

them now for these motives, we will do them later for other motives.

I attended the national conference on housing last week in Toronto. At that conference an American house builder who has been involved in housing programs said something like this: I hope you Canadians will be wise enough to tackle the housing problem on a broad enough scale now, while there is yet time. We delayed too long in the United States; we waited until the ghettos rose higher and higher, grew thicker and thicker, and the antagonisms mounted more and more. Today we are doing through fear what we should have done through justice and common sense years ago. I hope we shall have the wisdom to do these things now, Mr. Speaker.

I know my time is almost up and I wish to cite only one more illustration. Other hon. members had a little more time allowed them, except for one hon. member across the way. What kind of people and what kind of country do we want? I hope we will not everlastingly be grubbing along in this country satisfied with people just getting enough to eat, wear and provide a roof over their heads and a car in which to go places. That is not enough. We should be looking forward to making conditions such that people can have what used to be called the finer things of life, such as music, books, travel and a chance to meet and talk with people and do interesting things. We in this house can all do that but large sections of the Canadian public cannot.

Last fall the *Canadian* magazine gave the example of three citizens of Canada, one with a wife and four children and an income of \$8,000 a year, another with a wife and three children earning \$16,000 a year, and the third with a wife and grown son earning over \$50,000 a year. I could point out that the smaller the income the larger the number of children, but I will leave that side of it alone. But this is what I want to emphasize. The man with the income of \$8,000 a year can afford only 1.2 per cent of his income for books, entertainment, special hobbies, club memberships and vacations. The man who earns \$16,000 a year can afford 7.84 per cent of his income for these extra things, and the man earning over \$50,000 a year can afford 36.8 per cent of his income for what we call the finer things of life, above and beyond the creature needs of human beings.

I wish this budget had contained one little hint that we are aiming for this kind of society, because that is the just society. I say to

*The Budget—Mrs. Grace MacInnis*

the government: You have raised people's expectations in the country. You have lit the fire under people's hopes and aspirations and that fire, in spite of this damp squib of a budget, will not go out.

**Mr. Mongrain:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. lady and I apologize again for interrupting her. Of all the interesting comments she made this afternoon there was one that struck me as being somewhat inconsistent. I would therefore appreciate being told how the hon. lady links her present attitude of blaming the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) for promising the provinces that in the next five years they will have their autonomy and administer social services such as medicare, with the expressed concern of her party for the policies of my province which they themselves call "le statut particulier".

**Mrs. MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway):** Mr. Speaker, I would have no objection to the provinces having a great deal of leeway to carry out their own programs. As a matter of fact, I want that; but I want it along with a framework of national planning so that Canadians may move from the hon. member's province to mine and feel quite at home. It is for that reason that I deplore very much the destruction of a national framework of social security, including medicare.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member for Brant.

**Mr. Brown:** Mr. Speaker, could I call it six o'clock?

At six o'clock the house took recess.

#### AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

**Mr. J. E. Brown (Brant):** I should like to take part in this debate, Mr. Speaker, in order to deal with several important matters, one or two affecting my constituency and the others being of urgent national consequence. I will divide my remarks into two parts. The first part deals with the dangers to individual Canadians from the growing bureaucracy of government agencies, particularly as they relate to the position of individual members of parliament who represent the population of Canada in this house.

I could commence with a matter involving the Department of Labour, and which is