

Guaranteed Minimum Income

In fact, if the father works he receives the salary of a single man. To my mind, society cannot expect him to support five or six people on one salary which is barely sufficient for a single person. That is why a guaranteed minimum must be provided for the mother and each of her children.

The Progressive Conservatives and the Liberals have never taken the family into account in their tax legislation. A table, published at page 1534 of *Hansard*, on June 14, 1967, makes a comparison between a single person and a man with a wife and three children as dependents, both earning an annual salary of \$4,200. After paying his income tax and while taking advantage of his basic exemptions, this father has \$515 left to support his family. That is \$125 per person per year, \$10.50 per month or 30 cents per day. That is what our present tax system leaves to the taxpayer. One can imagine the small amount left to the mother of a large family. Thirty cents per day for the mother, the most important person in our society, when our national production will reach \$80 billion in 1970. Those figures show that the situation is abnormal.

In my opinion, the first move was to bring in a notice of motion in order to draw the attention of the House to this situation through proper parliamentary action. Social Credit has always advocated a philosophy and economic reforms promoting the well-being of the individual and the family in the monetary, economic and financial fields, and thus more personal, family and social freedom. With money in his pockets or in the bank, a man can speak the language he wants or go to the school of his choice.

While all the millionaires, the scientists, the chairmen of large banks and companies, the leaders or ministers of the old political parties are defending the interests of high finance, while all the unions are seeking higher salaries for the workers, nobody is doing anything for the unemployed who have a right to live. In fact, Social Credit is the only one to talk about that.

In this country, 5 per cent of the population are made up of people with personal income, 35 per cent earn salaries, 60 per cent are unemployed and depend on a producing citizen or on society in general. Here are the facts; here is the present situation in the Canadian society.

The Canadian government does not produce anything but it administers everything. It is the people who produce everything, even

[Mr. Godin.]

their ministers and members of Parliament. It is up to the people to say to their ministers and representatives how production should be distributed for the good of the whole population and not only for the good of capitalists.

The production of goods and services is excellent but purchasing power is lacking to buy this production. Purchasing power, it is money. Money is very badly distributed. Some have too much, others not enough. Inflation for some, deflation for the others. All the while discussions take place throughout the country about the sharing of taxes between the federal, provincial and perhaps even municipal governments, the poor distribution of money between families is forgotten.

When the government levies taxes, it is to distribute the sum total of this revenue in salaries, interests and administrative costs. Thus, taxes that have been drawn from the people are deemed to return to the people. If the national production is made up of the work of eight million citizens, isolated or associated, I think it should benefit all Canadians, including the thirteen million who are unemployed, but who also have the right to live in our society.

All the Social Credit philosophy based on the needs of the individual in the family, is there and it enables us to claim, even in the present system, a guaranteed minimum income for all.

• (5:10 p.m.)

The purpose of this method is to help families to fulfil themselves and, as the family is the very basis of society, I feel parliament should give serious thought to that problem. If we want the country to prosper, let us start by ensuring the prosperity of every family, every individual. If families are prosperous, all the institutions normally will be, or else they will disappear if they are not useful to people who can afford to pay.

Beautiful plants, stores, huge offices, marvellous schools and public buildings, skyscrapers fifty stories high are being built, but still too many slums are being tolerated.

Mr. Speaker, the concept of a guaranteed income is not new, since on October 22, 1968, I gave the green light, here, to the personal guaranteed income, during the private members' business hour. At that time, I was congratulated on doing so, particularly by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) and the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.