one part of an industrial group of this kind without taking it away from the other part. You cannot subsidize the married group without making some sort of reduction from the unmarried group.

*By Mr. Woodsworth:*

Q. Who said so?—A. Well, I am merely expressing an opinion again. We view this measure then—whether rightly or wrongly—as a palliative. We view it as a subsidy, to some extent a camouflage, something that would conceal the actual situation. And we oppose it for another reason that is very closely allied, namely, that we consider it, in a sense, as an unwarranted interference with individual liberty and initiative. We think that it is not desirable that the possibility of saving for a decent married life should be taken away from any married worker, that the state, or the industry, or somebody else, should be forced to do his saving for him and hand it back to him. We are not opposed, as a matter of fact we favour, I think, pretty generally, those insurance schemes that insure against measurable hazards; but this scheme we look upon as one that attempts to subsidize the normal condition of the community. To have a family is not something that is a dire accident that happens to you and, therefore, you are trying to protect yourself against. It is the thing that everyone should be taught to look forward to as the normal situation, and again we feel that this would be a dangerous measure from the point of view of subsidizing or insuring against something that is normal. The proposal, I understand, is intended, among other things, to encourage large families. It has already been pointed out—and I would like to emphasize it a little—that our observation, as social workers at any rate, is that the size of the family does not vary directly in accordance with the income. In fact, our observation is very much in the other direction, that the smaller the income the larger the family, and we see nothing in this that would indicate that we are likely to get large families from that, except as Mrs. Kensit has pointed out, in certain groups that perhaps we would rather not encourage.

And just in conclusion I think I would be expected to say, that social workers as a group have yet to be convinced of the desirability of large families. We find the most difficult situations in that type of family. We, as I have said, actually find the very large family associated with very difficult situations that run parallel, and we feel that as things are developing in Canada, and in other countries, at the present time, the problem of bringing up children in even a moderately sized family—I have three children and I know that they are a handful—is becoming about all the ordinary parent can tussle with. The difficulties of child training are being borne in upon social agencies perhaps more than the individuals that go to make up a community. We are seeing the results of child training, inadequate child training and inadequate parenthood more than other people, perhaps, and our belief in this matter is, not quantity but quality. Let us have all we can, but let them be of good quality, not more than we can handle, and let us do everything we can to get behind the State