

provide 50 per cent of the costs borne by the provinces in programs employing an income test, a measure which would allow provinces to embark on a guaranteed annual income plan with the federal government paying half the costs. What happened, all of a sudden, to the federal government's objection in November, 1970, to such schemes? Have they changed their minds about the overall cost of a guaranteed annual income being prohibitive?

In its White Paper on Income Security, the Liberal government rejected a guaranteed annual income on the basis that it was too expensive and that Canadians could not afford it at present. The government now has contradicted itself by offering to share with the provinces in instituting such a scheme.

Mr. Paproski: An election must be in the offing.

Mr. Marshall: This contradiction is evidence that the proposal to amend the Canada Assistance Plan is merely a political manoeuvre as part of their bargaining with the demands of the provinces.

Mr. Paproski: An election must be in the offing.

Mr. Marshall: There is another problem—how national standards could be maintained in the future if each of the provinces were to embark on a different guaranteed income scheme or, more importantly, refused to take up the federal offer to inaugurate its own guaranteed annual income. Furthermore, the implementation of such an amendment to the Canada Assistance Plan would only exacerbate the present situation in which there are wide variations in the provincial standards of social welfare schemes already instituted under the Canada Assistance Plan.

There is a wide range in provincial assistance available under the Canada Assistance Plan right across the country. The federal proposal will do nothing to close this gap. More likely, the gap will increase as the more well-to-do provinces forge ahead with guaranteed income schemes while the poorer ones fall even further behind. Provincial differences in terms of dollar grants are matched by differences in the form of assistance available. This raises the question of "portability". The federal government has stated in its working paper "Income Security and Social Services" that because Canadians are now so mobile and move so frequently from one province to another, "It is important to the people involved that their income security benefits be portable", and, "It is important for this reason too that income security measures be reasonably uniform across the country." Individual provincial guaranteed income schemes negate this statement of federal philosophy. Portability is a definite problem arising from the government's new proposal.

Once again, I have not exhausted the inadequacies of the government's most recent proposals in the social security field. I cannot spend longer on the subject in the time allotted. I think I have demonstrated that the federal government's involvement in the income support field has been nothing more than a series of contradictions plus rationalizations for its failures to take leadership

Alleged Non-Institution of Just Society

and provide information in this all-important area of the guaranteed income plan for all Canadians.

Mr. Paproski: That's merely a political manoeuvre.

[Translation]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I must join my colleagues of the Ralliement créditiste in censuring this Liberal government for having failed to establish the just society in Canada, as promised during the last general elections, in 1968. There is no need to study at length the present administration to discover the almost total failure of this government, for which publicity and trips abroad are more important than a sound and efficient administration of our country, Canada.

To censure the government is no fun. However, we must do it, in an attempt to awaken it if at all still possible—which I doubt—before the situation deteriorates again.

To realize a just society, a government must get going, resort to short-term and long-term policies likely to allow each citizen to develop to the fullest and to enjoy freedom and security, while participating thoroughly in the economic life of the country, being no longer a marginal element as most Canadians are now by reason of the lethargy of the present government.

At the present time we are not facing a lack of productivity in the Canadian economy, but rather an insufficient use of the available resources, and above all, a waste of labour. The government so-called anti-inflationary measures—as pointed out by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in his statements, as you will recall, were meant to reduce the total demand of the Canadian people whereas the economy could have easily met that demand.

However, what we need at the present time is an increased demand since our economy does not produce to its full capacity. And when it does produce, the production is not distributed for lack of purchasing power. Instead of following the policy advocated by us. The government has restricted the demand, and an unacceptable rate of unemployment has resulted.

According to Mr. Havilland, an economist of the Economic Council, the government policy has resulted in a \$3 billion loss, while *Le Machiniste*, a well-known magazine, puts it at \$4 billion. Mr. Firestone of Ottawa University, has estimated at over \$2 billion the loss of 200,000 new jobs. Anyway, even if economists disagree on the amount of the loss, they all agree that the government has failed and is responsible for a loss of several million and even billion dollars.

More and more Canadians are depending directly on the government for their livelihood. Imagine, for instance, that in April 1971, the Dominion Bureau of Statistics published an official report which showed that over 152,000 people were unemployed for more than seven months, a record figure. The government must certainly be blamed for its complete failure.

The present economic stagnation is a direct result of the government's attitude for whom power means more studies, more inquiries, more white papers, more statements of senseless policies, more useless trips, instead of