

object of such national dividends was to increase people's income so as to permit the maximum use of the benefits of industrialization and automation.

In 1924, Douglas specified the three basic principles that should be followed if the transition to a productive system based on machinery is to be successful rather than disastrous. The third of those principles was, and I quote:

That the distribution of monetary credit to individuals must be progressively less, according to the worker's salary, which means that the dividend must progressively replace salaries.

Ten years later, during a radio broadcast, he described the effects of such a policy in the following way, and I quote:

The actual effect of a national dividend would be:

1. to provide for individuals an income source which, although it would be desirable to increase it through work, could nevertheless ensure the purchasing power needed to maintain the individual's independence and health.

● (1520)

By thus providing a regular demand for our production system, it would already be a major step to stabilize conditions in the business world and would assure producers a constant domestic market for their goods.

When considering those comments, we are led to realize how strange it is that throughout the discussions recently held on a system aimed at increasing personal incomes, nobody has ever admitted that Crediters have been demanding such a program for decades.

How can such a situation be explained, Mr. Speaker? Is it possible that those who denounced or ridiculed the proposals of the Social Credit are embarrassed because they are compelled by events to consider, in order to deal with our economic problems, the same solutions which they ridiculed and disdainfully rejected?

Mr. Speaker, I think that it is now essential at this stage of my remarks to show that the guaranteed minimum annual income is a right to which all Canadians are entitled.

When a guaranteed annual income is proposed, it is often believed that government has the right to accept or reject it. The Social Credit Party of Canada asserts that the guaranteed annual income is a basic question. Payment of an adequate income to each member of our society so as to look after his basic and essential needs is not a government favour to be granted or taken back according to the decisions of a few individuals who are momentarily in power.

In fact, guaranteed income is a right of the individual, and in any modern and prosperous economy, this right must be recognized. We must realize that the philosophy underlying the actual methods of income distribution is basically primitive compared to the attitudes of civilized societies of some hundred years ago, when means were much more limited than they are today.

Policies that would deprive someone of the necessities of life so as to force him to work under some other person's rule are negating a civilized society's ideal. More than 2,000 years ago, Aristotle said that any man forced to do anything to earn some money is nothing more than a slave.

### *Guaranteed Income*

Former American president and political philosopher Thomas Jefferson said essentially the same thing when he stated that every man must possess enough earthly goods to look after himself, for in other cases, he would be reduced to the level of slave who depended physically and mentally on other men.

Professor Erich Fromm wrote, and I quote:

A guaranteed income would not only establish freedom as a reality rather than as a slogan, it would also establish a principle which is deep-rooted in the humanist and religious tradition of western civilization, namely that man has a right to live. This right to live, this right to have food, shelter, medical care, education, etc., is a basic human right which should not be restricted under any circumstances, even under the condition that man should be useful to society.

This tradition aiming at putting each individual in a position of economic independence so as to give him free moral determination was one of the achievements of our civilization in the past. The government rejected this principle in speech and in action. However, it has no right to do so. To deny its citizens the basic right to economic security is simply to deprive them of a birth right. I will indicate how this is so. We, Canadians, are fortunate to live in a rich country. However, many Canadians do not get a fair share of our affluence. They are not in a position to claim effectively a share of our common wealth. If we understood the actual basis of our wealth, we would realize that we need a new system that would enable individuals to claim and obtain the share of our riches which they need and which is their due.

The concept that a small group of individuals can monopolize practically all our wealth and keep all the profits for themselves is unacceptable. This concept results from a misunderstanding of the notion of wealth and of its sources.

In the past, it was thought that all wealth was a product of three interacting factors: land, labour and capital. This essentially materialistic concept did not take into account other factors which prevailed as production developed through increasingly sophisticated techniques.

One of these factors is what may be called the free benefits of partnership. This means quite simply that people can achieve more by co-operating than by going different ways. For instance, ten persons who work together systematically to meet their economic needs can do much more, and much more easily, if they unite instead of trying to work separately. This "surplus" that results from the common effort belongs naturally to all and should be distributed among all.

Another intangible factor of modern production is our cultural heritage. Our generation has the capacity to offer material abundance to all, but only an idiot would put down our position to our efforts alone. Without the contributions of previous generations, our civilization would not by far be as developed as it is today. Technological knowledge has been accumulating in human society for centuries, since and even before the day when a brilliant individual became aware for the first time of the potential of the wheel. Without the benefit of this tremendous heritage we received from our ancestors, we would not be any more advanced than the most primitive tribes of the world. Who would dare deny that every member of our society today has the unalienable right to participate in the profits of that heritage? Dealing with that question in