

Social and Economic Security

protect its citizens against aggression by those who threaten its legitimacy. However, it is also its duty to control the greediness of those who squeeze the people, of the big financiers who have abusively increased interest rates, one of the main causes of inflation and unemployment.

A social and economic situation cannot be remedied the way a bomb is defused. In a certain sense, when democratic governments have to rely on police forces to restore the prosperity and security of the country, it means they are gradually losing the game.

When groups of citizens, even if they are a minority, come to contest the legitimacy of government and to doubt the ability of public institutions to govern properly, when they resort to violence and disorder, it is a sign that something is wrong with the system.

This is an indication that it is most urgent that we should pass from the mere denunciation of the effects of violence to the consideration of its causes.

• (5:20 p.m.)

When solutions are proffered, serious minded people will sometimes say that this is demagoguery, that the proposals are naive, that we must keep on beating around the bush and keep our imperfect system even though some older parts are worn out, in the hope that they can be adapted to the machinery and end up operating in a normal way.

Referring to violence, one notes that the situation is almost unchanged since last year. We have witnesses, this year, a number of demonstrations here and there.

Some situations have actually arisen that were of concern to every Canadian who wishes to live in peace and security whilst going about under normal conditions.

The right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) travels across Canada surrounded by police forces as was recently the case in Quebec City. I am not making up that story which was published by the newspaper *Le Soleil* on November 13, and I quote:

Police forces steal the show from politicians.

When I was a little boy and used to read in the papers that Hitler, Mussolini, Stalin, and the great politicians of that time were going about—

An hon. Member: Ah, ah!

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): Whatever hon. members might say, I am referring to a situation that has happened and which is now menacing our own country.

When the Prime Minister cannot travel without such protection, something disturbing is happening. It is up to hon. members to talk about those things in Parliament to try and improve the situation. Let us wake up while there is still time! Some people are sleeping over a volcano and do not know it!

There was a very interesting caricature published in the newspaper *Le Soleil*. The caption was short but it spoke for itself. There was a man saying, "I inherited a small factory—". He was very happy, very radiant. "I make a little \$75,000 a year—". I am very glad for him. "I spend my winters in the South!" How lucky can you get! "I might say I am perfectly happy—but—". But there is a question mark. The man says, "I wonder why people are demonstrating in the streets?" Everything is going well for him. Everything is perfect so he asks himself why people are demonstrating in the streets. That is what he is

asking himself. But he does not want to look any further. He does not try to find out. He is just wondering.

So the government appointed a commission to analyze the economic conditions and determine if there were really poor people in Canada and if their lot could be improved. The Croll report on poverty talks about income security but the Prime Minister commented the report by saying it was impossible to realize. Here are comments published in the newspaper *Le Soleil* on November 13, 1971, under the heading: "Trudeau thinks nothing more can be done in the field of welfare and unemployment without jeopardizing other priorities". He was answering questions put to him by a newspaper man who asked him this:

Are your income programs adequate at this time?

The Prime Minister answered:

—I wish there was more money for everyone in Canada—

—More could be spent, but then there would be less money left to build bridges, highways, public buildings . . . If money is shifted, as you say, if our priorities are changed, naturally it would be possible for instance to eliminate the police, the army, the firemen and the mail carriers. People would then come to the post office to pick up their mail and they would put out fires with their own hoses.

I was amazed when I read that. Frankly that upsets me. I hope the Prime Minister was misquoted, because I am convinced that he is much more clever than that. Besides he has often proved it. I will quote shortly some of his remarks at a press conference.

I do not understand why the Canadian government, particularly the Prime Minister, thinks it is impossible economically to provide income security for all. That is similar to what takes place in a family. That is what fathers and mothers are doing when raising children. As far as the youngest of the family is concerned, he is insured security at the table, in his bed, in the kitchen, in order that his basic needs are satisfied and when that duty has been accomplished, the others are forgotten, even if they have more, even if we must spend more for them because we have fulfilled our mission to insure the youngest one of the family security and the satisfaction of his basic needs.

That is our aim. We do not want to make all Canadians millionaires, but we want to provide the working class, the weak and the needy with the necessary revenue to satisfy their basic needs, that is income security.

Is the gross national product sufficient to provide the necessary goods to meet the demands of consumers provided with a guaranteed minimum income as suggested by the Social Credit? The Prime Minister is supposed to answer that question. About a month ago, the Prime Minister stated, during a press conference, that in 1971 the gross national product will reach some \$95 billion. He also said that in 1961 it was in the vicinity of \$40 billion. He spoke the truth when he gave those figures. It means therefore that over a period of ten years, the gross national product jumped from \$40 to \$95 billion. It also means that Canadians are industrious workers, that our economic system, where productivity is concerned, is truly efficient and that we must continue to develop it that it might become even more so.

In 1970, the gross national product in Canada amounted to \$48 billion and according to the Prime Minister it will