

*Canadian Human Rights*

intentions. It is an ambitious piece of legislation which aims at putting an end to all forms of discrimination through the appointment of a board and a tribunal on human rights.

These two bodies might become another administrative mess as well, bulging with ineffective officials trying to solve discrimination problems. Mr. Speaker, judging by the usual measures taken by this government, there is every reason to believe and especially to fear, that all this commission and this tribunal will do will be to reduce unemployment somewhat by providing good jobs at high salaries to a few cronies of the Liberal party. But, as I said, Mr. Speaker, it is possible, if not probable, that the government introduced this bill with the best intentions. For my part, I believe that we are once more on the wrong track with this kind of bill. It is not by setting up commissions, subcommissions and subcommittees that we are going to solve our problems. It is not either, Mr. Speaker, by lavishing money on problems that we will find answers. Before legislating to solve a problem, we should always ask ourselves whether legislation is a good means, an effective means of solving the problem. In the present case, the problem seems to be one of discrimination in all its aspects and of protection of privacy.

In fact, our interest in such problems is the economic implications of discrimination and violation of privacy. It is a fact that a person cannot get a particular job because of discrimination, or that an individual loses his job because of a report concerning his private life he was never informed of. In both instances, the individual that is economically dependent on the job he is seeking or the one he is losing is subjected to economic hardship by the unacceptable actions of his current or potential employer.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, the individual is victimized in that his economic position, his economic security are jeopardized by the unacceptable actions of some individual who is in a position to cause financial harm to those against whom he is prejudiced because of the colour of their skin or the length of their hair. As far as I am concerned, they are the victims of discrimination, and I suggest that above anything else they cry out for the protection of their dignity. And the best way to protect an individual's dignity is to put him in a position where he will not be dependent upon those who want to revile him. Whenever he is independent from those who would deprive him of his rights, he can protect himself against their scorn and unacceptable behaviour. If, on the other hand, he is dependent, because for instance he absolutely needs the job that is available, he is automatically in a dependent position. Mr. Speaker, the law can force an employer to hire an individual, but it cannot prevent the employer from despising that individual or hurting him with subtle harassment that affects him deep down.

● (1640)

The tribunal is not always aware of the facts. The commission will not always be in a position to assess the quality of the relationship between the employer and the employee. Consequently, the main effect of this well meaning legislation, as I

said a while ago, will be to place discrimination sufferers under the control of the individual whose only aim is to strike a blow at his dignity and integrity. Mr. Speaker, is that the purpose of this legislation? I am convinced it is not. We all wish to make discrimination impossible, because it affects the dignity of the individual. We suggest that a person can be protected against discrimination only if his economic interests are protected against those who try to discriminate against him. Mr. Speaker, we may wonder how it can be done. We feel that by ensuring the economic security of each person, we would ensure individual freedom for all. No person is free if he is financially dependent. If he must crawl on all fours to earn his living, he is not free, he is utterly at the mercy of the person who gives him a mere pittance.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, Socreds have been demanding for several years a guaranteed annual income for each and every citizen as a basic and unquestionable right. We regard the guaranteed annual income as the basis of individual freedom. A person who has a guaranteed income does not need to ingratiate himself with, or work for, an employer who despises or is prejudiced against him. How many times, Mr. Speaker, did our dear and sorely missed friend Réal Caouette mention how undignified it was for people over 65 to have to beg for any kind of menial work, because the government would not support them, when they could have stayed at home with the guaranteed income we are proposing.

Mr. Speaker, of course the guaranteed income will only be possible if we agree to a fundamental restructuring of our present economic system. The reforms we advocate are an essential prerequisite in that regard. I am afraid that members of other parties do not give social credit principles and solutions the attention they deserve. It may be because they think they know them well enough already, or perhaps because they are satisfied with the present situation. Judging by what some government members are saying, I am afraid those were not and never will be understood. The fact that they are pressing for urgent measures to solve our economic problems is evidence to me that they are not satisfied with the present situation. On the other hand, their everyday attitude demonstrates that they know nothing about the principles and solutions advocated by our party.

It is impossible to understand Social Credit unless one accepts from the outset the fact that changes advocated by this party imply fundamental changes in our economic system. The reason is very simple: the defects of the present economic system are so deep that the only possible solution lies in rethinking and rebuilding the financial system on new bases by adopting new principles. If one wants to understand Social Credit, the most logical procedure is to consult the works of its founder, Major C. H. Douglas. In 1933, replying to two professors who were critical of his ideas, as are many members in this House towards Social Credit representatives, he stated in a few words what he found wrong with the current economic system, and I quote:

First of all, financial credit claims to be, but is not, a reflection of real credit. This means that our society's financial organization neglects true factors of production and consumption.