

If that is some kind of fabianism, then I say it is the worst kind of fabianism. It is not constructive criticism, Mr. Speaker, because it is not properly thought out and has no other purpose than to attract the attention of the public by getting the headlines in the newspapers.

That is petty politicking and the Canadian people as a whole will be able to see through those superficial marks of concern expressed by opposition members for the underprivileged classes of our society.

Never, Mr. Speaker, has a federal government shown more concern for our less privileged citizens. Our acts testify to that and a mere study of social security in Canada will show through deed, letter and legislation that social security has been the first and foremost goal of the Liberal party and of the federal government.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. parliamentary secretary, but his time has expired.

[English]

**Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway):** Mr. Speaker, in spite of what the parliamentary secretary has just said, every single measure of social security that has ever come before this Parliament has been fought against vigorously by the government in power, and over most of those years it has been the Liberal party that has been in power.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mrs. MacInnis:** I remember it well. When old age pensions were brought in, I remember well the clamour on the part of the government of the day that it would ruin the country, that it would destroy the sacred obligation of children to look after their parents. I remember the battle that was fought against the introduction of family allowances. I remember the fight for unemployment insurance. I remember the fight for housing, and so on, step after step. All these measures had to be fought for vigorously over the opposition of the government.

First of all, they fought openly against any such social measure. Later, they did not dare to fight openly and they began fighting against such measures by putting them off with task forces, with white papers, with studies, investigations, and so on. That is the stage at which the guaranteed income is now. This government no longer dares oppose guaranteed income on principle as being an evil thing, but it is throwing every form of blockage in the way, using the excuse that it must do more research and investigation, that it must prowl into and delve into it, that it must prepare a white paper, a task force, and all the rest of it.

I want to warn this government that if it persists in this attitude, it is simply blocking its ears and blinding its eyes to what the people of this country are thinking because no matter what party the opposition members belong to they know perfectly well that the people of this country want a guaranteed income at this stage, need a guaranteed income and are determined to get a guaranteed income. I warn this government that it had better

#### *Alleged Non-Institution of Just Society*

pay heed in time. Indeed, I would predict right now that this government in its election program will certainly do a much better job of playing politics, if that is what it calls it, than it has done to date because it will most certainly promise a guaranteed income. This, of course, does not mean necessarily that anyone will get it. But the government will make that promise because they know that people want it and will make sure they have it.

I believe firmly in what has been said by members of the two other opposition parties who have spoken here today. They know the feelings of the people of this country. Whether or not members on the government benches know them is something else again. Because they have done so well, I will not repeat what the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall) has said in describing how the guaranteed income should be worked out. Nor will I repeat what the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) said in his description of the global need for it. What I will do instead is to bring several members of my constituency here in the form of their letters, and thus let you know what these people, who are typical of those in my riding, are thinking at this time. Some of these letters are from the greater Vancouver area.

• (4:00 p.m.)

I want to tell you that the only reason these people are as tolerant and as patient as they are is simply that they cannot believe the government has had the need for a guaranteed income drawn to its attention, has considered the proposal, and has put off implementing it. That is why they are so patient in urging us to try to do things. Here is a letter from a woman in my riding. She writes:

This letter is an appeal to you to see what you can do for widows. My late husband was in the First World War. He left Canada in 1914 and was there until 1918.

Oh, the parliamentary secretary over there may smile about this, but this woman gave all she could while her husband was in France for four years. I continue quoting:

Now as his widow I receive \$26 per month from the DVA I also receive \$135 old age pension (that includes the supplement). Now the DVA claim we are only allowed a monthly income of \$161 a month. How is it possible to live on \$161 a month, pay rent, light and phone, and the price of food and clothing as it is today? So I am asking you to see what you can do about it.

How would we like to live on \$161 a month. In recent weeks members of the House of Commons were crying that they could not live on what they were getting then, which was many times this \$161. How is this poor widow expected to live on it?

**Mr. Boulanger:** You're an old time politician.

**Mrs. MacInnis:** It is you who is the old time politician, who believes he can get away with soft-soaping people like this. They used to believe in that sort of thing but they don't any more.