

Distribution of Goods and Services

with goods, etc. A very subtle way of bringing us around to paying three times what the bridge is worth.

I told the Secretary of State that the \$20 million paid in interest could have paid for another Jacques-Cartier bridge, beside the present one, so that we could have offered the population a better service. Through sophistry, they try to save face and to justify themselves before the public.

As I said Canadians lack purchasing power under the present system. That is what the *Créditistes* have said all along. Some people do not have enough revenue; the hon. minister, the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) and the hon. minister of Regional Economic Expansion are aware of that.

For others, income is eroded by taxes, thus weakened further. As to the unemployed, they have no income at all. Such is the situation in which a vast number of Canadians find themselves.

What do we propose? Many times in this house we have mentioned an increase in family allowances. We will ask again for family allowances, not taken from some and given to others in need, for that would be state socialism, which we fight, because we realize, as I said in English last night:

● (3:40 p.m.)

[English]

If we keep taking away from the haves to give to the have-nots, eventually we shall reach a point at which we shall have all kinds of have-nots and not many haves in Canada.

[Translation]

Mr. Alfred Rouleau proposed the following:

1. Increase family allowances.
2. Guaranteed annual income.

At the time the chairman of the Co-operative Board was saying that family allowances should be increased, there are rumors in Canada that the government is about to cut back family allowances. They will probably not be taken away from families with yearly incomes of less than \$6,000 or \$5,000, but they will try to take them away from those with a yearly income of more than \$8,000. They will reduce expenditures to be able to pay more interest to those who are now putting Canada into debt and are destroying the country.

Mr. Speaker, that is the solution the Prime Minister and the government will recommend, we are told to be ready to tighten our belt by early 1970.

[Mr. Caouette.]

The chairman of the Co-operative Board said the following:

—to increase family allowances in a substantial way, in order to abolish poverty.

That is one way of doing it. The *Ralliement créditiste* keeps asking for an increase in the allowances. Besides, Mr. Rouleau is not the only one. The fourth recommendation of the Canadian Welfare Council, in January 1969, runs as follows:

Benefits levels should be increased substantially in the federal family and youth allowances programs, and youth allowances should be expanded to include student allowances.

They also recommend the following:

Higher benefit levels in family and youth allowances programs offer a most effective and equitable method of recognizing family size among lower income families. As social security benefits, they should be taxable, but again only if recommendation 4 is satisfactorily implemented.

—to increase allowances.

The rate of recovery from higher income families will depend upon the manner and degree of recognition of family composition in the income tax structure.

Mr. Speaker, those are recommendations in the Canadian Welfare Council report published in January. Another recommendation of the same report reads as follows:

A non-contributory program or programs should be developed providing for the payment of flat-rate benefits to all permanently disabled persons and dependent survivors.

In his book entitled "Free Men and Free Market", the American economist Robert Tho. Banan makes the following suggestion about a minimum annual income, and I quote:

[English]

We shall need to adopt the concept of an absolute constitutional right to an income. This would guarantee to every citizen of the United States, and to every person who has resided within the United States for a period of five consecutive years, the right to an income from the federal government sufficient to enable him to live with dignity. No government agency, judicial body or other organization whatsoever should have the power to suspend or limit any payments assured by these guarantees.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, those are findings and suggestions made by economists.

We appeal to the good sense of the government. We are not trying to play politics by proposing the motion now under consideration. We have only been suggesting to the government some *Créditiste* solutions for many years.