

*Income Tax Act*

**Mr. Caouette:** The hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken). I believe he will become a Créditiste one day.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to hold the committee too long. Earlier I was talking about the United Nations, as everybody knows. The Liberals know it and we know it. Last year, I was one of the most convinced advocates of using the Canadian armed forces to fight terrorists in Montreal during the October crisis.

**Mr. Roy (Laval):** Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. member for Témiscamingue a question.

**Mr. Caouette:** Agreed.

**Mr. Roy (Laval):** I would like to ask the hon. member for Témiscamingue—the leader of the Social Credit party whose convention I followed carefully and whom I congratulate on his organizing ability—whether he could tell me the difference between a socialist party on credit and a socialist party that wants to socialize all existing companies for cash.

**An hon. Member:** That is stupid. Have you ever heard anything more silly?

**An hon. Member:** That is inexplicable.

**Mr. Caouette:** Where does that chap come from?

**Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse):** From Laval.

[*English*]

**The Chairman:** Order, please. I suggested to the hon. member before he relinquished the floor following his first presentation that perhaps he was not staying within the confines of sections 109 and 110. I was fortified in my decision when I heard the question of the hon. member for Laval. I would hope that hon. members would give due regard to the rules of the committee and would not enter into a general debate. The question having been asked, perhaps the hon. member would wish to answer it briefly. I hope that he will then continue his remarks having regard to the confines of sections 109 and 110.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Caouette:** Mr. Chairman, you are absolutely right. The Liberal member for Laval (Mr. Roy) got a bit mixed up while asking his question, he did not know exactly how to put it. It is rather difficult to answer a question that does not make sense. But, in any event, I say to him that a socialist system, in my opinion, is not appreciated in Canada, but with all the rules and bills like the one that is before us, particularly clauses 109 and 110, we are moving on toward state socialism that constitutes a step toward authentic communism.

Mr. Chairman, while trying to address myself to clauses 109 and 110, I want to say this: A moment ago, I spoke of the admission of Communist China to the United Nations and I say—let us remember that we have here about fifty Liberal members from the province of Quebec,—that last year I supported the government 100 per cent as far as the war measures were concerned when taken against the terrorists of Montreal. Everyone knows that.

[*English*]

**The Chairman:** Order, please. Under the rules of the committee the hon. member for Témiscamingue has the

floor. I think this is the third or fourth time that I have appealed to him. I do it in all sincerity, I think with the support of the committee. The hon. member should not discuss matters which are irrelevant to the purport of sections 109 and 110. I entreat him to obey the rules. All of us transgress at times. I know the hon. member is a very fluent and forceful speaker, but I hope he will try to confine his remarks to sections 109 and 110.

**Mr. Caouette:** I will definitely try to obey your request, Mr. Chairman. There is my good friend, the doctor, who has saved my life once anyway, and he is a Liberal. I am not a socialist. But this is not on section 109. He saved my life once and I am still alive. The Conservatives know very well that I am, and so does the Minister of Labour.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chairman, I want to confine myself to the subject matter of clauses 109 and 110. However, I cannot at this point but admit that I am in the same frame of mind this year as I was last year when I sided with the government. When I see a government, be it China's or the U.S.S.R.'s, assuming power with the help of terrorists, and by resorting to violence, I cannot accept anything more now than I did last year. This is all I have to say on that subject.

• (9:10 p.m.)

Mr. Chairman, clauses 109 and 110 clearly state that the government intends to improve the standard of living of Canadians or to create the just society which we were promised during the 1968 election campaign. This just society has not even materialized in Valleyfield. Neither has it materialized in Quebec City, Montreal or Rouyn-Noranda.

Mr. Chairman, I have specifically detailed our suggestions a few moments ago and I urge all sincere members, whatever their political allegiance,—not as social crediters, or progressive conservatives, or new democrats or liberals—

**An hon. Member:** Or independents—

**Mr. Caouette:** If we are to have a hard working people, a people who works, whose initiative we respect, let us give him a social and economic security which it has not hitherto obtained. We are giving economic security to the U.S.S.R. and China, but at the expense of personal freedom. Nobody, even a member of this House, wants to lose his personal freedom.

Then, Mr. Chairman, a solution is available although the hon. member for Papineau interjected the other night that it would cost \$18 billion. The last war cost us \$14 billion and nobody has warned about inflation. We have made war and won it, but it has cost \$14 billion. No one objected to this expenditure of \$14 billion, not even the Minister of Finance. Even the hon. member for Lac-Saint-Jean (Mr. Lessard) did not object.

**Mr. Asselin:** A former colleague.

**Mr. Caouette:** A former colleague who used to understand more when he was with me than he does presently. Nobody objected to an expenditure of \$14 billion to wage a war. But when it comes to spending \$18 billion to guarantee social security to each Canadian citizen, people