

Mr. Speaker, the minister contends that government restraints have helped curb demand. Certainly the loss of salary or purchasing power curtails demand or slows down its growth. However, it is unfortunate that inflation has been fought at the expense of the workers.

The late President Kennedy felt very strongly about the problem of unemployment. He was a master at coining phrases. Here is one which is a genuine plea:

The loss of a single year of personal income on account of unemployment costs us more than 12 years of education.

These words become more and more significant as our civilization becomes one of leisure.

Productivity increases and the standard of living rises with it. Retirement comes earlier, working hours decrease to be replaced by leisure. This fact has become so obvious that some corporations expect to grant their employees education leave as they do sick leave.

In view of price increases and the rise of the unemployment rate, which are the direct causes of the lack of purchasing power, we, of the Ralliement créditiste, suggest the revaluation of family allowances and old age security pensions.

An increase in family allowances and old age security pensions would be an efficient means of putting in the hands of a certain group of consumers additional purchasing power which would renew the confidence of our people while starting an economic upsurge.

Therefore, I fully support the subamendment of the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) which calls for an increase in family allowances.

Acceptance of this subamendment by the government would be a first step toward the implementation of a system insuring a guaranteed annual income and paving the way to a true just society.

• (8:20 p.m.)

[English]

**Mr. Colin D. Gibson (Hamilton-Wentworth):** Mr. Speaker, in the spirit expressed in the Speech from the Throne, I wish first to congratulate the hon. member for Bourassa (Mr. Trudel), the mover of the Address in Reply, and the seconder, the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) for the excellent speeches which they made in the House. I am particularly pleased since both hon. members exhibited in their speeches sincerity of character, devotion to duty and absolute integrity, as well as obvious ability.

The Speech from the Throne was an inspiring one, Mr. Speaker. The words which appeal to me most in the Speech are as follows:

With foresight and stamina and enterprise, ours may be, if we wish it... a society which encourages imagination and daring, ingenuity and initiative, not coldly and impersonally for the sake of efficiency, but with warmth and from the heart as between friends.

[Translation]

And in French, my second language:

... une société qui encourage la créativité, l'audace, l'ingéniosité et l'initiative, non pas froidement et de façon imperson-

*The Address—Mr. Gibson*

nelle à des fins de stricte utilité, mais avec chaleur et cordialité, comme entre amis.

Mr. Speaker, several of us are determined to learn French. Of course, we shall succeed!

[English]

Speaking on the current situation in Canada, I express the desire that we reform our criminal law in order to provide much more severe penalties for offences currently being committed in this nation. I refer, of course, among other things, to section 233 of the Criminal Code or the section relating to kidnapping, and to the aiding and abetting section. I am thinking now of the crime of aiding and abetting kidnapping. I suggest that the aiding and abetting section should be used by the police whenever there is sufficient evidence to warrant a charge being laid under it. I also refer to another crime with respect to which I have found, after research, that there are no reported cases in Canada, fortunately because our society has been relatively peaceful up to this time. I refer to section 51 of the Criminal Code, which relates to acts of violence in order to intimidate Parliament or the legislature of a province. The maximum sentence for that offence is 14 years imprisonment. I urge that that offence carry a maximum sentence of life imprisonment and nothing less.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gibson:** I believe that our attention ought to be directed urgently to a debate on security. There should be a searching examination of statements made on radio and television by inflammatory revolutionaries who, by sympathizing with criminals, therefore encourage support for violence by criminal acts. I submit that in so far as matters relating to the safety of the realm are not regulated by statute, the powers in that regard are in common law at the prerogative of the Crown, acting upon the advice of its servants, which has unfettered control both in time of peace or war of all matters relating to the disposition and armament of the military, naval and air forces, and the manner of the exercise of such prerogative powers cannot be inquired into by the courts, whether in a civil or criminal case. The authority for this proposition is found in the case of *Regina v Chandler* (1962) 2 All England Reports, page 314. I submit the same principle applies to Crown prerogative powers in Canada today. Further, Mr. Speaker, I quote from the judgment at page 320:

Those who are responsible for the national security must be the sole judges of what the national security requires.

I represent the riding of Hamilton-Wentworth, a riding that is partly urban, in the city of Hamilton, and also partly rural. It is a riding with a population consisting of Canadians of varied national origins and many Canadians of British origin. The constituency also contains the township of Ancaster, which includes fine farming country and a suburban community. Also, it contains the historic town of Stoney Creek. That town, I hope, will be the source of Canada Day.