

thing for a man to be forced into retirement at 60 or 65 when the average span of life is 70, and when so many people live into their eighties and nineties.

This is another way of saying that an increasing number of people find themselves with nothing to do for years and years, with no resources or, at least, insufficient resources to live on. Thousands of Canadian citizens, people who worked hard and faithfully to build up this great nation and make it what it is today—and it is a great nation—are today living at or below the poverty line. I know I sound as if I am preaching a sermon. I am not a preacher. Let us remind ourselves that in this regard man or woman does not live by bread alone. Thousands of people in their sixties, seventies and eighties have nothing to do, nothing to occupy themselves with, and, in many cases, insufficient resources to live a half decent life. This represents a great Canadian problem.

● (1600)

Incidentally, because of this policy of forced retirement, people of the calibre of Senator O'Leary could be put out to pasture prematurely. In Senator O'Leary's case he could have been put out to pasture 20 years ago. Surely we need no further evidence of the utter ridiculousness of such a policy. This policy of forced retirement deprives the nation of the knowledge, skills and dedicated service of men of Senator O'Leary's calibre. Had Senator O'Leary been a civil servant or bank employee he would have been vegetating for the last 20 years, instead of making the great contribution that he has made to Canadian culture and Canadian civilization.

The fact that there may be unemployment in Canada in no way invalidates the principle I am enunciating here. In no way is that an excuse for the inhumane and stupid approach to this evergrowing problem—and it is an evergrowing problem. Mathematically, it has to grow.

I must confess that it is only in recent years that the seriousness of this situation has come home to me. For some years I was deputy minister of the Department of Public Welfare in my province and later the minister, during which time I saw firsthand the needs of our elderly people in what was then one of the most deprived parts of this nation. I realize the value of institutions, but it is worth noting here that Canada was one of the first countries, perhaps the first, to start institutionalizing the aged on a large scale. I am told, too, that we do more of it today than does any other country. There are, of course, good aspects to institutionalization, but that, in turn, creates problems and obligations to which we fail to face up. We cannot salve our consciences by simply saying to our elderly people by the thousands, "Here is a good institution. You will be warm; you will be well fed; you will receive medical attention. Goodbye." We should not do that in a civilized country.

We have made some progress in protecting the rights of the consumer, but we have only touched the fringe of the problem. The fact is that over and over again the Canadian people—and we are not alone in this—are being exploited by some of the great corporations in Canada, many of which are merely the offspring of still larger corporations in the United States or, for that matter, multinational corporations. If there is one lesson we ought to have learned from the past few years it is that the larger and

more powerful the corporation, the greater is its potential for harm. I realize you cannot damn and condemn all corporations, or paint them all with the same brush, and I am not doing so. Nevertheless, we cannot ignore the experience and the lessons of the last few years. The more power a corporation possesses, the greater the likelihood it will abuse that power in the interests of its own greed and aggrandizement.

It is not an accident that those corporations in the United States and, by projection, in Canada which have been guilty of some of the most serious crimes against society—and I am using these words deliberately—are among the largest and most powerful in the world. We had motorcar manufacturers knowingly putting out cars with lethal defects; drug companies putting out improperly tested drugs, knowing that they had not been properly tested; tobacco companies defying the legitimate findings of medical and scientific inquiries by spending untold millions of dollars to discredit those findings.

Two nights ago on one of our television stations the head of one of the greatest tobacco corporations in the world boasted that the tobacco interests combined are now spending \$25 million a year in a research program which, he alleged, is designed to find out—and I am using his words now—what, if any, harmful ingredients there are in tobacco. They are very proud of that. He neglected to mention that those same companies last year spent between \$300 and \$400 million in a program to discredit those medical findings and, more serious still, to seduce our young people, our children, into a habit which they know, and as you and I know, statistically must shorten their lives. A significant number of children who are being seduced into this habit through these magazine advertisements and other forms of advertising will, inevitably, die from cancer of the lung induced by smoking.

Lest anyone think I am biased in this approach or that I am against the big money interests, the great corporations, let me say with equal emphasis that the power and activities of some trade unions in our North American society must be viewed with suspicion and apprehension. In a democratic society, or a society which calls itself democratic, no comparatively small group of men should have the right or the power to do to an entire province what was done to my own province last summer. I say that with full knowledge that we have here in this chamber two distinguished representatives of the trade union movement, and I say it with full knowledge of all that the trade union movement has done for the betterment of human beings in our society. Having said that, I repeat: No group of men should have the right or the power to do what was done to my province, and what has been done to other provinces, in recent years.

If there is one lesson which my study of history, which has been fairly extensive, and my experience in politics, which, again, has been fairly extensive, have implanted in my consciousness it is that power, no matter where it is found—whether in business, politics, organized religion, or trade unions—is always a potentially highly dangerous commodity, and one which must be kept under constant scrutiny and over which there must be ultimate control if it is not to lead to disastrous abuse of the democratic process and to devastating corruption.