*Income Tax Act*

then I will join them. If it is a matter of time, let us take the time needed, the situation is very serious.

Mr. Speaker, have you ever seen a measure which, to my mind, is so unfair and discriminatory? I must admit that even coming from a government which is the servant of large financial interests—this is nothing new, everyone knows it—that surprises me. The very idea of a sales tax cut is that it should benefit everyone since everyone is a consumer. That is the way it should be. On the other hand, a tax cut benefits only those who pay taxes and the right hon. Prime Minister once again said so today.

Mr. Speaker, where is justice for senior citizens, for people on welfare and for all other underprivileged Canadians? As they do not pay taxes they will not benefit from any tax credit. They have been ignored by the government. It is a sad way to progress towards a just society. But what is insulting here is that the government assumes that the people are idiots. It is hoping that this false generosity will turn public opinion in their favour. Not only does it hope to influence the voters in its favour but it hopes to do it with that paltry $85, and that is the maximum since many people will have much less depending on the taxes they paid.

Mr. Speaker, I object to that solution for another reason relating to the very principle of democracy. As I have just said the National Assembly has, on two occasions, unanimously objected to the federal government interference in its tax jurisdiction and to the proposals made by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Chrétien). I am thinking of the new leader of the provincial Liberal party which held its convention recently, in April I think, and that was well covered by the CBC. I am thinking of the comments made by the Secretary of State (Mr. Roberts) in this House last May 11 while I was not here. I did not have the opportunity to comment on them but it seems from his remarks that that Crown corporation is free to air truths and half-truths, lies and political covention of their choice and so on. I repeat, I do not agree with that method and I am anxious to know the decision of the Chair following the motion I proposed here in this House last May 8.

Mr. Speaker, the National Assembly represents the people of Quebec as legitimately as we represent here in Ottawa the people of Canada. When a sovereign assembly unanimously decides something it does so one behalf of all the people. It does not matter if the government is short-sighted, blind or deaf. What matters is that these people, who are elected by the population, have adopted a resolution requesting that members of parliament, especially those who represent ridings in the province of Quebec, oppose this measure.

I did not have to wait for this resolution to know that my party and I must oppose this measure, especially clauses 30 and 59. Mr. Speaker, I would not want the House to think that I object to the entire bill, because there are also good measures and good provisions in this piece of legislation. However, the fact that all parties and all affiliations in the National

[Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse).]

Assembly voted unanimously in favour of the motion gives added dimension to the matter. The federal government has succeeded where the PQ government has always failed: forming a common front in the National Assembly against the central government. The fact that the concept of Quebec's sovereignty might earn new credentials because of this crisis is nothing to brag about: the federal government will have been the major force behind it. We should reflect very seriously about this.

● (1622)

It is easy to understand that a government can make mistakes. It can always be forgiven if it has the courage to admit it and tries to make up for its mistakes. However, a government that refuses to admit its mistakes and tries to blame others for them no longer deserves the confidence of the population. This government is on the road to political suicide and I shall certainly not be the one to stop it unless it wants to drag the whole population in its wake. In this case, I am responsible towards the population and I will fight with all my energy to protect all Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot put into words everything that is now going on in my mind. To fight effectively against this government, I want to remain in this House as long as necessary so that we may get to the bottom of this issue and find a solution likely to bring harmony to our country instead of division.

However, I admit that I am indignant, revolted and disgusted at this unfair, partisan and offensive attitude towards the whole population of Quebec. Mr. Speaker, this bill is a logical result of an improper tax system that we should no longer tolerate. Instead of helping small wage earners, the economic policy of the present government only widens the gap between the rich and the poor.

Yesterday, I was happy to hear the Minister of Finance say that he gave 15 years of his life to try to narrow this gap between the rich and the poor. I believe he is sincere, but he will certainly never attain his purpose with such formulas. Mr. Speaker, the minister also told the House that he had never been able to understand the theories of social credit. On two occasions, he replied to my questions on this subject. Yet, I am convinced that the economic situation in our country would be better than it is now if he had understood them.

This bill is the outcome of an irresponsible and excessive position taken by the federal government both in political and economic matters, as can be seen in a part of the bill. This bill is the outcome of a series of blunders which have ruined the Canadian economy in the past 15 years. Fifteen years ago, Canada was the second wealthiest country in the world. Today, we see our position is constantly declining. Qualified engineers are needed to build a strong bridge. So, we need good politicians to run the country in a sensible manner. For ten years the government has followed the advice of economists who based that advice on orthodox theories which are