

Old Age Security Act

only ones to have found any solutions so far are those who go straight to the heart of the matter and say: If production is automated, consumption must be too. We must develop ways of making distribution automatic, like production.

At present, production is being financed, but no one bothers about the consumer side of things. When consumption is financed, it is with measures that do not fit the economy, by taking from those who are short already so as to give to others. What is given to others is lifted from the pockets of those who are already lacking. So some are made poorer that others might live. This cannot go on, since it is wrong and out of tune with reality, since we are living in a country that abounds in wealth and whose industry is automated; we can do better than that.

Our main objective in the present situation must be to bring the increase in the cost of living to a halt; there would then be no need to be always raising pensions, then this, and then the other thing.

• (2040)

Not one party here can accept this or can suggest any way likely to prevent the cost of living from ever increasing and from ever unbalancing the economy.

The more we progress the more we increase pensions, social services and taxes, the more we increase the deficits which we must meet by borrowing and by selling government bonds. In so doing we must pay new interest rates and we increase public debt. So we will never succeed in balancing the economy and we will never allow Canadians to live decently in their over-affluent country which is moreover automated to an unbelievable degree.

It is essential to have a social budget able to meet each citizen's needs and to guarantee his right to live to each Canadian. Is our national production sufficient for this? I am not afraid to reply in the affirmative because our national production is sufficient; this year national production amounts to \$142 billion and national consumption to \$60 billion; therefore our reserves are \$40 billion. If we have \$40 billion this year we also had \$40 billion last year. It is those \$80 billion accumulated during these last two years that we should use to give Canadians what they are entitled to have, namely the right to live. This is what I was leading to.

The right to live is not a moral, social or religious question; the right to live is only a monetary, economic and political question. It is the responsibility of those involved in economy and politics to establish a balanced system so that each individual may have his three meals a day.

The right to live is not a municipal, provincial or regional question; it is a natural, national and federal question in Canada and a universal question on earth. Let us settle our problems first in Canada and the other countries will follow our leadership depending on whether our experience turns out to be effective and profitable.

If we must start somewhere, Mr. Speaker, why not in Canada? If we must start one day, why not today? Since the monetary system has now become almost worldwide, since money has truly become a must in terms of buying useful goods which are essential or pleasant for life, for

[Mr. Latulippe.]

each living citizen in every country, particularly in those that are more advanced industrially speaking, including Canada, it becomes most pressing to withdraw as directly as possible from our monetary, economic and political system the responsibility for each citizen's right to live.

If the entire economic system comprises production of goods and services, consumption of those goods and use of those services by living citizens, as well as the capitalization of the instruments of production and progress, if the entire economic system has to ensure justice and economic equilibrium in every sector of the nation's economic activity for the benefit of all Canadians, it is through the monetary system that the political authority must act to bring about the ultimate end of the national economy which can be but the fulfilment of the needs of all citizens composing the nation.

If the annual national production is based on natural resources, on the capital and the work of adult citizens, one knows that natural resources are provided freely by nature or Providence and that capital requires interest and work a salary according to the rates determined by the citizens concerned.

In 1973, Canada has almost 23 million inhabitants of which some 9 million only have a satisfactory purchasing power thanks to the interests on their capital or their salaries. The 15 million dependent citizens without employment nor capital are also entitled to live and to obtain the necessities of life out of our national production and our natural resources. Our organizations, with their financial, economic and political framework, are already set up and operate with efficiency and flexibility which all our experts find surprising.

Nothing is left to chance, Mr. Speaker. Everything is determined, anticipated, decided, planned and directed by a few qualified and responsible leaders. All the mechanisms, bodies and instruments are controlled by men, by recognizing and accepting the economic situation in Canada at the end of the 1972-73 fiscal year and considering our enormous capacity for producing and capitalizing. So, for the end of the current fiscal year, let us immediately improve our present methods for distribution of the purchasing power in the hands of dependent citizens who are without income, capital or work, and let us recognize at last the entitlement of the individual to a guaranteed annual income on par with the national product.

Mr. Speaker, for the past twenty years, we have been advocating a guaranteed annual income for each Canadian citizen, taking into account the annual national production based on three different sources: capital, work and the vital entitlement of each person living in this country. Just as personal capital calls for a personal income under the terms of an agreement, so dependent citizens deserve a personal income also guaranteed by contract. This is what we have been asking for quite a while. We are able in our country to negotiate a contract ensuring our people their right to three meals a day.

The word "income", Mr. Speaker, is an administrative term known throughout the world. Income equals expenses and surplus. This is at the same time the capitalist, socialist and communist formula which is being used