

The Budget—Mr. Caouette

in disparaging the Social Credit in Quebec. Let him meet me on the hustings and I will fix him in public.

Mr. Ouellet: Any time.

An hon. Member: He is going to bust his balloon.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I have burst a lot of balloons in my days.

People are being told shameful lies and the Creditistes are accused of talking nonsense and of proposing senseless programs. The hon. member for Papineau thought it was funny when we asked for \$150 a month. Who would have voted against that? Now, he is saying: the Liberals gave you \$150. But it took the Creditistes to kick the government in the right place.

Mr. Speaker, we are asking for the adjustment of the financial system in Canada. That is where the trouble is. I know that the government members are human. Both the government and the hon. member for Papineau know that the financial system is the sore spot. That is why there is no reference to it in the budget, that is, it is being changed for the benefit of big business which is getting more incentives and tax concessions under the pretext that more jobs will be created.

Here is a good one. We will see how good the minister is. Let us look at the blatant inconsistencies among the government people. The Liberals agree with one another. Here is what the Minister of Finance said in his budget speech on May 8, and I quote:

Mr. Speaker, my first words to this House as Minister of Finance last February were that my most urgent priority was jobs. This remains my first priority. The main thrust of this budget is to deal with this problem; to buttress the Canadian economy—to provide incentives for Canadian industry to grow and compete and provide jobs.

This is what the minister said. The objective is to create jobs. All the new industries are happy. Everything is clear: they will make more profits without increasing their sales, because the consumers don't have the money to buy the finished products.

Mr. Speaker, on March 10, 1972, the Finance Minister's chief, the Prime Minister, stated in Victoriaville, and I quote:

"Man's most sacred task is to develop his talents, and that objective is not necessarily fulfilled through work, because we are moving more and more toward a society of leisure," stated the Prime Minister of Canada before some 500 people in Victoriaville on Friday, March 10.

One says: My main objective is to create jobs. The Prime Minister says: one must not believe that, it is self fulfillment that matters.

It seems we should organize leisure instead of creating jobs. If he thinks of creating jobs through further subsidies to large companies, the minister will not reach his objective. At the present time, those corporations are faced with overproduction in all Canadian economic fields.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Order. It is my duty to tell the hon. member that the time allotted to him has expired.

[Mr. Caouette.]

To proceed, the hon. member must obtain the unanimous consent of the House. Is that consent given?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): The hon. member for Témiscamingue.

Mr. Béchard: Provided it is new.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I hear the hon. member for Bonaventure-Îles de la Madeleine say: "Provided it is new." I feel that what I have just said is rather new. Anyhow, I thank my colleagues for their kindness and I will do my best not to abuse their generosity.

To get back to the conflicting statements made by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance in the space of two months. The former said: We must organize leisure, and the latter: We must create jobs. So, the Canadian taxpayers are wondering who is right and who lied.

Who is on the right track? I agree 100 per cent with what the Prime Minister said in Victoriaville because that is what we have been saying for the past 30 years. More and more, through the use of new techniques, workers are going to be replaced by machines. Then, we will have to organize activities and provide the people with a higher purchasing power so that they can buy the products of machinery.

• (1730)

Mr. Speaker—and again I say what I have been saying for a long time—the problem in Canada is not one of production. Even if car dealers were paid grants—I sell Chrysler products myself—they could not possibly sell every last unit. The same applies in all sectors: clothes, food, grain. During a recent visit out west I noticed four-year old crops in warehouses but no buyers. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) is well aware of it.

In eastern Canada there are too many apples, too much milk, too much wood, too much of all kinds of things. In the Maritimes there is too much fish.

In British Columbia there is too much fish as well as too much wood and fruit.

In Alberta there is too much oil.

Recently that province's premier came to Ottawa in the hope of finding new customers.

Mr. Speaker, even if industries are subsidized, how will that increase the purchasing power of the Canadian taxpayers? It won't. That is why we claim there is obviously not much difference between what the government now proposes, for instance, for big business, and what the Creditistes have been suggesting for a long time. The big companies will make additional profits, but the little people, the average citizen, the ratepayer will still pay for the minister's budget. The minister did not say, in his budget speech, that the government expects to collect an additional \$1,125 million more in income tax from the private citizens than in 1971-72.

The so-called gift of \$500 million the government will give industry and that of \$425 million to the veterans together amount to \$925 million. This means that the