Mr. Speaker, I believe it is my duty to state in the House the measures we do not like. After all, the Parliament of Canada is the place to say what goes wrong in our country, to try to improve conditions and solve problems.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the rising cost of living is Canada's greatest problem. The cost of food, of clothing, of housing, of oil, everywhere we must face the gloomy picture of inflation. Prices increase and the individual's purchasing power cannot cope with that increase.

In Lotbinière and other ridings I have met people with fixed incomes and salaried people who are completely overcome by price increases and who cannot face those increases.

I would like to deal with those Canadians who are building our country and who are called medium or low income people. When they get their pay cheque on Friday as often stated by the leader of the Social Credit Party (Mr. Caouette), the stub of their cheque is longer than the cheque itself. The balance is then clearly inadequate to meet the increasing cost of living.

This problem is most serious and I am disappointed that the Speech from the Throne did not include or announce specific measures to help those people.

Mr. Speaker, when a father of two, three or five children with a fixed income of $100, $125 or even $150 a week walks into a shop, a grocery or drives into a gas station and must pay the same price as everyone, this is revolting.

This worker, with his purchasing power, gets fewer commodities for the same working hours. This is currently due to our way of thinking and an individual's income has always been based on the value of his work; he is paid a salary in proportion to it and he is told that with that money he will be able to meet his food, lodging and leisure requirements.

Even though the workers have today the same working potential as in 1971, they get about the same income but fewer commodities in return.

Now we are told that the quality of life in Canada is improving, that our goods are better, that their quality is excellent. Mr. Speaker, if the individual does not earn an adequate income to encourage him to continue to work, he is caught in a vicious circle, he becomes a second-class citizen and he then becomes dependent on a whole series of welfare measures which are extremely costly for all governments.

Mr. Speaker, the citizen is discouraged, because if he works hard, he does not earn enough to meet his obligations. In addition, this is more serious, as a result of inflation his money having less value, he gets less for his dollar.

Mr. Speaker, hence the many welfare measures bringing the individual under the control of the rotten Canadian bureaucracy. Finally, this individual becomes an entirely second-class citizen.

The Social Credit Party of Canada has long identified with the consumers; for quite some time, we have been telling the government that there should be measures to help the consumers directly, not necessarily by controlling prices, but by protecting the consumer against abuses and specifically by helping him buy products.

Compensated discount is a measure which, while not controlling prices, restrains them by helping consumers buy something that their purchasing power no longer allows them to buy. Members of this House find it funny when we mention compensated discount because it is a Social Credit measure. When we ask for direct help for the consumer through an increase in his purchasing power, some members of this House find it funny and say that we should not help the consumers. And now because this has become a major problem, everyone is talking about a guaranteed annual income, and even those who used to laugh at the Social Credit are talking about it; there are even some tests going on in the present system.

Mr. Speaker, the meetings that we have had in our constituencies confirm entirely the statements contained in some newspaper clippings. I would simply like to read you the titles of a few articles. I invite my colleagues who laugh at the Social Credit Party to listen to these titles taken from newspapers that are basically defending their system and to see if all goes well with their system about which we must not laugh and which we must certainly not attack.

Here is an article from the December 18, 1973 issue of *La Tribune*:

THE PRICE OF CLOTHING WILL GO UP

Good news for everybody! Another publication gives the profits of oil companies for 1973: British Petroleum made $135 million; Exxon (Esso), $638 million; Gulf, $210 million; Mobil, $231 million; Shell, $413 million; Texaco, $307 million.

• (1750)

Those are the profits of the petroleum companies. I shall say more about this later.

I have here an article published in the magazine *Actualité* and entitled "Where will shortages and inflation strike in 1974?" It tells a sadistic tale of increasing prices to prove that nothing has gone up.

I also have here an editorial from *La Tribune* entitled "The Year of Frustrated Hopes". Another newspaper entitles an article on housing and higher prices "Ottawa agrees with all provinces save Quebec". The newspaper *Le Nouvelliste* carries the heading "Violent Sally of Liberal Member for Longueuil in House of Commons—Petroleum Companies Can Even Have Government Change—Olivier". In *La Presse* I read this "Bread—4 cent Increase"

Everything is just fine, Mr. Speaker, in the Liberal and Progressive Conservative system. Who is responsible for the petroleum crisis? The producing countries or the great multinational companies?

I have here another article which gives the consumer price index based on Statistics Canada data. I quote:

The consumer price index reached 155.5 in November 1973, that is 9.3 per cent more than 1972. Food prices went up 18.2 per cent. This graph shows the rise in consumer price index, based on 1961 prices from 1941 to November 1973.

And then we are told, Mr. Speaker, that all's well in the best of worlds.

Another newspaper reports the following, and I quote:

Sugar—another high increase item.