

spoken—to introduce an amendment to this effect since a member cannot do so.

As for me, I would have appreciated it if the increase had been retroactive to September 1, 1973 because it was school opening day and because it is the time when expenses are highest to prepare children for school. I calculated that this would cost approximately \$4 million. Maybe retroactivity in this field will surprise many people. But if you think it over, the future of the young is being mortgaged for various other reasons and for years to come. If, from time to time, we should adopt a retroactive measure for families I think no one would complain.

I would like to deal with another point. More and more mothers have to work to increase the family income and meet the family necessities. The principle of a direct income to the mother is slowly progressing. Earlier I heard a member mentioning it; the principle is making its way. The family mother is also entitled to security and to income. For example, in Germany, a law has been adopted which guarantees to the mothers, to the housewives a monthly income of \$300 to \$400. People give statistics saying that the housewife works considerably, that is the same number of hours as plant employees, but I for one would be very hard put to say the exact number of hours that housewives and mothers work each week.

I was brought up in quite a large family and I never counted the time that my mother dedicated to the family. Everyone knows that mothers are very generous with their time to keep house and take care of the children.

If we passed a legislation providing some income for mothers, they could stay at home, take care of the children, have some security, all this while contributing to the family income. This would also give a chance to young people to go to work.

Young girls often ask me to help them find a job as a secretary, etc., in any field where they are ready to work, and they often make the following reflection: Why is it that we, young people, who have followed courses, hoping to get a job, are put aside so that mothers can have these jobs.

I believe that we should make up our mind one day to give some security to mothers, thus allowing young people to find jobs and thus reducing unemployment considerably without having to ask mothers to make sacrifices or ask parents to spend money. I think we should consider this very seriously. I am sure that the minister is already convinced. We will have to find a formula, with the officials of his department so that we can table appropriate legislation during the present session. This will be innovation in Quebec, but it will in any case be innovation and evolution in the right direction.

I want to say in all honesty that during this session I have been, until now, satisfied with the social security legislation which has been passed, especially as concerns income security.

We are therefore on the right track and I hope that this may continue. We must not stop, because if we do, we shall lose time. We must then continue while there is still time.

I would not want to take advantage of the indulgence of the House, but I have here a lot of documentation which

Family Allowances

shows that many families still do not have the minimum vital income. Here are the figures for the city of Toronto:

A family earns \$50 less than the vital minimum.

On the other hand, the Economic Council of Canada published the following in its report:

Four million Canadians live in poverty.

And then an article in the *La Presse* newspaper states that:

One third of the population of Montreal lives in poverty.

Now, those are figures and quotations that should stir in us a deeper interest in the problem.

We should think of our own underdeveloped. We often hear of those overseas, in Africa, Asia, but we often forget that we can find some, every day, on our own Canadian soil.

Indeed, I agree that we should help underdeveloped countries. I also agree that we should help our own poor even more, to give our country greater social stability, to avoid being faced with deplorable dissension which inevitably harm the national balance and often the harmony and prosperity in our country.

So, while it is still time, we should of one accord endeavour to achieve that objective. That is why I suggest, once again, that the minister consider seriously, while we are at work, the possibility of moving an amendment to make the increase retroactive to the 1st of September and, secondly, of increasing the rate immediately to \$20. That would make four months' more allowances to be paid, I know, but if we really want to fight poverty and inflation, if we sincerely want to increase substantially the purchasing power of families, to meet their needs, to my mind we can no longer put it off.

In any event, I shall vote sincerely for Bill C-223; however, if it is amended in the way I have just suggested, if the law allowed me, I would vote three times to approve it.

[*English*]

Clauses 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: When shall the said bill be read a third time?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): By leave, now.

Mr. Lalonde moved the third reading of the bill.

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) put us into such a nostalgic mood that I, too, should like to personalize for a moment. He is the father of family allowances and the whip of his party is the recipient of them, at least that is how they put it. I want to recall that when we were dealing with the orange paper and we had visions of \$20 a month, I told the minister at the time I was going to give urgent family consideration as to whether I should amend my own personal family planning and endeavour to overtake the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lang) in relation to this \$20. Upon careful consideration, and this was purely an intellectual decision as there