

who do not want to work. We are trying under this omnibus motion to give a reward for being pregnant. The rewards of being pregnant should be self-explanatory: the reward is children. Anybody who has had them or who has had grandchildren knows that this is a reward in itself and that it requires no federal statute.

Day-care centres are a wonderful idea. I believe it would be workable if we lived in communal dwellings. But I see difficulties connected with setting up day-care centres all over Canada, because I believe only in universal legislation. I do not believe that only the city mother who wants to go to work in Woolworth's as a shop girl should have her babies looked after from cradle to school age. What about the Eskimo woman who helps her husband trap seals? She should have her babies cared for while she is out with her husband on ice-floes. She is a Canadian also, and probably a taxpayer.

I believe, also, that by and large it is our job to enact legislation which assists us all. Goodness knows, there are thousands of things we could do if we had the money. Where will the money come from? Are we going to tax the day-care mother? Certainly not. We are going to tax the rich. But who are the rich today? It is not anyone earning \$10,000 a year, because if you earn that amount you will get none of these benefits. Your baby bonus will be cut off and you will get nothing free. If you build a decent home in which to support your children, let alone day-care centres for somebody else's children, you will pay up to \$1,500 a year and income tax on top of that.

I think that today, faced as we are with many economic illnesses, we should try to find out how we are going to earn take-home pay for the goose that is supposed to lay the golden egg, for the \$10,000 a year man who aspires to that level and to the social benefits which we all know he should have. But we find few people who are willing to pay more than they are paying today. As I travel up and down the country—I hesitate to say how many thousands of miles I travel to try to do my job in this House—on every occasion I hear, "If you cannot beat them, join them". What do they mean? They mean that if you cannot afford taxes which a \$7,000 to \$10,000 a year man has to pay, you had better be unemployed and get everything for nothing. Nobody within the sound of my voice, or nobody who will take the trouble to read what I am saying this afternoon, would disagree that this is the horrible truth. What the people of Canada are looking for today is for us to come up with sound economic answers to what will happen to the middle-class wage earners' take-home pay.

I have an imagination second to none and I could dream up fancy schemes for spending other people's money equal to anybody's in this chamber. But I have to scratch my head to tell you how we can take one more dollar out of the ordinary taxpayer's pocket in Canada without making him face economic ruin. It is no good boasting about our gross national product. I am shocked when I read about our gross national product being doubled while my take-home pay is being divided in two. It does not add up. There are a great many people in the

Status of Women Study

country who are desperate for answers. I venture to say that if we had a strong man in Canada who had answers to these questions, people would flock to him like the children did to the Pied Piper. But they are not being fooled by the kind of Pied Piper music they are being given today. They are sick with worry and they are tired of talking about sex, abortion, day-care centres and unemployment insurance when what we should be talking about is more jobs, more production, more employment and less taxes.

If I do not agree with abortion, I am left with only two choices at present, either to be called a cold-blooded butcher of women or a cold-blooded butcher of helpless children. Is there truth in both? Are they both wrong? Or is there something about the whole thing wherein a man of common sense can find an answer? I am old-fashioned; I am what the younger generation might call a square. I go back to the standards taught me by the same grandmother who thought it was a good thing to have babies and to have grandchildren. She said that human life was sacred and that we should do all we can to protect it. That is a good starting point. That is where I stand and that is where I intend to remain.

I voted in this House against the death penalty. The Criminal Code is nicely vague. I think they are talking about abortion. I may be wrong. Perhaps they are talking about the death penalty. I voted for a change from capital punishment because although I am a policeman by profession I feel strongly about the sacredness of human life, even the sacredness of a condemned criminal, a cold-blooded killer of a policeman. I voted against the amendment to make a policeman's life more sacred than that of anyone else.

I believe in the universality of democracy. I believe that human life is sacred, that it is not expendable. There is only one excuse for taking a human life, and that is if it is for the greater good. That is why I was a soldier; that is why I was a policeman—to try and uphold the right, which is nothing more than maintaining the best possible good for the greatest number. I voted against the retention of the death penalty because people told me, and they cited statistics, that it would take the human race one step further along the road to the Utopia which we are all striving to reach. So going against what was common sense to me, I agreed to give the abolition of the death penalty a chance, to see if humane treatment of cold-blooded killers, killers of children and of bank tellers, killers of people who had worked hard to buy their own property and believed they had a right to keep it, would do the greatest good.

● (5:50 p.m.)

I did this, Mr. Speaker, because I have a profound belief in the decency of human life. Let nobody in this House or this country tell me that if I vote such and such a way on abortion it is because I am a cold-blooded killer either of women or of children. I will vote as I have indicated because I have a profound respect for human life. If anybody can convince me that I have a right to terminate the life of an unborn child for the good of humanity, for the ennoblement of the human race, for the