

never could have been paid for had it not been for the mother's earnings which helped to supplement the father's income.

Then there is the next group of women, whose talents and training do not lie in the domestic field. I should hate to see a law or custom that would impose upon all males the same sort of employment. I should think it would produce many misfits if we expected every man to make his contribution to the community as a plumber, a janitor or even as a lawyer. By the same token it is unfair to expect that every woman will love housework or be skilled in its many branches. To be a good mother does not require that Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth do the royal laundry. Other people are paid to wash Her Majesty's dishes. In fact I have never seen it suggested that the royal family was anything but a model of contentment. It is a medieval hang-over to suppose that every successful wife and mother must personally perform the duties of the household; in fact it was never required of women who had the means to pay others to discharge these duties. If the training and ability of the individual woman, be she spinster or wife, fit her to accept gainful employment in the professions, in business or in industry, it should be her right to accept such employment. In fact any attempt to deny her this right is a violation of our solemn pact endorsed by the Canadian delegation and by us in the San Francisco charter.

The next argument against women being gainfully employed may be that women depress wages. The simple remedy for this objection is to pay a certain wage for a job regardless of whether the applicant is male or female. When you buy a bus ticket, a railway ticket, a meal or a book the vendor does not ask you whether the purchaser is male or female, nor does the price go down if the purchaser is a woman. For their own protection men must insist that equal pay be given for equal work.

Finally, there is an urgent social and moral problem involved in the right of women to economic independence. Our Doctor Bates of the health league of Canada has cornered every member of this house, either in groups or individually, to gain support for his attack on disease. He is especially concerned, and rightly so, with preventive work. I need only remind hon. members of his V.D. clinic, where many thousands of cases are receiving treatment with penicillin. It was, I am sure, a revelation to all of us to hear Doctor Bates relate his conversation with the young Russian doctors who visited his clinic. Their statement, that at the outbreak of war they did not

have enough V.D. cases in Russia to demonstrate its ravages to the medical students, came as a blow to us, and in comparison with our record fills us with shame and envy.

Equally significant was the statement that this was the result of placing women on a plane of economic independence. If we are ever to approach the position where we can say with pride, as a nation, that we have eliminated forever the scourge of venereal disease and prostitution, then we must hold as sacred the right of every person, man and woman, to maintain self-respect, and natural pride in honourable work, paid for at a level that will provide happiness, security and cultural advancement.

In closing my plea for taking seriously our solemn declarations at this milestone in the world's history, I wish to state that the urgency of our task is matched only by its magnitude. It is our only hope. It is our next step. Our task would be simpler of achievement if every nation shared our inherited religious practices, the inherited colour pigment of our skins. But the time to act is now. We cannot wait to make the world all Christian, or all democratic. We must take this contemporary world, and under the urgency of our need for peace we must learn to live together, or cease to live at all. This is an attempt to find a method, and incomplete as it must be at this stage, it merits the support of Buddhist, Hindoo and Christian alike.

I am very happy to be able to support the provisions of the San Francisco charter, to be applied throughout the world, and especially am I concerned that they apply here in Canada; that there be written into Canadian statutes "the equal rights of men and women."

Mr. NORMAN JAQUES (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself entirely with the opinions and views expressed yesterday by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Low). I think I can say that those remarks will be endorsed by true social crediters the world over, and I believe that they will be endorsed by a great many more people in Canada than some hon. members appear to think.

We may sometimes overestimate the information of the people, but I think we are very apt to underestimate their intelligence. Speaking in the house last March in the debate on the motion to send a delegation to San Francisco, I said this:

The defeat of German arms is certain, but the plots of international finance and communism, their plans for world control by the surrender of national sovereignty to world government and police force, has become a greater threat to our liberties as Christians and democrats than the disaster at Dunkirk.