

*Old Age Security*

have much of a case or that certainly his party does not have much of a case.

I listened very carefully and attentively, as I always do, to the hon. member for Vancouver Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis). I heard her comment to the effect that we should be paying married couples \$400 a month. She did not suggest how much that would cost, but I suggest it would be something in the neighbourhood of \$1,300 million. The NDP is different when it forms a government from when it is in opposition. We have heard the NDP talk about \$400 a month, but what does the NDP government give when it is in power in certain provinces? In British Columbia they suggest \$250 a month is enough. In Manitoba it is \$242 a month. In Saskatchewan it is \$219, plus a 5 per cent increase announced in August which takes it to \$230 a month. What is the highest figure in one of the richest provinces, British Columbia, where most of the money to be spent was raised by the Social Credit Party? The amount in that province is \$250 a month. Half of that amount comes from the federal treasury.

It is one thing to be in opposition; it is another thing to be in government so far as the NDP is concerned.

**Mr. Orlikow:** Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** The hon. member would have to have the consent of the hon. member who has the floor.

**Mr. Cullen:** Mr. Speaker, I am very anxious to see this bill go to the committee stage today. I would be quite happy to take the question right now, but—

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

**Mr. Cullen:** If hon. members are prepared to agree to second reading and proceed to the committee stage I would be happy to sit down now. I do not think it is necessary to catalogue what the government has done; it has been fantastic. Mr. Speaker, might the question be put now?

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order, please. Other members are standing up, so there does not seem to be unanimous consent.

**Mr. Cullen:** I must say I regret that. This bill provides for a very ordinary run-of-the-mill increase based on the cost of living. I think the tactic and the idea behind this is good. I believe it is necessary. I am afraid, however, that there does not appear to be unanimity among the opposition parties. I notice that no members from the Liberal Party stood up. They are prepared to pass the bill and refer it to the committee stage.

**Mr. Macquarrie:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. There seems to be a grasping for consensus by the hon. member. We are, as we were last night, prepared to facilitate the passage of this bill.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order, please. Is it the wish of the House that I ask whether there is unani-

[Mr. Cullen.]

mous consent to put the motion for second reading at this time?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

● (1720)

[Translation]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** I am wondering if the House would give unanimous consent to proceed immediately to the second reading of the bill and to its reference to the committee of the whole.

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon—Mr. Laniel in the chair.

**The Deputy Chairman:** Shall clause 1 carry?

**Mr. Latulippe:** Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to say a few words on clause 1 of Bill C-219.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is very important even if we know that it will not solve our problems; we must apply ourselves to restore a national balance between the various economic social and legislative elements in this country. We have legislation to pass because of the effects of the present system which has thrown our economy off balance to such an extent that it is necessary through legislation and regulations to increase pensions, salaries, etc. Mr. Speaker, people are not satisfied and amendments must be introduced and corrective measures must be passed in several fields.

I would say, Mr. Chairman, that the modern state is man's enemy. In the midst of this chaos, there is however one thing: the success of science. The results are there before our eyes as evident as the light. Science itself gives proof of it, as it is a perfect success in its own field but men use it as an instrument of exploitation and domination. We are always exploited, dominated by various factors. When there is no war on we experience a general unbalance in our economy, tax increases, problems for our population, increases in prices, in the unemployment rate too, and we witness a general unbalance of our economy. We have no stability and the bill before us is far from being able to stabilize the economy as much as it should.

Mr. Chairman, the development of interplanetary rockets is wonderful in itself. Man is freed from the universal gravitational pull, the cosmic route is open, all planets are within the reach of any man or nation: is it not magnificent, Mr. Chairman? In this age of plenty, when science is as advanced and applied as it is, we can hardly find the most simple solutions. We cannot make them available to the people so that they may live in reasonable comfort. We hear of nothing but surpluses in our economy; we hear of nothing but production increases and we are bothered by overproduction. In front of so many wonders the pride of men knows no limit but at the same time on earth at least one billion people out of three billion do not fully fill their stomach. And we have the guts, Mr. Chairman, in our economy, in this Parliament to give subsidies, to pay exorbitant amounts of money through taxes taken out of the pockets of citizens who do not have enough, to reduce our production. It is a crime, Mr. Chairman, vis-à-vis