

I hope when I am at the United Nations again—and I trust I shall return there some day—we will see greater leadership by that World Council and greater determination by the two big powers to come to grips with the permanent setting up of the council's peacekeeping machinery to end the bickering and chaos which goes on in respect of whether one man or another man will be the leader. There should be more dynamic trust placed in the Security Council's deliberations to help those who are trying to form a United Nations peacekeeping code second to none in history. This must be done, and we must take more active interest in this type of activity.

In the field of taxation, it was obvious to me that although the trite comments of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) fell on plauditory ears on his side, they brought forth no new ideas on tax reform. This must be capitulation. Surely the opposition can see that the removal of six million Canadians from the tax rolls has helped those six million people who have suffered from low income.

• (1710)

We have reformed our unemployment insurance program. I admit we are having difficulties with the administration of the new plan due to the installation of computers, and new forms, and difficulties with the new mechanism of implementing this act, but we are granting more money to those who really need it. We are faced with the economic problems of unemployment. This has been the most progressive and finest step which has been taken to deal with these problems.

The opposition heaps scorn and derision on our alleged failure to cure unemployment, despite the fact that in Canada we have created more jobs than have all the western European countries put together. Despite the fact that we have struggled with an increasingly growing work force, we have imaginatively created local incentives programs which certainly in my riding are working well in the Saltfleet area and in the city of Hamilton area. These are progressive reforms. They deal with a situation which must be dealt with rapidly. They are imaginative and successful.

The Opportunities for Youth program had great success last year despite a few bad grants, and we all know about them. But what about the thousands of good grants that were made, where young people were given a tangible method of contributing and working for Canada? These were very successful. They will be expanded this year and we will go on to a more imaginative and constructively practical plan than ever before in our history. The opposition did not criticize any of these plans. They cannot, because they know they are good. I suppose they cannot be expected to praise us where we have done well.

The opposition have not suggested any alternatives. Do they have ideas for the retraining of old people? Do they have ideas for constructively employing people who are aging, who cannot manage a full eight-hour day but who can do part time work? I notice that the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock (Mr. Mather) came up with a constructive suggestion along these lines, but it was not taken up by the other members in his party. I suggest that his was a constructive idea and he should be praised for thinking along these lines.

However, the Leader of the Opposition is bereft of such ideas. He has nothing but gloom and doom, nothing but words about the election coming, and all he relies on is figures which he says will help him. That is what he is resting his campaign on, and I submit that it is falling flatter than a pancake.

With regard to the reform of our rules, I am pleased that we have brought about many changes which have made Parliament more realistic. However, I submit that during the debate on most bills a time limit of ten minutes per speaker should be imposed, for two reasons; first, that most speeches longer than ten minutes are repetitive and irrelevant and, second, that limiting speeches to ten minutes will create more dynamic interest in this chamber. More people will be on their feet and there will be a chance to hear expressed more views than those of a few who have to labour a long time speaking in debate after debate. This will get more people into the act, into the game. I think it would add to the interest and the imaginative function of this Parliament and would make it more realistic.

With regard to the Indians, the Eskimos and the Metis, I wish to reply to something that was said by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) who said sarcastically that the Prime Minister and the government were negative in the Throne Speech about Indians and Eskimos. Nothing could be further from the truth. Much was said forcibly, succinctly and rationally, not only in the Throne Speech but also by the Prime Minister who has set as one of our national goals the conquering of the isolation of the individual.

As a member of the Joint Committee on the Constitution I was deeply moved and impressed by the recognition of the urgent and compelling necessity for our government to create better communications with the Indians, Eskimos and Metis in our far north, particularly the Metis who have been left in a no man's land in the sense that they are not treated as either Indians or white people. We must somehow try to bring the Eskimo people into our great society in Canada and encourage social workers to assist them, to understand the plight of these people, as well as to give them equal treatment with the Indians. I submit that we should work hard toward the day when we have an Eskimo senator, because it is time we did. Also, I believe that the Metis should be given equal rights with the Indians.

I believe in a multicultural Canada, in a Canada that accords recognition, respect and love to every Canadian no matter where he comes from, be he a Croatian or a Serbian. Let us pray and hope that they will become Canadians in the full sense that is evidenced by many Croatians and Serbians in the great city of Hamilton. They are hardworking, industrious people who have a love of their own culture and who practice at picnics and social gatherings their folklore, dances, customs, traditions and language. This is part of being Canadian and it enriches Canada by according to the past respect and love. We must look forward, as we do as Canadians, to making this country the greatest in the world.

I am pleased that, as is mentioned in the Throne Speech, we will make "O Canada" our national anthem. I cannot refrain, at the same time, from urging the government to make July 1 Canada Day—le jour Canada—crowning our