

primarily of the Canada Pension Plan disability pension. People have to prove, not that they cannot get a job, but that they are not able to do a job. We find a great many people who certainly are able to participate in some kind of employment, but they are not able to get jobs. It is as simple as that. There is no benefit in being able to do something if there is no one who is willing to employ you at doing it.

Many people, particularly men in their fifties, have worked hard all their lives in warehouse work, or in other work which requires very strenuous physical exertion, and when they get into their fifties, and their backs go out and they are not able to perform that kind of work any more, they find themselves tossed on to the heap of surplus Canadians.

Those people are not useful to the system any more, yet this Canada Pension Plan disability fund, which is supposed to provide for people in that state of affairs, is unable to help them because the rules are written in such a way as to ensure that only the barest minimum number of people come under the benefits which are provided by this plan. I cite that as just one example of a place where much improvement is needed and something that is going to require a lot of money—and a lot of new money at that—and not just trade-offs between existing programs.

I have been doing a lot of talking about new money, and I can hear the cash registers ringing in the minds of my colleagues to my right and across the way. They say, "Well, there goes the NDP talking about spending, spending, spending again". Indeed, if we are going to do the things we want to do and if we are going to be the kind of society we want to be, we will have to spend, but the other side of the government spending question and the other side of the restraint mentality is the revenue question and how much revenue the government has at its disposal to do these kinds of things. The other side of the revenue question brings us to the tremendous amount of money made in this country which never sees the door of the revenue department.

The other side of the restraint question and the paranoia about government spending is all the money that never sees the door of the revenue department because we do not have a fair tax system in this country. All that money never sees the revenue department because, in a year like 1978, we spent \$32 billion in tax expenditures, and that is not even recorded in such a way that the people of Canada are aware that there is that much money out there not being collected. There is money enough to pay for deficits and for new programs, and yet we sit here—at least some of us do—and whine and moan about the deficit. It never occurs to us to go out there and tax the wealth that is already there so that we can begin the process of living up to the throne speeches of so many varied and inadequate Liberal governments over the years.

We are talking about new social policy goals and meeting the needs of groups, some of which were not even on the scene 20 years ago in 1960, the year that the hon. member for Rosedale spent so much time talking about this afternoon. We are talking about the tremendous needs, for instance, of single

parent families, a phenomenon which, I submit, was not prevalent to the same degree in 1960 that it is now.

There are all kinds of new social phenomena upon us. There is the problem of native people in the cities, the problem of single parent families, which I mentioned already, and the problem of children who, because of advances in learning theory, are perceived to have learning disabilities, and should no longer just be streamed off into more docile occupations. They should be helped to improve themselves, with the knowledge of their particular disabilities. That is just to mention two or three things that are more with us now than they were 20 years ago.

We will not be able to meet these needs unless we have fundamental economic change, and to that degree everyone here today who has said that social development cannot be separated from economic development is right. Without fundamental economic change we will not be able to pay, to build economic structures which will ensure that enough of the wealth which is created in the country comes to the public purse in order for us to be able to pay for the kind of society we want. Here the Liberal government and the Liberal party are at the crossroads. I look forward to the next few years because it is in the next few years that the Liberal party and its government will come up against realities which they have been trying to postpone for a very long time and which, indeed, they have been very successful at postponing. The happy coincidence of Canadian liberalism will soon disappear.

● (2130)

The happy coincidence is that hon. members, such as the Minister of Finance (Mr. MacEachen) and others, over the last few decades have been perceived to be social reformers, while at the same time pursuing the same old economic orthodoxies of which the official opposition is so proud. They will come up against the fact that they have been able to have their cake and eat it too, to the extent they have because the economy was growing and because we were in a period of unequalled expansion. So they could take that incremental growth and distribute it about. And so long as the pie was getting bigger, even if you were only getting 5 per cent of the pie, it was 5 per cent of a bigger pie and you were happier with the government than you might have been otherwise. But now the pie is not getting any bigger and it does not appear likely to become any bigger, not just because of the incompetence and mismanagement of the Liberal government but because of the international and global realities, because of the redistribution of resources which will have to take place globally, unless we want the world to go up in a tremendously violent fight over limited resources. And so now we will be up against it.

Now when the pie is not getting any bigger, we will have to decide what kind of society we really want, because we will not be able to defer to the glorious economic future which awaits all the poor if they would just wait for more foreign investment, if they would just wait for the economy to come out of the recession, if they would just wait for the next boom cycle. All these are vain hopes.