

The amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition was justified. The leader of the New Democratic Party introduced an amendment to that amendment on February 18, as reported on page 45 of the House of Commons Debates. It read as follows:

—and in particular has taken no effective steps to relieve the serious unemployment situation that has affected Canadians in all parts of this country throughout its term of office.

It referred to this government. Mr. Speaker, the amendment was put and the Leader of the Opposition as well as the Progressive Conservative members and those of my party voted in favour of it.

Later on, that is on February 22, we introduced the following amendment to the amendment:

• (1620)

That the amendment be amended by striking out all the words after "economic deprivation" and replacing them with the following:

"resulting from the absence of any monetary reform tailored to the needs of the Canadian society."

It was put on February 23, as recorded on page 195 of *Hansard* and the Progressive Conservative as well as the New Democratic members voted in favour of the monetary reform which we proposed in order to meet the needs of the people.

On February 23, the amendment of the Leader of the Official Opposition was put. We voted, as the members of the Progressive Conservative party against the Throne Speech. However, the Progressive Conservative members are now asking the government to carry out the measures outlined in the Throne Speech, while they voted against it. We do not find that quite logical.

Something is missing somewhere. It may be sincerity or perhaps understanding. Terms are misunderstood. Something is not going right. You are either for or against something. If you are against it, let us not come back two months later and say: We condemn you for not having applied what we were opposed to.

Mr. Speaker, this is about what is happening. By introducing the amendment, they are saying to this government: You are incompetent, you did not apply the measures contained in the Throne Speech. And yet, the Progressive Conservatives were asking this government not to apply them because they were worthless.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that parliamentarism compels the opposition to say "no" when the government says "yes", in some cases, but I do not think that this is an efficient way of opposing an inefficient government. When a government fails to keep its promises or meet its commitments, it is up to us to tell it so. But if we object to its taking a certain course and then later blame it for not having done so, I am at a loss to understand and can make neither head or tail of it. Let us be consistent.

We voted against the Speech from the Throne because we sincerely felt it did not contain adequate measures to meet the needs of the population of Canada in all fields of economic activity.

In that speech everything was mentioned: taxation, fiscal reform, etc. This last is being applied by way of taking from the haves and giving to the have-nots, pur-

#### *Procedure of Legislative Program*

porting to enrich the poor by impoverishing the middle class. Finally, we shall discover that we have yet more poor, that we have no middle class left because it has been taxed into oblivion. We have got to the point where we are taxing taxes.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that there is a tendency to eliminate the middle class solely for the benefit of the rich people, because the poor do not get anything out of it. Old age pensions have been raised recently. The increase meant only \$2.80 more per month for the have-nots, which is not enormous. Old people will not be able to raise their standard of living with that amount, even though pensions from now on are going to be tied in with the cost of living. It means that every time the cost of living will go up 1 per cent pensioners will get an increase of 80 cent a month.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne dealt with taxation. We have fought in this House the new taxation which is, furthermore, accompanied by income tax forms which are a hundred times more difficult to understand than the previous ones, to the extent that some accountants are completely baffled. They have to check and recheck time and again their audits. In the budget speech, the government has undertaken to reconsider the tax forms so that they might become more understandable. This is a bureaucratic "gimmick". Yes, it creates jobs.

Mr. Speaker, as the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, the Speech from the Throne advocated passage of 34 bills, five of which have been adopted since February while 29 others are still on the order paper and have not yet been dealt with.

For instance a new formula should have been submitted concerning federal-provincial relations, but the government is hesitating. Improvements should have been made in agriculture and increased aid provided to our youth, to the Local Initiatives Program as well as to the retraining of the unemployed to enable them, at least, to become more educated unemployed, but nothing has materialized. Aid to youth has decreased from what it was last year and the problems have not been lessened either.

I said yesterday that of the 17,000 projects under the Local Initiatives Program, only 5,000 had been accepted; that more than 19,000 projects under the Opportunities for Youth program had been submitted to the government and a little more than 3,000 of them had been approved. We are up against a stone wall. We are repeatedly told: We have no money to approve more projects.

Mr. Speaker, the industrial strategy for Canada has been also dealt with and the more we discuss this project, the more plants and industries are closing down, not only in one specific province, but all over Canada. Plants are closing down because products are not being sold. This is what industrial strategy is all about!

And while plants are closing down, workers, such as those of the textile industry in the Eastern Townships are asked to go on pension at the age of 54, not on their present salary, but on part of it in order to make way for younger people.

In the meantime, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) is in China or Japan purchasing textile products to enter into dishonest competition with