

greater emphasis on the need to get people who are on social aid back to work. It promises a fair and just relationship between the incomes of people who are working at, or near, the minimum wage and it indicates that recognition must be given to the provinces' wishes to have the structures of social security vary in accordance with the social needs, income standards and the cost of living in different communities. It also gives notice that the government accepts the principle that reconsideration of Canada's social security system must be conducted jointly by the federal government and the provinces.

The throne speech does not, however, tell us how all of this is going to be accomplished. In other words, the throne speech, like the just society concept, sounds very promising but, like the just society concept, the throne speech lacks substance and integrity. The government says it will reduce unemployment by providing increased funding for the Local Initiatives Program; increased funding for on-the-job training; a substantial seasonal capital works project and special funding to increase direct employment in labour-intensive projects. The government says that certain aspects of the Unemployment Insurance Plan will be clarified; that a new family income security program will be proposed and that legislation will be introduced to improve the economic situation of old age pensioners.

The economic situation of old age pensioners has been improved by this government before. That assistance came in the form of a mere 42 cent raise in pensions and a 2 per cent maximum increase in the guaranteed income supplement, at a time when the cost of living was rising at 4 or 5 per cent, annually. Only when the election was imminent did the government give consideration to increases in old age pensions according to annual increases in the cost of living. But the gap created by its lax attitude in the past has not been filled and those on fixed incomes still suffer. It seems they will continue to suffer at the hands of this government if it remains in power and if the NDP has anything to say about it, for their joint defeat of our motion in the House to bring some immediate relief to old age pensioners this winter was nothing but crass insensitivity.

The irony of the throne speech is that the government, in spite of the lesson it supposedly learned on October 30, has chosen to offer the same old programs as solutions to Canada's problems and those of her people. These are the same old programs that have proven to be ineffective, offered by the same old government that has proven itself incapable of dealing with the problems, and all of this aided and abetted by the New Democratic Party.

It is interesting to note that some of the press feel that the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) is not as arrogant as before, that he has a new appreciation of parliament. Well, Mr. Speaker, at a time when we have some serious issues to bring before this House like old age pensions, unemployment and income tax cuts, the right hon. gentleman puts the capital punishment debate No. 1 on his list. I suppose as a further smokescreen to the real problems of Canada the language bill will be the second item for debate. Mr. Speaker, I say the government is stalling because it has not got positive new programs for this country.

The Address—Mr. Reynolds

Meanwhile, in British Columbia for example, people are asking for solutions to problems; solutions to problems like urban traffic congestion in Delta, Richmond and other lower mainland cities, for which residents are requesting federal assistance in developing a reasonable urban transit system. What is this government's response to this kind of request? The hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Basford) and the hon. member for Capilano (Mr. Davis) are supporting construction of a second bridge across the first narrows in Vancouver. Of course, it does not matter to them that this bridge may not be wanted or needed or, for example, that the bridges in my riding handle more traffic than the Lions Gate bridge. Yet they push ahead with this project, despite the wishes of the people involved, in true Liberal government style. I say, Mr. Speaker, that we should use the money involved to build a rapid transit system for the lower mainland; that we should concentrate on construction for the future, on something really worthwhile and on something that will last.

People in my riding are seeking solutions to problems like pollution. For example, the residents are requesting federal government assistance in providing a tertiary sewage system to eliminate pollution from industrial and/or domestic sewage. But how long will it be, Mr. Speaker, before the federal government finally realizes its responsibility to clean up Canada's lakes and rivers? We, the people, Mr. Speaker, are tired of excuses and tired of non-action. The Fraser River is the recipient of hundreds of millions of gallons of raw sewage every day. Experts say they do not think pollution is affecting the salmon. The experts, Mr. Speaker, should know. This is too important to pass off so lightly.

And then there is penal reform and the great contribution the former Solicitor General (Mr. Goyer) made to that area of concern. I am not opposed to penal reform, but I am opposed to the negligence which accompanied Canada's recent effort in that regard; negligence which resulted in cases like the following: A man on a weekend pass murders a seven year old girl on the lower mainland of British Columbia; the government decides to transfer another man from an east coast maximum security cell to a west coast minimum security cell to testify at the trial of the murderer. He, too, escapes, kidnaps and rapes a woman.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the only thing we need mention about penal reform is that it was a major contributor to the defeat of this government in British Columbia. And the right hon. Prime Minister's comments this morning that the capital punishment matter is at least as important as pensions does not leave me with much hope in this Liberal government. It is essential that the government take new, innovative approaches to Canada's problems, that people be involved in their solutions, and that people benefit from the legislation that is introduced and passed in the House of Commons.

This does not mean an outburst such as the one in which the Prime Minister was engaged in the House of Commons on January 8, 1973 when he said that some Progressive Conservative Members of Parliament had tried to divide the country. This does mean the formulation and application of policies that will reduce inflation