

income. Yesterday the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Francis) spoke forcibly and eloquently on this subject. In substance, he said we could not afford it. My hon. friend from Winnipeg North Centre reminded him that this has been the story of every Liberal government in the past when increases in pensions were proposed.

Mr. Francis: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member has referred to my remarks yesterday and I believe he is obliged to quote them correctly. The context of my remarks was not the guaranteed annual income proposal but the universal payment of \$150 a month to pensioners proposed by his friend from Winnipeg North Centre.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): I must bring it to the attention of the hon. member that his question of privilege is merely a point of debate. If we were to allow questions of privilege with regard to the interpretation of speeches by hon. members, it would prevent us from progressing in the debate.

Mr. Francis: With the greatest respect, the hon. member is misquoting me. That is not a question of debate; it is a fact which can readily be verified by reference to *Hansard*.

Mr. Gilbert: If I misquoted the hon. member for Ottawa West, I will rephrase what I said. He may be right with reference to his remark concerning the demogrant of \$150 in accordance with the universality principle. He said it would cost too much. My hon. friend from Winnipeg North Centre reminded the hon. member for Ottawa-West that this was the story which has been told time and time again with regard to any proposal for increasing old age pensions.

Mr. Francis: But it was not a guaranteed income I referred to.

Mr. Gilbert: Hon. members will recall when another Liberal government was defeated in 1957 in connection with its proposal to increase the old age pension by \$6—they were called the “six buck boys”. Perhaps they will now be known as the 10 cents a week boys, or the 42 cents a month boys. I thought there was at least something they could learn. When we establish the principle of universality, and make looking after our senior citizens a national goal, surely we can find the money to take care of them.

We in the New Democratic Party say there should be a demogrant of \$150 a month. My hon. friend from Winnipeg North Centre says that if this is not considered possible we should take a first step by making it \$100 a month for each person with a \$50 supplement. The hon. member wrinkles his nose like a ravished virgin and asks: Where does the money come from? He cannot come up with the answer. It is unfortunate. We are in favour of the demogrant because it affirms the principle of universality, because it minimizes the division within the

Old Age Security

community and gives to Canadians a sense of dignity, a sense of worth and a sense of accomplishment.

A few months ago a debate took place on the subject of a guaranteed annual income and the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) set forth our beliefs. He told the House that two myths had arisen with regard to this proposal. The first was that any such scheme would be abused. I am not going to take the time to quote the experts, but these studies have shown that less than 5 per cent of the people in receipt of welfare abuse that privilege. Therefore, the myth of abuse is exploded.

• (2:40 p.m.)

Second, we have the myth that if you give people money, they have no incentive to work. In this regard we are fortunate that a welfare experiment was carried out in New Jersey, because that experiment revealed that people who do receive money of a welfare nature do not lose their incentive to work. The hon. member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton (Mr. McBride) is a United Church minister, one who I am sure would want to translate the mind and the spirit of the Christian doctrine into lay action. He has agreed that the experiment conducted in New Jersey was one which had exploded the myth regarding abuse and regarding removing incentive to work. I would expect him to rise in his place and speak with the eloquence of a Cicero and the strength of a Billy Graham and let the Canadian people know that it is about time we maintained the principle of universality; that the principle of selectivity will create a divisiveness that is not worthy of Canadians. I am waiting for his speech and hoping that he will oppose this niggardly approach to the senior citizens of Canada.

In closing, may I say I hope that the Parliamentary Secretary will have the strength and courage, when the bill is referred to the committee, to travel across the country to hear the representations of different groups and will reconsider this poor principle of selectivity as well as the restriction on escalation. I trust he will rise and speak against it, indeed that we will all speak against it. I hope the government will bring forth a bill that will not only provide for \$150 a month but an escalation provision that will keep pace with the cost of living. This will be our goal, and we shall strive hard to achieve this end.

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

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Is the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich rising for the purpose of asking a question?

Mr. Anderson: Yes, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. member for Broadview would permit me I would like to ask him a question with regard to the motion that was refused earlier this day requiring the President of the Treasury Board to live on \$58 a week for one year.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): You mean the Minister of Finance.