

*Social and Economic Security*

graduates specializing in money matters, economics, politics, or the social, industrial and administrative sciences.

There is no question of entirely spoiling a system which does so well in planning production, capitalization and even to a great extent consumption for the 8,700,000 Canadian producers contributing to production and earning wages for their work as well as interest on their principal.

Mr. Speaker, there remains only to plan a guaranteed personal income for the \$13 million dependent Canadian citizens in order that every Canadian without any income from work or capital can be sure of a guaranteed vital minimum, large enough and planned according to his needs and the production capacity.

Such is the situation in which we find ourselves, Mr. Speaker. That is where we should focus our efforts. We should ask our great experts, politicians, economists and others to see to it that the surplus production is distributed—

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

[*English*]

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, like others who have spoken in this debate today, I should like to commend the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) for placing on the order paper the motion that we are now discussing. I think I can also say that the debate has been a very interesting one. All of those who have taken part have been obviously sincere and earnest in their desire to get rid of poverty. I think that all of us realize, as the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis) put it, that poverty is a cancer that can destroy our society.

Although I have paid tribute to those who have taken part in this debate for the sincerity and earnestness of their approach, I must say that I disagree with many things that have been said. It does seem to me that many of the ideas and proposals that have been made fly in the face of one basic, fundamental fact. That fact is that you do not get rid of poverty simply by paying people money because they are poor. When that is done, no matter what title may be given to the payments, the result is that the poor are kept in their poverty.

If I may use the words of the Minister of National Health and Welfare, there are many measures that have the effect of institutionalizing poverty, and that goes for any scheme that gives money to people simply because they are poor. We have to find a much better way, and I hope that even this day's debate will result in some new thinking about this important issue.

The Minister of National Health and Welfare was quite right in asking that spokesmen for the various parties in this House should make clear where they stand with respect to the guaranteed annual income. I am afraid that is a phrase which a few years ago was capable of at least two different definitions, but the developments which have taken place have narrowed the field. It used to be that one could say he stood for a guaranteed annual income when what he really meant, as I did, was that he stood for universal programs, for demogrants. I still think

[Mr. Latulippe.]

that that is a good connotation to put upon the phrase "guaranteed annual income". However, because of developments that have taken place in other jurisdictions, and because of the use of the title "guaranteed income supplement" with respect to the attachment to old age security, and because of the way in which the Croll report uses the phrase "guaranteed annual income," it has now come to mean something in the nature of the negative income tax. It has now come to mean a program under which, by use of an income test, people are given money to bring them up to a certain level.

• (9:00 p.m.)

I have to say that if the guaranteed annual income means that, if it means what is set out in the Croll report, I am not for it any more than is the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro). But I am for a guaranteed annual income as I see it. I am for universal programs. I am for demogrants to designated groups in our society.

I said earlier that the fundamental fact that all of us who want to get rid of poverty must face up to is that we will never get rid of it by programs that institutionalize poverty, by programs under which money is given to people simply because they are poor. Programs like that keep them poor, start their children off poor, and as a result we will go on having a society in which not just 25 per cent by perhaps even a larger percentage of our people are poor throughout their years, despite the potential affluence of a country like this.

What bothers me most of all about the recommendations in the Croll report—and many people use the kind of language that is in that document—is that it generously criticizes all of our present welfare programs, saying they are a hodge-podge, saying they are no good, saying they do damage to the poor, and then it suggests another one. The Croll report proposes just one big welfare scheme that would be much easier to administer because it is on a one-shot basis, but I suggest it is far removed from the realities of the situation.

That applies not only to the Croll report. I submit it applies to much of the thinking of the present government. I was with the Minister of National Health and Welfare when he was criticizing those who are prepared to drop a number of our programs—he specified some of them—in favour of one over-all scheme. But I am not with him when in the administration of this phase of this government's activities he moves away from the universal principle and moves into more and more income-tested programs.

I hope the minister is not going to say, "Oh, there is Stanley again, still preaching the same old thing he has preached for the last 30 years."

**An hon. Member:** Thirty-five years.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Thirty-five, 40 years, or whatever it is. I submit that in advocating universal programs and demogrants I am not advocating anything that is old-fashioned. It is welfare; it is the means test that is old-fashioned. I am advocating what is going to come, the day of universal allowances, of eco-