

Mothers Allowances

It is true that there is a great lack of child day care nurseries, but let us consider how many family centres could be established simply by using the administrative money which would be required to carry out the hon. member's proposal. What do the truly socialized countries in Europe do in this respect? Family centres are found there in profusion. In the socialist Utopia it is the rule rather than the exception for mothers to be employed in such work as cleaning the streets, shovelling snow, laying tile, cobblestones—

• (5:40 p.m.)

Mr. Deachman: Working in the steel mills.

Mr. Byrne: —or working in the steel mills, as the hon. member reminds me. I do not believe they work in the mines, but they do almost all of the arduous chores. I am not recommending this situation. However, when I tell a predominantly male audience about this situation in Russia, they are inclined to ask: Is that a situation which we should endeavour to bring about here? These are the facts of life in the socialist Utopia. There is no thought of people being able to make a decent living, beyond the poverty line, without two full incomes flowing in to the home. With these two incomes combined, they arrive at the princely sum of perhaps 200 or 250 rubles per month with which to make provision for a home in a land where prices range anywhere from one third higher to double the prices in North America.

The hon. member has the nucleus of an excellent idea. We are all in favour of motherhood; there is no question about it. We would all love to see motherhood on a pedestal. But after all let us be responsible people. At a time when we are facing one of the most serious inflationary periods in modern times, at least in the post-war years, and endeavouring to slow up government spending, it is proposed that we embark upon an expenditure which could range anywhere from \$200 million to half a billion.

I believe we have the right to expect more responsibility from the members of the New Democratic party. We have a right to expect them to go along with the government in its endeavours to curtail inflation. I believe we have a right to expect some consideration from others, and some indication that they believe we feel just as strongly about the family, about motherhood and about the welfare of all the people in Canada as do the members of the New Democratic party.

[Mr. Byrne.]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Tardif): I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but the time allotted to him has now expired.

[Translation]

Mr. Henri Lafulippe (Compton-Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to the important notice of motion given by the member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis).

We are pleased to deal with such questions because we know from the start that our economy cannot really meet the request of the hon. member. Were our economy even slightly reformed, it would be easy to distribute more to the nation and to encourage the family which is the very foundation of society.

Mr. Speaker, if we cannot find the means to protect society, and especially children so that society can regenerate itself, we will be ruined.

The family is the basis of any economy, any society. Without the family, there would probably be no communities, no provinces, no federal governments, no companies, no institutions. Institutions are born out of individuals, of self-renewing families. For our nation to prosper, it is absolutely necessary that our families continue to develop and evolve, that human beings continue to be born.

If we cannot even protect our Canadian mothers, who can we protect? Can we protect society, yes or no?

We are told that it is impossible, under the present system to find a means of compensating or helping mothers to take care of their children and their family. The first duty of a mother should be to stay at home to take care of her children. But, under the present system, mothers have to go to work outside and leave their children to the care of institutions during the day, in order to earn an additional income which will enable the family to survive. Mr. Speaker, this is not normal. According to the revenues actually shown in the *Canada Year Book*, production in 1967 reached \$62 billion for a population of 20,400,000. This means an average of \$15,000 per family of five and a monthly average of \$1,250 per capita. If, with such wonderful averages, there are so many poor and insecure people, it is up to us to take care of them and to find a reason for this poor distribution of our great wealth. The following table shows the national productivity increase. In 1944, we had a revenue of \$11,400 million; in 1967, we had a revenue of \$62 billion. This is $5\frac{1}{2}$ times more.