

Family Allowance Act

citizens, and also to strive for profits and capital investment by institutions.

Both these things are necessary, but meeting the present needs of citizens in 1970 should not be sacrificed to seeking over-ambitious capital investments in view of our future development.

Each year's production should provide for the current year's needs before it is applied to the needs of subsequent years. Instead of using \$34 billion for capital investment out of a production of \$84 billion in 1970 and consuming only \$50 billion, let us consume \$12 billion more, deducted from the \$34 billion for capital investment. That will still leave \$22 billion for capital investment for our future development, still more than \$1,000 per capita. Those \$12 billion added to consumption would provide monthly family allowance payments of \$30 for the 7,000,000 school-children under 11, \$60 for students between 12 and 17, \$90 to each citizen between 18 and 59, without work or capital, and \$120 to all citizens of 60 or over.

Every citizen would thus be assured of a guaranteed income, either through his labour or through his capital, from the national product in each fiscal year. The 21,500,000 people who make up the Canadian population would thus be assured of a decent purchasing power.

As all those figures are accurate, they should be carefully studied. If we set aside \$12 billion for purchasing power from a capitalization of \$34 billion, \$1 billion would be circulated each month to assure a minimum guaranteed income to each citizen. And, should we do this under our present system, nothing would need to be changed, except that the government would have to make a decision.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has now expired.

Does the House agree that the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Latulippe) should finish his speech?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): The hon. member for Compton.

Mr. Latulippe: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the hon. members for allowing me to continue but I have nearly finished.

• (4:20 p.m.)

I was saying earlier that if we put more money in circulation fewer people will have to receive unemployment benefits and welfare allowances. We could solve this problem, and it would not cost the government any more to give away money as guaranteed income than as family allowances or social welfare benefits. All the plans now implemented could disappear and be replaced by the guaranteed income to every Canadian citizen. It is possible, if we rely on the economic reality of our country. If we provide work to almost all citizens, the national prod-

[Mr. Latulippe.]

uct will double and it will be easy to find a billion dollars a month to assure Canadians of a viable and well balanced economy that will satisfy them.

[English]

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Latulippe) presented his motion at four o'clock, His Honour the Speaker discovered that my hon. friend did not have any of his party colleagues with him to second the motion and therefore he took the liberty of naming me.

Mr. Walker: Politics make strange bedfellows.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Go back to sleep, Jim. I had not given my prior consent, but I have no objection at all to being the member who makes it possible for the hon. member for Compton to have his motion discussed during the private members' hour this afternoon. I confess that the motion is worded in language I perhaps would not want to place on the order paper, mainly because even if we should pass the motion I do not quite know what would be the result. It seems to me, however, that the hon. member has a point. He emphasized it in his remarks and it is a point which Parliament and society as a whole one day will have to consider.

I know my hon. friend is criticized because he and his colleagues talk about providing increased benefits without increased taxation. Indeed, the immediate response to that is that it cannot be done. I should simply like to put it this way. Twenty, thirty or forty years from now no doubt our productive capacity will have resulted in an even greater quantity of goods and services than we now produce, and I just cannot imagine that we will continue to divide an increased quantity of goods and services among our people in such a way that a few are fabulously wealthy and a multitude are grievously poor.

I think we will find a better way to distribute the goods and services we produce. I believe we will get over the idea that it is good enough to increase the standard of living of those at the top by three or four times the extent to which we increase it for those at the bottom and that we will find a better way to distribute our goods and services. Perhaps in the 20, 30 or 40 years to which I have referred we will not achieve economic equality in a country like this, but unless we move toward greater equality and away from an era in which we forever widen the gap between rich and poor, our society will be in a bad way.

I do not subscribe to the economic theories of my hon. friend who moved this motion of which I am now the seconder, but I am glad to see the subject discussed. I commend him for raising it year after year, and I think hon. members who wish to criticize my hon. friend's proposals should come up with something better or we might as well call it five o'clock.

[Translation]

Mr. Gaston Isabelle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I will