

has come when that responsibility should rest on the Canadian people through the federal government and the various provinces of Canada.

This minister shrugs off his responsibility toward housing. What does he put into the housing program? He put in an additional \$200 million which will only build about 8,000 dwellings in this country, which is far too few compared to the number of people in Canada today who need housing. A large part of that money will go to encourage the private developers to build houses. Where is this government when it comes to building the houses itself, putting money into public housing, stopping the land speculators, and creating land banking around large cities? Where is the government when it comes to bringing down interest rates, controlling mortgages, and doing something meaningful to help meet the housing crisis? It throws a few peanuts to the elephants and says, "Look boys, build a few more houses for the poor people of this country." The housing crisis will not be solved in that way.

Surely the responsibility of this government is to lead. It must help those who need help the most. Perhaps that is how one differentiates the Liberal party from a democratic socialist party. We believe in a more egalitarian, more equal society where all those living at the low income level receive a much greater share of the national wealth, a much greater share of the income we have.

An hon. Member: We have the guts to do it.

Mr. Nystrom: I would like to see a Liberal government with a few guts. What it lacks is intestinal fortitude. We never see that demonstrated on the other side of the House. All you have to do is look at the seven or eight major areas of the budget. I will take them one by one.

First, there is the excise tax. How many times in the last year and a half has the government acted unilaterally with regard to resource taxation or developing resources in Canada without consulting the provinces? How much of a strain has there been placed on confederation between the producing provinces and Ottawa? The ten cents a gallon tax on gasoline will bring in \$350 million to the federal treasury from the ordinary people. This is again an infringement on provincial rights.

This tax will affect everyone. There are people in my constituency who have to drive 30, 40 to 50 miles to work and back again at night. They have to pay the extra tax the same as someone living in a city. People living in the suburbs around the big cities must also pay the tax. It affects everyone in the same way.

This tax is immoral and unequal. It will affect everyone, the working man in a factory who is not organized in a trade union, as well as the doctor or lawyer. That is not the way to remove the inequities and injustices in this country about which the Prime Minister spoke so many times back in 1968.

There will be an increase in the price of natural gas. The ordinary homeowner in Canada does not have a choice of whether he should heat his home in the winter. The hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow), and everyone else, all have to heat their homes. It gets cold here. This unfair and unjust tax that affects us all will increase the cost of fuel.

The Budget—Mr. Nystrom

Second, there is the matter of job creation. When the minister said he would bring down a budget I thought he would put a lot of money into projects that would create jobs in Canada. In his budget the minister announced there would be \$450 million spent on the creation of jobs in the next few years. Where will these jobs be created? Most of the money will go into extending existing programs such as LIP, the student employment program, or others in the series of ad hoc programs in which the government is involved.

An hon. Member: Are you against that?

Mr. Nystrom: I am not against it. We have all kinds of programs; LIP, LEAP, LUMP and what have you. They are all ad hoc in nature. They do not have long term ramifications in terms of developing a country with full employment, or in terms of processing our raw materials and resources. Why do we as a country not start putting more money into developing our own resources and creating jobs on a permanent basis? That is something the government is not prepared to do.

Third, I thought the government was concerned about the cost of living and about bringing down inflation. My understanding from statistics is that the gasoline tax of ten cents a gallon will increase the bill an ordinary motorist pays for his gasoline by \$75 a year. Natural gas for home heating will add an extra \$65 a year to the home heating bill, again an increase in the cost of living. It will add about two points to the consumer price index. This budget was supposed to deal with inflation and get the economy back on its feet.

Another major area where the government opted out is housing. It has allotted only \$200 million which will build about 8,000 units. Most of the money will be for the private market. The time has come for governments, not just the federal but all levels, to get serious and put a lot more money into public housing. We need the units. It is about time we put much greater emphasis on public housing.

It is time we took the whole area of housing out of the private market and made it a social right for the people of Canada. This government should control interest rates and remove speculators from the field. It should encourage provincial and municipal governments to undertake public land banking and make serviced lots available at cost to the home buyer rather than having the speculator or middle man taking out his profit. These are things that could have been done if this budget were to have a long term effect on the Canadian people.

Another area is the whole question of unemployment insurance. We have had an unemployment insurance plan where, if the unemployment rate goes above 4 per cent, the government steps in and pays the cost. Under the new proposal, it is my understanding that it will base that rate on a sliding eight year average. If this were in effect in 1975, the unemployment rate average would be 5.3 per cent. Above that, the government would come in and subsidize the plan. But I would suspect, Mr. Speaker, that it means that the ordinary working people of this country are going to be paying more in unemployment insurance premiums, as well as the business people. Big corporations, of course, will pass it on. But the small businessman is also