

Social and Economic Security

income. We cannot afford it, but if war should break out tomorrow, the hon. member who is presently absent, would be the first to vote several billion dollars to set up the Canadian armed forces, war industries, youth enrolment and so on. He would be the first one to vote for it. Even if it cost \$10 billion they would find the money. They would tell us, it is because we are facing an emergency situation. It is urgent.

Is the situation not urgent nowadays when we go down to Montreal and we are afraid to walk down the street, to encounter terrorists, to hear a bomb explosion?

The minister was recently on station CKVL to answer questions that were being phoned in on the Frenchie Jaraud program. When he came out he could have been ill-treated by the Lapalme employees. We are in a situation when we have a bomb here, terrorists there, bloody demonstrations. Is that not urgent? Does emergency simply mean going to fight on other continents and leaving oppression go its way here at home before we wake up, take action and introduce legislation acceptable to the population?

Is this not an emergency? Why are those people protesting? Why do the young no longer respect family, school, provincial or federal authority? It is no longer wanted. They do not realize that even after they have done away with our society, they will have to abide by some kind of authority. Montreal's Michel Chartrand would take over and enforce his authority with the help of his clique, put the people in a strait-jacket as Castro does in Cuba or as the leaders in communist or socialist countries do to their population.

Would Canada stand for this? Is it not high time that we wake up the silent majority which would rather wait for the bombs to explode instead of making changes?

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to help the Canadian people to live. Was there ever a more stupid argument? And to think that it comes from an hon. member who deems himself responsible. I would say he is feather-brained; he does not understand anything, he does not want to understand, he is impervious to understanding. Unfortunately he is absent today but I shall repeat that to him at the earliest opportunity, when he will be back in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I will keep on with the quotation:

—we want to develop furthermore an income protection system—

Imagine! The citizens have no income and we are going to protect them. As to the establishment of a guaranteed annual income, it is impossible; we cannot afford it. As for the people without an income, we shall guarantee them that they have no income. That is exactly what it means. I should say the argument is quite bright and comes from a fairly learned economist. I keep on:

—we want to develop further an income protection system in favour of classes of Canadian citizens who deserve to get assistance:

older people in need, large families with a low income, retired people, disabled and handicapped people and all those who can and are willing to work, but who on account of the present economic conditions are unable to find employment.

There is a glaring inconsistency in what the hon. member for Papineau said. In another article, under the heading "Elimination of poverty—Collective responsibility

[Mr. Caouette.]

ty" it is reported that the president of the Quebec Caisses populaires, Mr. Rouleau, directly blames the system. I quote:

In Canada, says he, following a substantial increase in family allowances and especially in allowances according to the number and age of the children, two thirds of the poor would be eliminated, according to professor Henripin.

In Quebec, we spend large sums of money for welfare institutions of all kinds, but we are always reluctant when it comes to really helping the basic institution of our society, namely the family. We pay for instance from \$75 to \$200 per month for a child in an institution—

Therefore, it is true. When the child lives with his family, nothing or almost nothing is allowed. People have to draw the child from his home in order to get a decent pension. If the mother requests custody of her 5 or 6 children, social welfare officials refuse. They tell her: Madam, let your children leave home and then we shall pay up to \$200 per month for their maintenance. If you keep them at home, we shall give you \$10 per month. Can you imagine such a legislation! All the more power to Mr. Rouleau for pinpointing the weaknesses of the system.

Mr. Speaker, I have only a few minutes left. A while ago an interruption cost me 4 or 5 minutes. Therefore, I should be able to express my suggestion. I am not allowed to speak over 30 minutes. I was so advised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) not long ago.

We are suggesting the establishment of a social security plan as advocated by the Social Credit Party of Canada. I do not wish to take the time of the House to read a document, but if my colleagues allowed me to do so, I would have it recorded in *Hansard*. The figures would be shown in the official record and I would not need reading them. May I have the permission—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. In all respect, I would suggest to the hon. member that this procedure is not at all in order. In so doing, we would be adopting a new procedure, and it would not be profitable for the House if hon. members, in the course of their remarks, were to request that some documents be recorded in *Hansard* and be considered as part of their speeches. For the information of his colleagues, the hon. member should try to summarize the document. Then, it would be part of his speech. Besides, I have no doubt that his colleagues will grant him the extra time he needs.

• (3:30 p.m.)

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I have enough time, I think, to read the whole piece rather quickly. Here it is:

Since every Canadian with an income of \$15,000 or more a year is already assured of his social security it is therefore proper to suggest to following:

Tax exemption on any income under \$3,000 for all single persons

Tax exemption on any income under \$5,000 for all married people

Exemption of \$500 for each child

Allocation of a vital minimum to all those earning less than \$15,000 a year according to the following standards and without any condition.

If the fellow is working and earns \$5,000, this amount is added to his social security.