

make whether the government or the employer, or the worker or the salaried individual contributes? It all comes ultimately from the consumer, and there is not enough in the consumer's pocket to enable him to buy all the products of industry in the first place, even if what the consumer has were not taken from him. That is another position which must be acknowledged by economic thinkers. It is assumed by almost everyone in this house except the members of this group that industry is self-liquidating; that all you need to do is to start an industry, get it going, and automatically it will distribute enough money to buy back its own products. That is one of the greatest economic fallacies which we hear expounded to-day. No industry or business, whether it be a peanut-stand, a corner grocery store or a million dollar corporation, can distribute enough money to buy back its own products. All you are doing under the existing financial policy is redistributing poverty; that is what the whole unemployment insurance scheme amounts to, the redistributing of poverty.

What we need is not a redistribution of existing income, but a greater income. In normal times our income is never equal to our production. We must reconcile ourselves to that fact, and if we proceed to balance our national income by supplementing the incomes of the people to the point where the national income is equal to the national production we can wipe out the whole unemployment insurance bill and all similar legislation. When that takes place our people can enjoy freedom. They will not need to take orders from any government bureaucrat. When their incomes are supplemented by national money to the point where national consumption balances national production people will not only be enabled to acquire the national production but will have the freedom to choose what they wish to do. It makes it possible for machines to be used to the maximum degree and the work-week reduced to the absolute minimum, thereby giving the people plenty of leisure.

A few moments ago the hon. member for Spadina said that people want to work. I deny that. He does not want to work any more than I do.

Mr. MITCHELL: The hon. member is speaking for himself.

Mr. KUHL: Yes, I am, and I resent the imputation that he should set himself up in any way to recommend to me what I should do. I say that is a prerogative which no government official should have.

Mr. CASE: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. KUHL: Yes.

Mr. CASE: Is the hon. member saying that he would pay everyone a national income whether he worked or not?

Mr. KUHL: Yes. Without that you have no freedom. The reason they should obtain this income, or national dividend, whether they work or not is that they are entitled to it by reason of being citizens of this modern civilization. A dividend is not a hand-out; it is the heritage which belongs to the individual whether he works or not. That is a fundamental.

Mr. JOHNSTON: The recipients of the family allowances do not work for it.

Mr. KUHL: The work has been done by our ancestors. We who are alive to-day have contributed nothing to the discovery of electricity, the steam engine, diesel power and all the other inventions which make this great abundance possible to-day. We have simply accepted it, but we have not had sense enough to devise a proper system of distribution to enable us to enjoy the potentialities of production which it is possible for us to enjoy to-day. Certainly I say that this supplement to the individual's income should be received whether he works or not. He must receive it because he is entitled to it, and no one—whether the state or anyone else—has any right to step in between and determine how and where he should spend it. That is the glorious aspect of the social credit philosophy, wherein every man has the right to choose what he is to do, and does not have to take any orders from a government bureaucrat. That is the kind of civilization I should like to see in this country of ours as well as in every other country. Therefore I resent the inference or the direct statement by anyone that he is going to tell me what to do, where to go and what not to do. I want to choose that for myself. I claim that privilege for every one of my fellow men.

What people want is not work in the ordinary sense. They want an opportunity to indulge in leisured pursuits. That is what the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) privately seeks to do. He does not spend any more time in the house than he has to; he does not write six paragraphs in a letter when he can get away with two. He conserves his energy.

Mr. MITCHELL: He works sixteen hours a day, six days a week.

Mr. KUHL: That is because he has to. If he did not have to do it he would not do it.

Mr. MITCHELL: It is work to sit here and listen to the hon. member