

Like every one of us, I cannot ignore the 70 per cent of the Canadian people who are unemployed or earn less than \$4,000 per year. There are also those whose annual income is \$5,000 or \$6,000. In that group, there are also the farmers who worry about the situation in which the present government has put them.

I recall, in that regard, the motion proposed by the leader of the Ralliement créditiste (Mr. Caouette) in May 1967, asking for subsidies in order to raise the price of industrial milk to \$5 per cwt. The answer given is known to all. The motion was rejected on the pretext that no money was available.

On December 17, 1970 I moved an amendment to Bill C-202, an Act to amend the Old Age Security Act. This amendment was simple enough as it proposed a monthly amount of \$150 to be paid to every citizen of 60 years of age or over. This amendment was deemed unacceptable by the Speaker because such action would have necessitated disbursements on the part of the government. If we cannot make payments for the benefit of senior citizens, of people on pension, I do not see very well how we can today increase parliamentary salaries and allowances.

On three occasions I urged in this House the establishment of a guaranteed annual income for Canadians. Under the pretext that this would cost too much, Liberal members who spoke on such occasions felt a compulsion to stifle my proposals which meant a step toward better justice. All those who wish to refer to speeches concerning this matter may find them in *Hansard* of October 2, 1968, April 20, 1970 and April 19, 1971 where I moved a motion to this effect.

● (4:40 p.m.)

Right after my election to Parliament, on the occasion of the Speech of the Throne, that is on January 24, 1966, I had hastened to move an amendment for an increase in family allowances. Once again, all Liberal members present voted against it, again for the same reason, lack of money.

When we consider that there are 700,000 unemployed in the country, and when we see every day, under the present administration, factories that have to close down, whether this takes place in La Tuque, Grand'Mère, Montreal, Saint-Hyacinthe, Quebec City or Rimouski, we cannot but question the formula used by the present administration.

When we see young people looking for work throughout the country, we can be doubtful about the efficiency of this administration.

We have already experienced a depression in the years 1929 to 1939. Great experts at that time had succeeded in making us believe that we were slightly to blame since we were uneducated. However, today conditions are different. Young people are afraid of the future; they must wait for better days and see what the Liberal party has to offer. Finally, each spring, each autumn indeed each season, the Liberal party frankly declares to the Canadian people: We have nothing to offer at the present time, but be patient. So the people are waiting especially the young.

Senate and House of Commons Act

If they do so, especially the young people, it is not because they lack training, because we all know that we have now reached the period of the educated unemployed.

Mr. Speaker, the way a country is run is predicated upon its leaders and the failure of the present administration is a clear indication that our leaders are not up to their task.

It is ridiculous that the Canadian people should lack everything because of our affluence and I will not be in a position to support the bill now before us as long as this situation will prevail.

On January 12, 1969, our present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), then in Britain, stated that his most cherished economic formula was communism.

Mr. Speaker, if parliamentary indemnities are increased as much as provided by this bill, the Prime Minister's indemnity will be raised to \$53,000 from its present level of \$45,000. I suggest such a high compensation should not be accepted by a communist leader.

An article by Pierre Elliott Trudeau, titled "Fluctuations économiques et méthodes de stabilisation", appeared in *Cité libre* of March 1954 on page 34. It reads as follows:

The problem still is to find out whether there is any limit to unemployment other than utter misery.

The most obvious solution would be to level off income among the various social classes so that the poor will have more to spend and the rich less to save.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the misery of Canadians, I do not think it is time to pocket but rather to share. As long as the government and members of Parliament will not make better services available to Canadian electors, bills such as Bill C-242 will be unacceptable.

[*English*]

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I originally had no intention of speaking on this bill and I will not detain the House more than a very few minutes. My attitude toward the bill has already been expressed by my colleagues, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis). I agree with them, that the problem of narrowing the gap between poverty and affluence is the major problem of this society. It seems to me that this bill is not consistent with that purpose. Frankly, I would have a hard time facing the old age pensioners and others on the edge of subsistence in my constituency if I supported this particular measure.

I do think that there are no objections in principle to an increase in the salaries and remuneration of Members of Parliament, but this bill does it in the wrong way and at the wrong time. I think an admirable case can be made out and, indeed, was outlined in the report of the advisory committee on parliamentary salaries and expenses headed by Mr. Beaupré, for a complete change in the practice regarding expenses and allowances for Members of Parliament. An allowance of \$6,000 or \$8,000 for expenses, income tax free but not accountable for by the members, creates a serious injustice. Some members have actual and clearly accountable expenses of very