

government, and then from lower levels of government to the people themselves. The ordinary people will be given more control over their own lives and will be given a greater say in their own destinies. And that, Mr. Speaker, I think is what most of them are looking for today.

It is a recognized fact that as government gets bigger it becomes not only more inefficient but also more remote, more impersonal and more insensitive. This trend must be reversed. It is not good enough just to change direction in two or three areas; the trend has to be reversed completely. We must go in the opposite direction to the direction we have been taking for the last 10 to 15 years.

If we do reverse this trend and use just a few simple macrocontrols to maintain an economic climate of expansion and opportunity, we will be in a position to do many of the other things we want to do and to solve many of the problems that concern us most. On the negative side, we will be able to abolish the bureaucracy that is now involved in the welfare system for employables. Since that will not be required it will be eliminated. Of course, some income will be required for the unemployables, but as far as the employables are concerned it will not be necessary to perpetuate the present welfare system because jobs will be available for them. Similarly, the Unemployment Insurance Act can be revised in such a way as to eliminate the present anomalies which I think are unacceptable to so many Canadians.

Then, on the positive side we would have the resources to do those things we want to do. With the extra \$3 billion to \$4 billion a year available to us in real terms we would be able to get on with the job. We would have the necessary resources really to attack poverty, to do something in a determined way about poverty. It is a matter of regret that we have more relative poverty in Canada today than we had a few years ago when the anti-poverty campaign was begun.

In addition we could do something tangible about the slums that exist today. Over a period of a few years we could eliminate every slum in Canada and make this a realizable goal in this country. There is no reason why we should have people living in shacks.

• (1650)

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hellyer:** It was one of the most profound experiences of my life when travelling with the task force on urban development to see Canadians living in buildings which most of my farmer friends would think unfit for animals. This is the kind of degradation which should not be allowed in a country like ours where we have the resources to provide decent housing. If we were to go to the zero inflation solution, then interest rates for the National Housing Act would drop by about one-third and it would once again be possible for ordinary people in Canada to aspire to ownership of their own home. It would not be a dream beyond them. Once again we could give the ordinary people a range of choice. We would also have the resources to attack pollution control in a determined way, to organize it and get on with the job of cleaning up our lakes and rivers and our environment, protecting it and saving it. It is the only one we have and we should treat it with great care.

### *Speech from the Throne*

Finally, we should move in the direction of a strikeless society. We should substitute the rule of law for the rule of the jungle. We should end the organized blackmail and put people first. I think this is what most Canadians want to do. I think this is the way to significant, positive Canadianism. I do not think we will ever achieve greatness in this country by anti-Americanism or anti anything else. I think we can be proud to be Canadian by doing great things here and by pursuing excellence in areas within our capability. There is no better place to start than within the economy by bringing it from the position of the worst managed economy in the world to the best. Then, people would come from other countries to see how we do it.

Having laid the foundation, having put down the cornerstone, we would be in a position to get on with the job of building a better society. We could enlist the resources of our young people and give them an opportunity to use their idealism and creativity to build the kind of society where human values are put first. To do that, the foundation must be well and truly laid. That is the reason I make the suggestion that we should change completely the totally inadequate policies of the last few years, reverse them and get on with building a more dynamic society in Canada, the kind of which all of us, especially our young people, can be proud.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

### SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order, please. It is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 40 to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis)—Bridges—Vancouver Harbour—Government financial contribution to construction of proposed third structure; the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. McKay)—Fisheries—Possible variation in lobster season, District No. 5, Nova Scotia; the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Burton)—Canadian Pacific Railway—Removal of station agents, Saskatchewan and Alberta—Consideration of nature of undertakings by company in review.

### SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

#### CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Ross Whicher for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Stanfield (p. 34), and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Caouette.

**Mr. H. E. Stafford (Elgin):** People who say they stand for an independent Canada are repeating a threadbare platitude mouthed by politicians from the first day of confederation. The quickening tempo of the debate on economic