

money rose and that is why we have so many housing problems in this country.

Mr. Axworthy: Just keep saying it, because the people in Winnipeg love it.

Mr. Hawkes: He says to just keep saying it. I will say it to the day I die because I like to speak the truth. Of course, he did not do this alone. He was joined by the spendthrift gang.

One can recognize the difference between a Conservative and a Liberal by seeing what was absent from the Hon. Member's plea for \$2 million or \$3 million more. If the Conservative Government decided that spending \$2 million or \$3 million for Winnipeg should be a priority, it would determine what cuts could be made in order to provide that money. Rather than borrowing the money we would make a cut in an area of less importance. Do not make today's children pay tomorrow by borrowing more money; cut an expenditure if you want to provide an increase elsewhere. That is the difference between Liberals and Conservatives.

Mr. Axworthy: The difference is that we don't give capital gains allowance of \$500,000 to rich friends like yours.

Mr. Hawkes: I remember the scientific research tax credit of \$2.5 billion, Mr. Speaker. What a triumph of public policy, that \$2,500 million was. That one simple tax program amounts to double our expenditure on housing in this country this year. What a bunch of geniuses.

The Hon. Member made one comment with which all of us should be able to agree. He said that housing for Canadians is important. I have had a peculiar set of jobs which brought to my attention the frequency of suicide and illness and the sense of alienation that occurs in Canadian society.

Soon after the Second World War, Central Mortgage and Housing decided that mortgages and insurance should relate to houses of a particular design, with the advent of the L-shaped living room and dining room in small 940 square foot houses.

That simple insurance principle destroyed the family kitchen in Canada. This is a room that was built on warmth, closeness and conversation. It is a room that provided for a closer relationship between parents and children. Children would do their homework there while the mother would knit or listen to the radio. Yet that policy on houses probably contributed more to alienation and mental illness in this country than any other policy. That realization contributed to my sense of the importance of public policy on the lives of individuals and motivated me to enter this Chamber.

It is important to note clearly the difference between the housing policy proposed by the Minister of Labour (Mr. McKnight) and that which would be proposed by either of the two opposition Parties. Canadians had a choice in September, 1984, and they must not lose sight of their options in 1988.

The motion before us today suggests that the eligibility for housing assistance should be defined on an income-based

Supply

figure alone and should apply all across the country. That is not inconsistent with the opposition Members' points of view about all kinds of things. When they talk about universality, they talk about treating the rich and the poor equally. They talk about treating all members of our society and all communities as if they were the same. That is the basic thrust of their proposition. It is not the thrust of ours.

• (1530)

The thrust of our approach to public policy is to recognize that this is a large country. It is a country with many unique communities and with cultural differences that relate to language and background. It is a country which has been built by immigrants. It is a country that takes pride in its sense of multiculturalism and in its sense of diversity. Members of the Liberal and New Democratic Parties want us all to be of the same mould and to be treated in exactly the same way. That is a point of view, but it is not my point of view. I think the country is richer and better served by public policy that recognizes provincial, regional, community and cultural differences.

What the Minister of Labour has proposed in what he is carrying forward into the community is a sense of a core need concept. His sense of that core need is close to my own. He has identified core need as being applicable to any household in which 30 per cent of the family income, or more, goes to providing decent shelter. What does that formula take into account? It takes into account the reality that wages vary, and that they vary enormously from community to community. That is the income side of the issue, the family income side. It also takes into account the fact that the price of property and the rents we pay for that property vary widely from community to community.

If one lives in a low wage area with low housing costs, then one may or may not meet the definition of core need. If one lives in a low wage area with high housing costs, then one will certainly meet the requirements. If one lives in a high wage area with low rental costs, then one will not meet the requirements. However, if one lives in a high wage area with high housing costs, then one may meet the requirements. Incomes are matched to costs. That is surely common sense. Surely it is the only formula proposed which takes into account both sides of the equation, the cost side and the income side.

Members of the Liberal Party and members of the New Democratic Party would have us take into account only the income side. If it is strictly the income side which is to be considered, then some people who are relatively rich will receive part of the money, as will some who are relatively poor. If we follow the formula devised by the Minister of Labour, none of the money will go to the rich and all of it will go to the poor.

What do Canadians want? If we were able to provide a certain amount of money to all Canadians, would they prefer that everyone receive \$100, or that the poorest 10 per cent receive \$1,000, or that the poorest 20 per cent receive \$500? I