

*Old Age and Veterans' Pensions*

exclusively on welfare allowances. In fact, conditions are not good for fishing at this time of year. Income is limited and people live on social welfare. Election canvassers even told the people that if they did not vote for their party they will lose their family and social allowances. I advised the mothers to throw out those canvassers with a broomstick. I do not if they did it, but at least that was what I suggested.

In any case, this is an important matter. The government is racking its brains trying to work out a production policy, but it is ignoring the consumers who should normally benefit from it. Then, why does it not tackle the true problem, that of production? Indeed, the whole production cannot be used up.

Just let the producers produce and give the consumers the means to purchase the products. And how can we do that? By allotting additional purchasing power to the consumers. They would then command production. So that our senior citizens might buy more products, and they are in abundance, or at least be able to get the necessities of life, we must first increase the old age pensions to \$150 a month. No pension must from now on be less than \$150 a month.

Where will the money come from? From the pockets of those who have money? No. That is the solution of socialism. Some European countries adopted it but the situation was not much improved. Such a policy crushed the rich but did not help the poor very much.

As I often say, millionaires do not pile up their money in a corner of their bedrooms. They use it in a productive way. Plant extensions, new industries, new jobs and respect of personal initiative are the products of private enterprise. If people were roused against millionaires because they live in castles, if 10,000 poor people who live in shacks were brought together to fight the rich, there would come a time when the castles would be blown up. The poor would be satisfied because the castles would be destroyed. They would return home and find out that they still live in the same shacks. This action would not have improved their standard of living, but would have destroyed what was good. This solution is not the right one. It is bad to take something from those who have and give it to those who have not.

That is done in Russia, Czechoslovakia and other Communist countries of the world. We do not want that regime. If we do not want it, the time has come to consider seriously

the problem of consumption in order that those who have something keep it. It is difficult to convince people of this. Still, it is possible to convince those who have time to think. It is a waste of time when one is dealing with press gallery correspondents. Incidentally, I see there is nobody in the press gallery. It is impossible to convince the CBC of this. The CBC advocates that we must take from those who have, stir up people and give to those who have nothing. It comes to the defence of the poor, but fails to take the means required to help them.

As for us, we talk about monetary reform and people say we are lunatics. And while the lunatics are shouting, Canada is in the throes of a recession. The poor, the disabled, the blind and the old are at the mercy of economic conditions.

• (4:30 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, production in Canada this year will amount to \$72 or \$75 billion. Compared to this production achieved by Canadians, we will have a total national income of some \$50 billion. This means that there will be from \$22 to \$25 billion worth of products for which we will not have the purchasing power. There is no money for that. That means that the total income cannot buy the total production. It is as simple as that. Neither the journalists nor the CBC people can get that through their heads. I do not mean the small employees of the CBC, no, but the big shots as they are called.

Mr. Speaker, other countries have run into similar problems. Must we necessarily follow in their footsteps? Are we waiting for a revolution to break out here in Canada, for the poor to revolt? An old proverb says: It's no use preaching to a hungry man. Now, if we allow those people to revolt, there will be no point in preaching to them. If the husband, the wife and the child are hungry, eventually they will act. Hunger will not be tolerated in as rich a country as Canada. That is obvious. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) knows it as well as I do.

We had a depression from 1929 to 1939. When we speak of that depression to the young people of today, they think it is a fairy tale. Only, we "witnessed the fairy and the tale" at the same time. And today we seem to be heading towards a new depression.

Mr. Speaker, I say it again: a floor for poverty, yes; but a ceiling, no. That is clear. If we impose a ceiling, as soon as it is reached, people with initiative will say: Before work-