

*The Budget—Mr. Godin*

Using these figures, constituencies could be found in Nova Scotia where 63 per cent of families were not even getting the wretched incomes mentioned above.

Since, therefore, we cannot trust the solutions put forward by the Liberals, because they have not put an end to unemployment or prevented prices from rising, and since we cannot trust in the Progressive Conservatives, because they were no more successful in bringing prosperity and security to Canadians from 1958 to 1962, I suggest that all that remains to us is to try Social Credit, which has not yet failed us and is full of promises.

• (1650)

I imagine that the majority of hon. members are not happy about the misery and distress of almost 700,000 Canadians who have no jobs in this country. So we, of the Social Credit Party of Canada, want to ensure economic freedom and security for all Canadians. For this, we propose that the Canadian population apply a system which has never been applied anywhere, and which cannot be worse than the one proposed in turn by the Liberals and the Progressive Conservatives.

It was on June 26, 1937, during a lecture he gave in London, that the founder of Social Credit gave a detailed definition of it. Here it is:

In the minds of many people, Social Credit is a plan for monetary reform, and that is why today when money and credit are scarce the monetary reforms it proposes are so popular. But Social Credit is not only that, Social Credit is the policy of a philosophy. This philosophy may be described as the partnership philosophy or the power of human beings living in partnership to get the wanted results in order to meet their needs.

If we make a more thorough analysis, we may ask ourselves: What is credit? This is the answer: Credit is just the belief that partnership brings along benefits. For instance, the first Canadians relied on the wealth which were within their reach and able to meet their needs. That is what is called the real credit of a country. This credit includes the country's wealth as well as all the men who want to exploit them. Therefrom one may conclude, that the real credit of a country is a social common thing. Therefore, the real credit or the social credit is a reality, a fact for our country. But, if social credit is a reality, a fact, why do members of the Social Credit party not stop complaining, asking above all for social credit, trying to change the monetary system and to have enough members elected in Parliament in order to reach their objective? The only reason is, Mr. Speaker, that the present financial system does not reflect reality and that our bank system prevents consumers from taking advantage of the result of their partnership, because the financial system keeps for itself the benefits of partnership which should normally belong to every citizen.

This is the situation, Mr. Speaker, which led the Right Hon. Mackenzie King to say once, and I quote:

Yesterday's promises are today's taxes.

So that Canadians really benefit from the results of their partnership, we must therefore relate the financial credit to the real or social credit, that is to say relate money and credit to what Canadians produce and provide and are able to produce and provide.

[Mr. Godin.]

Values that were far sounder and far more basic than the present bank system have been put aside. Religion, Catholicism, papal authority, private property, respect for the human life of the foetus, and many other things have been put aside.

And, Mr. Speaker, what about the desperation of international bankers who are seeking a new international bank system. If the international financial system has to be reconsidered and worked out again from scratch, this is because the national financial systems also have to be reconsidered and worked out again from scratch.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the task which the Creditistes are trying to carry out, being precursors and innovators, misunderstood perhaps and rejected sometimes because they dare attack finance. Fortunately, finance is no longer a taboo subject today, the monetary system is no longer sacro-sanct, and because facts prove us right, Creditistes are going to continue even more successfully, I think, to expose the present system which has no justification in the nature of things and perpetuates a false concept of money in a human society.

[English]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. Perhaps this is rather irregular for the Chair, but before I recognize the next speaker I would point out that there are six names left on my list. We have 50 minutes left in this debate, and if those six members were agreeable that I call each of them for 8½ minutes, that would give everybody who has offered to make a contribution an opportunity to do so. This, however, would have to be with the agreement of the six speakers on the list. Although it might be a departure from the normal practice, is it agreed?

**Mr. Lefebvre:** We are always ready to agree on this side, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member for Bonavista-Trinity-Conception; eight and a half minutes.

**Mr. Dave Rooney (Bonavista-Trinity-Conception):** Mr. Speaker, I have decided to give my first address to this honourable House an official title: "Budgets may come and budgets may go, but inequalities go on forever." That statement is not likely to startle many hon. members; indeed, it is not my intention that it should do so, nor is it my intention to sound cynical or pessimistic. On the contrary, I am very optimistic about the future of this country and about the future of this government.

I am sure that the statement contained in the title will be forever true. But it is also true that the very uncomfortable extreme of inequality has always been borne by great numbers of dependent, unorganized and often helpless recipients of meagre financial means. What has always disturbed me greatly, Mr. Speaker, is that in our own times and in our own nation this situation has been perpetuated largely by the insensitivity and inaction of those with the political power to make more equitable adjustments to the distribution of our nation's wealth. I might add that, prompted by a remark made in this House, I had considered another title: "In this House there are many mansions". While that statement is made in jest, it also bears the reality that in our push-bottomed chairs and