

Procedure of Legislative Program

not know where the Minister of Finance or anyone else finds good hearts in the corporations, when I find it difficult to find any heart at all, but they always do. The time has come for the government of this country to become people oriented instead of corporation oriented. The time has come when all the laws and policies of government have to be directed toward the people of this country, particularly those who work for a living in factories, offices, on farms, in the mines, fishing or whatever. The time has come for the government to change its attitude and direction. So long as we have a government of the kind we have across the way, so long will there be failure in Canada doing its major job, which is to make sure that its human talents are not wasted.

My eyes wander along the aisle to the Leader of the Opposition and the people who surround him. I ask myself, are they capable of changing the direction of government in this country? The answer is obviously no. No matter how deep one's regard may be for the Leader of the Opposition, and I have great personal regard for him, he is no different from the Prime Minister of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lewis: In the Leader of the Opposition there is not the slightest difference from the Prime Minister of Canada.

Mr. Stanfield: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: As far as his policies and philosophy are concerned, there is not the slightest difference. The Leader of the Opposition expresses himself a little differently. His mother tongue is different. He comes from a different part of the country. In opposition he sounds serious about wanting to do something for Canada, just as the Prime Minister sounds serious about wanting to do something for Canada. I say to him, if you want to find a time when unemployment was as high as it is now, you will find it during the term of office of the previous Conservative government. I ask myself what the Leader of the Opposition would do about foreign control of the economy. The answer is obvious: he would appoint Steve Roman, of Denison Mines fame, as minister of industry, trade and commerce to screen takeovers in Canada. He would certainly have the kind of man who would protect Canada's economic independence.

• (1610)

I was not in the House yesterday because I was returning from a western tour, but on looking at yesterday's *Hansard* I noted that the Tories moved a motion condemning the incentives program of the government. The hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings (Mr. Hees), who undoubtedly is slated for a portfolio if the people of Canada are blind enough to elect the Conservatives into power—it does not require any more blindness than was the case previously—urged that the corporate tax reduction announced in the budget to come into effect on January 1, 1973, be implemented right away as of July 1, 1972. His corporate friends do not have even the patience to wait until next January. The corporate friends of the

[Mr. Lewis.]

Minister of Finance were told they would have to wait six months, but the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings cannot wait that long. He wanted further tax incentives for corporations in order to improve productivity.

When we of the New Democratic Party proposed that pensions be increased to a level of \$150 a month, the Leader of the Opposition told a group of pensioners—so I was told in Vancouver—that that figure was too high to be acceptable to him, that the country could not afford it. In my opinion—I say this knowing that it will be offensive, but I cannot help it; I have to speak the truth as I see it—

Mr. Jerome: We know you cannot help it.

Mr. Lewis:—the Liberal and Conservative parties of this country are both corporation oriented. Their concern for the people is secondary, and so long as they are in power it is the people who will suffer.

[Translation]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I just heard the list of future Progressive Conservative cabinet appointees. I could perhaps in turn give that of the future New Democrat cabinet, if that party ever comes to power: Michel Chartrand, Minister of Labour; Marcel Pépin and Louis Laberge at the Department of Education, Yvon Charbonneau to get the provinces to agree with Ottawa, and Raymond Laliberté, probably special adviser to the Prime Minister—undoubtedly the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis).

Mr. Speaker, those shadow cabinets will not change the situation which prevails today in Canada. However, I find very surprising the motion of the Leader of the Opposition, which reads as follows:

This House regrets the failure of the government to proceed during the current session of Parliament with a positive legislative program; and particularly regrets its failure to carry out the program proposed in the Speech from the Throne on February 17th, 1972, and adopted by this House, thus betraying the trust placed by this House in the ministry to provide adequate measures to meet the needs of Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, now the Leader of the Opposition blames the government for not having enacted the intentions expressed in the Speech from the Throne; yet, he was completely opposed to that speech when it was given on February 17 last. The behaviour of politicians is sometimes strange. That is why I was not surprised, yesterday or the day before, to hear that the hon. Leader of the Official Opposition had gone to the zoo in Granby. That is where he won such wonderful support in the province of Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne was moved by the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher) and seconded by the hon. member for Trois-Rivières (Mr. Lajoie). The Leader of the Opposition, as reported on page 34 of *Hansard* for February 18 1972, moved the following amendment:

—we respectfully regret that your government has not only failed utterly to provide an economic climate in which Canadians can have confidence in the future and to give protection to Canadians against the isolation of individuals caused by economic deprivation but, in fact, has deepened the gap between the affluent and those in need.