

for proper solutions to the problems now existing in Canada.

The Social Credit Party of Canada recognizes as the basic principle of its philosophy that the human being is the most important being in the world and that indeed no community could exist without the individual. In order to recognize effectively that importance of the individual, we must organize our society so as to respect any individual whoever he may be.

Now, in a modern society, in order to recognize the importance of the individual, we have to recognize his needs and his right to satisfy those needs.

I think that you will all agree with me that the individual is better qualified to know his own needs as he is better qualified to decide how they can be satisfied.

But if our society is to meet each individual's needs, it must be structured so as to allow the individual to make a choice while preserving his freedom; in other words, he must be assured of his security with freedom and not without it. Let me give you an example; I give security to my dog, in feeding it, in giving it care and shelter, but without freedom, for I am the one who decides when and what it will eat, and if I decide it will stay outdoors, it is my decision, not the dog's decision.

But, Mr. Speaker, I still can say the dog enjoys security, but I repeat that this is not the type of security we ought to give people.

We must give the individual security with freedom. That is what is really difficult.

This government and previous ones have certainly attempted on several occasions to guarantee some security to the individuals but, every time, they applied controls thus deciding for the individual and restricting his freedom. There is plenty of evidence to support this. With one hand, they give the individual some degree of security but with the other, they put a collar around his neck. Every government acts like a trainer with his animal: with one hand, he gives it what it likes, what it wants, and with the other, he puts a collar around its neck in order to direct it, to oblige it to do what he wants. I am sure that once more the animal has some security, but no freedom. The only way we can really be sure that the individual's needs will be met is to go back to the means of exchange between the needs and the production of goods necessary to meet these needs.

The most common means is still money. Within 50 years or even 100 years, we might have developed some other means of exchange. We might go back to the barter system, which is the exchange of one commodity for another. But in one way or another, today, the most common means is still the use of money. It is therefore necessary to provide individuals with the means to meet his needs through an existing production, that is a means of exchange, by providing him with the money he needs for this purpose.

The minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) may say that hospitals are not money. They are services designed to meet needs, and older people homes are services that are designed to satisfy needs. But the minister does not understand, and his colleagues even less, that these services are subject to some sort of freedom

Guaranteed Income

loss. Can the older citizen who goes to live in a home choose what services he will get inside? No, he cannot. What section he will live in? No. The older citizen is placed in a corner, and they say: society is taking care of him, it is taking care of his security. It may be so, but it also destroys or deprives him from his freedom, or part of it. And this is what happens whenever the government tries to meddle with the so-called social affairs.

We feel therefore that the solution to this problem would be to find a way for society to provide each individual with enough money to allow him a choice, enough money to satisfy his basic needs and help him make his own free choice. It remains for us to find the means whereby society can recognize the needs and fully satisfy the needs of everyone without penalizing some of them, as it is the case at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, the philosophy of this administration is based on the necessity to distribute the riches. We have heard government members mention in turn that distributing the riches meant taking away from those who have too much to give to those who have nothing. Any way, the potential of everybody is reduced so that we end up with a "gang" of "have-nots", while some of the wealth is in fewer hands. A society where wealth is shared is the just society we want. But what really goes on? Tax exemptions are granted to large companies. They are permitted to increase their price. What help for the little people! This is so in the case of sugar, iron and oil. This is probably how the government feel that lower income people should be helped. And what is more surprising still, the four most highly paid individuals in Canada do not even pay a cent of income tax a year. This is the "liberal" redistribution of wealth.

No doubt the minister of National Health and Welfare intends to talk again about higher family allowances and old age pensions, but he will not say that those alleged incomes are now taxable. Unemployment insurance benefits are taxable. Whatever they give with one hand they take it back with the other so that those who still have the strength or courage to work are penalized.

● (2010)

Last week, I asked a carpenter to come and make a few repairs in my home but after discussing with him we agreed that it was only a two-day's work. Then the guy made me easily understand that he was not interested in losing his unemployment insurance benefits to work two days at my place. He said that by working two days for me he would earn only \$60 whereas he would be paid over \$100 by the unemployment insurance and that in addition to that, if he made those repairs for me, he would lose his unemployment insurance benefits. He would be penalized. So he refused and rightly so. Why would he be foolish enough to lose \$40 and be victimized by an incompetent Department of Manpower and Immigration? That man is right when he does not want to be penalized as is done by all the existing welfare programs.

We, in the Social Credit party, are trying to consider facts from a new angle, namely that all individuals should get help instead of penalizing some guy in order to help some other one faced with hardship.