

For our part, we say: Let us use our credit to develop Canada to the utmost and, in so doing, we shall find it must easier, after taking care of our people, to provide assistance to needy or underdeveloped countries in the world. Then, we could logically help them as much as possible.

But let us start by providing the Canadian people with an economic system that will guarantee them economic security. This is the reason why, over the weekend, in Regina, we put forward a well-considered, realistic program, not made up of promises. We suggested to replace the present social welfare system, which fosters laziness and fraud, with a social and economic security system that will stimulate personal initiative and prevent no one from working or producing more.

If someone earning \$5,000 received a yearly supplement of \$2,000 or \$3,000 this would mean an incentive instead of a penalty. At the present time, many things are taking place. Saturday night, on television, I dealt with the problem of a family on welfare. A mother of seven children is the recipient of social welfare allowances of some \$235 per month. The federal government pays half the amount, that is \$117.50. That mother calls at the social welfare office and asks for additional aid. She is told that according to government standards and criteria, she cannot be given more than \$235 per month. True, she has no rent to pay, but, for instance, she has to meet the needs of her seven children for clothing and food and also to care for herself.

Now, she can no longer make it. Someone tells her: Madam, find a home for your children with strangers, and then, you could work and earn a living. In fact, that is what she does. She finds homes for her children here and there in Abitibi. As soon as this is done she starts getting \$60 per child each month from the social welfare office. She gets \$420 for her seven children and \$20 each month as pocket money for each of them—\$140 more. Therefore she receives \$540 in addition to the clothes supplied by the social welfare people. This mother would have lived like a queen with \$420 per month, not \$540. She would have kept her children and would have lived like everybody but social welfare officials cannot do anything for her unless her family is divided, separated, disseminated. Then and only then can they enter the picture.

With the economic and social security system we are advocating this mother could have stayed home with her children to see to their education, their well-being, etc. This is the ever recurring question. We are always wondering: Where will the money come from?

Mr. Speaker, we seldom wonder: Is Canada in a position to guarantee economic security along with individual freedom to all Canadians? Do we have enough natural resources to meet the needs of the whole population? No one doubts that, we are sure of it.

If Canada enjoys great resources, if it is true that we have a "rich land" where only vitality is lacking, we Créditistes are offering this vitality so that we may live in peace and harmony on this "rich land".

[English]

Mr. Mark MacGuigan (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, philosophical perspective is the exception rather than the rule in politics, and members of the House will

Speech from the Throne

therefore feel a sense of gratitude that the Throne Speech this year not only engenders reflection on some of the basic philosophical problems of our age but also clearly indicates that the government has a profound understanding of these problems and a coherent plan for meeting them. The key passage in this philosophically perceptive and beautifully integrated speech is to be found at pages 1 and 2 of *Hansard* of last Thursday. It reads as follows:

In a period dominated by bigness, in an increasingly impersonal social system, one of the major challenges facing government is to remove the impression of isolation which so often surrounds men and women, depriving them of their sense of worth, of accomplishment, of fulfilment, and removing from them their identity as individuals.

Isolation takes many forms in Canada—physical distance, social stigma, economic deprivation. In each of those forms it represents a degree of rejection, of exclusion, of estrangement. This country fails in its essential purpose if it does not ensure that its most precious resource, human talent, is not wasted away. Our challenge is to remove the barriers that create isolation, to permit each Canadian to detect—even if not always able to fulfil—his own potential, to ensure that his image of Canada is one of promise and compassion.

Every one of us is enriched through involvement in this stimulating process we call Canada. Our goals and hopes are bound up in the restlessness and vitality of this rich land. We in this place have a special responsibility to help bring these goals and those hopes within reach, to make real the Canada of which our forefathers dreamed: a land so large that some of it will remain always serene and unspoiled; a society which believes in the dignity of every single individual; a community which husbands its resources and shares them justly among this generation and those to follow; an enterprise which permits and provokes each Canadian to contribute his skills and his talents.

As the Parliamentary Committee on the Constitution travelled across Canada we found the isolation of which this passage speaks as well as a powerful desire to participate in the mainstream of Canadian life.

Sometimes the feeling of isolation springs from a general concern about the magnitude of today's problems. I have just received a letter from a constituent, Mrs. R. M. Langs, writing on behalf of the United Church Women of Chalmers Church in which she says:

We are concerned with the fact of the apparent helplessness of individual persons against the problems the world faces.

She lists several of these problems, the problem of industrialization, the problem of energy resources and the problem of Colonial Africa. Then she asks "what can the individual do?"

Sometimes the feeling of isolation comes from a sense of frustration in dealing with problems of a more local nature. Always it involves an apparent condition of powerlessness. The solution, as the throne speech suggests, has to be found, negatively, through removing the barriers which create isolation and, positively, through encouraging and even creating involvement in the public processes in Canada and in decision-making processes of all kinds.

What I want to do this afternoon is to relate two problems which concern my part of Canada, the Windsor area, to the general theme of the throne speech. The first of these problems is economic, the second cultural.

First is the economic problem. Windsor is situated at the tip of a thumb of land surrounded on two sides by water and on a third side by the United States, with the nearest large Canadian city more than 100 miles away. There we