

*Adjournment Debate*

What about the unemployed who are at home? Should all these people be included as well, and if so, according to what criteria?

And finally, as we all know, because of the way the unemployment insurance system works, paying benefits to people who are not employed can often have undesirable side effects. People normally want to maximize their consumption of products, services and leisure, including products and services they can produce by themselves. This means that if the government were to provide benefits to people who are not on the job market, some people would see this as an incentive to get out of the job market in order to get the so-called "free" benefits offered by the government under this kind of system. Does the government really want to encourage this attitude? The answer is pretty obvious.

It is clear that it is not easy to find a fool-proof criterion for identifying persons who "remain at home". I think that is obvious from the few examples I gave and the questions I raised. There would perhaps be a way to establish a link between "salary" and "remain at the home". The link between salary and individual income could ensure that all women who remain at home receive an income. However, most programs that are based on an assessment of the level of income already take into account the family income, which is the best yardstick for the resources available to each member of the family.

Another way would be to tie the salary to the presence of children in the home, in the case of either men or women, or perhaps to the care of parents or other family members who are disabled. Establishing this link between salary and the presence of children in the home is fairly easy. We already use this criterion for the child tax credit and the Canada Pension Plan exclusion clause for raising children, for instance. Tying salary to care provided for disabled family members may be more difficult to do on a permanent basis. However, assuming this problem can be solved, let us consider the concept of "salary" in the proposal presented by the hon. member for Abitibi.

As I said earlier, the salary concept presupposes that payment is made for services rendered.

• (1700)

We are all familiar with the many and sometimes difficult tasks performed by those men or women who stay at home. These would include raising children, looking after the whole family, or perhaps just taking care of a spouse or even themselves. Furthermore, many people who remain at home become caregivers for the elderly or handicapped relatives living with them. Others give their time as volunteer workers to all kinds of charitable organizations.

I am sure most people will agree that, in practical or realistic terms, the government could not consider implementing such a policy. On the one hand, there would be discrimination and, on the other hand, it would be impossible to quantify the work of men and women staying at home according to the type of services.

For those reasons, I am unable to endorse this motion whose objective, although worthwhile, is beyond any conceivable implementation.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** As no other member wishes to speak, the hour provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired. Pursuant to Standing Order 96(1), this item is dropped from the Order Paper.

---

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

### CRIME PREVENTION

**Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park):** Mr. Speaker, on March 17 I asked a question of the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada about the recommendations made at the national symposium in Toronto.

I reminded the minister that at the symposium four ministers confirmed that the way to reduce crime and make our community safer is to do something about poverty, illiteracy, unemployment and the lack of adequate housing. Four ministers said that the true roots of crime are poverty, illiteracy, unemployment and the lack of adequate housing. In his reply the minister did not say