

Alleged Non-Institution of Just Society

Mr. Speaker, I am not singling out the hon. member for Mercier (Mr. Boulanger). Not at all.

Mr. Speaker, the new media will not report what we are saying today. No. Those who wish to know what went on in the House, in short, what we proposed, will have to read *Hansard* tomorrow. And that is called freedom of the press. To lie shamelessly, forget conveniently, and report the monkey antics and nonsense that take place throughout the country, that is just like newspapermen. They are more interested in what goes on in Pakistan than in those who are starving in Canada.

We had a big meeting last weekend at Granby. Did the CBC cover it? No! But as soon as Mr. Lévesque, who is not even a member either in Ottawa or in Quebec City, makes an insignificant statement in Montreal, the CBC quotes him immediately. He is in the news.

When I suggested—as I still do—that the CBC needed a cleanup because it is infiltrated by separatists, socialists and even communists, I knew what I was talking about. It would be of great service to the public should the doors of the Corporation be closed for a year in order that this necessary cleanup be carried out. The CBC is an organization designed to set people against one another instead of reporting actual facts. And then I am accused of bearing a grudge against the CBC. A bunch of bums, as people say, paid out of tax money which we vote right here. As a matter of fact, \$200 million have been voted by Ottawa to maintain a crummy organization such as this. It is an organization of nobodies, an organization of heartless men ready to spit and bite the hand that feeds them.

Mr. Speaker, those people will not be talking about us tonight nor tomorrow. They will not speak of what transpires in Victoria. Not a word!

The right hon. Prime Minister said this morning: Ottawa rejects priority but welcomes competition. Ottawa does not acknowledge the priority of Quebec in the field of taxation for social security because this belongs to Ottawa. But I am in favour of this proposal for Canada as a whole. Open to competition, this in good French means: Quebec, if you want more family allowances, levy your own taxes and pay the allowances yourself. I do not object to this. But it means an increase in taxes and Quebec would like Ottawa to bear the burden. However Ottawa answers back: It is up to Quebec to assume responsibility. The fight between the two is not a struggle for cost-sharing but a battle raging around imposition of taxation. The controversy centers around the question of knowing who should have the power to grab whose money and how it should be done. This is the controversy. It does not pertain to the monetary system. The hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Marceau) thinks this is funny, but he knows that I am right. Priority no, competition yes. This means that we continue to tax but that the provinces must do the same. This means two taxes instead of one, this means that the citizens of Quebec will be happier. They will say: At least the Prime Minister has given us the benefit of being taxed more. What an improvement!

[Mr. Caouette.]

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take more time, but the way things are I could go on all afternoon. My colleagues also have something to say.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the stability of the modern world depends on the stability of its currencies.

● (2:50 p.m.)

However, it is obvious that the value of money is unsteady, but always and directly tied up to the value of production. If we produce more for one dollar, it is obvious that our dollar is worth a lot more, while if we produce less, our dollar is worth less.

One must understand that the stability of our modern world is based on the stability of the currency, as far as the currency reflects the facts. It is very doubtful that all the miseries inflicted on the British people by bad kings, bad Parliaments, bad ministers and bad judges would equal those imputable to a bad currency.

The same thing could be said about Canada. When the currency goes well, Mr. Speaker, everything is in good shape, but when the currency goes wrong, everything goes the wrong way.

When I asked the President of the Treasury Board—who is in the House—for some extra help for my office on the sixth floor, I was told: We have no money, you are not entitled to any additional aid. However, there are unemployed, people looking for work but the government has no money for that.

But to pay expenses for trips outside and inside Canada, for trips everywhere, for setting up government and ministerial offices, for laying wall-to-wall carpets—not small carpets at \$5.80 a yard but carpets so thick you almost need snow-shoes to walk on in ministerial offices—for all that there is money. However where it comes to those who need money, they discuss the matter like they did last Tuesday and conclude that none can be spared.

I urge the President of the Treasury Board to give us the help we need in order to perform our duties as members of Parliament, and we are entitled to get that help in Parliament.

The minister is looking surprised. Perhaps he was not present but at any rate he is advised to take steps to give us satisfaction.

Mr. Speaker, a sound currency, one which retains its stability for repayment of debts, its purchasing power, and the purchasing power of salaries, of savings, of pensions, is the key to economic freedom, progress and development.

The objective of a monetary policy is therefore to preserve the stability of the dollar and to bring about maximum production.

In fact, next to maintaining law and order that should be the government's prime responsibility. You can never preserve law and order in a country unless finances are made to serve human beings.

It is a known fact that the value of money is determined by the value of goods and services and not that money, as the hon. member for Edmonton West stated before dinner, is a monetary illusion. That tends to prove