

*Alleged Non-Institution of Just Society***AFTER RECESS**

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

[Translation]

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue):** Mr. Speaker, I am happy to take part in the debate on the motion proposed by my colleague, the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert) to the effect that the government has—  
...neglected to institute the just society...

—he promised us in 1968—

... which should have been a reality for a long time; by refusing to increase the basic income tax exemption for individuals, by refusing to repeal the 11 per cent tax on building materials and by failing to institute a guaranteed annual income scheme.

Mr. Speaker, the motion naturally invites opposition parties and the government to express their views on the situation prevailing in Canada. Right now, a vital conference is going on in Victoria where there are discussions on ways of amending the Canadian constitution in order to patriate it to meet the wishes of the provinces.

Mr. Speaker, I read this morning in *Le Devoir*, which is surely not a Créditiste newspaper, the following:

**PROVINCES ASK ABOVE ALL FOR MORE MONEY**

Even before discussing the repatriation of the Constitution, even before thinking of amending the Constitution, provinces are asking Ottawa for more money, even those, Mr. Speaker, which we penalize at the present time.

It has been said in the House this morning, and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) stated so in a telecast yesterday evening, that there are in Canada three rich and seven poor provinces. The three rich provinces are: Ontario, with a debt of \$8 billion; British Columbia, under a Social Credit administration for 20 years, with no debt at all, and Alberta, also under a Social Credit administration for 35 years, with no debt at all.

Of the three rich provinces of Canada, two have no debt at all and enjoy such prosperity that Ottawa has decided to penalize them in order to help the poor provinces, and that at a time when those two rich provinces need all their fiscal and monetary resources to maintain their economic expansion.

Mr. Speaker, at this very moment the provincial premiers and the Prime Minister of Canada are discussing a balanced distribution of wealth. We should take from those who have in order to give to those who have nothing or next to nothing. We should prevent some from prospering in order to help someone else. This is an utterly socialist—not to say totally communist—theory.

I can see the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Lang).

**Mr. Aurélien Noël (Outremont):** The Minister of Manpower and Immigration!

**Mr. Caouette:** The President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen), the Deputy or Acting Prime Minister, who is now in his seat.

[Mr. Speaker.]

• (2:10 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, when something is taken away from someone with purchasing power or an additional income, he does not lose anything or does not hoard his income in a corner of his bedroom. Everybody knows that the Canadian citizen who earns \$15,000, \$20,000 or \$25,000 a year spends it. If he spends \$25,000 because he earns \$25,000, and if \$5,000 is taken from him to be given to someone who earns only \$4,000, the purchasing power of the one earning only \$4,000 is increased a little, but, on the other hand, the purchasing power of the one who used to spend \$25,000 is reduced in proportion. That is not a solution to the problem.

The same thing can be said of the guaranteed annual income, Mr. Speaker. That is nothing new, it was not invented by the Prime Minister or by this government. This is not something which has just been recognized or advocated since the Créditistes have been asking for it for at least 35 years. The Créditistes have been laughed at when they have requested a minimum income. I remember when I was 21—and I am now 53, that is to say 22 years ago—

**An hon. Member:** That is to say 32 years—

**Mr. Caouette:** —32 years ago when we asked for a guaranteed annual income in the form of a minimum income, the Créditistes were laughed at.

Recently we read about “a fair sharing of resources”, “an adequate guaranteed income”, “social justice for all Canadians”. And yet this is not from the Créditistes. I quote:

A program intended to assure an adequate guaranteed annual income, a program which the Canadian Welfare Council considers as a social right for all Canadians and which should be implemented as soon as possible, that is what the Council said in its statement.

Mr. Speaker, before the lunch hour, I heard the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) wonder how the members of the Ralliement Créditiste would distribute the guaranteed annual income or the vital minimum. He added that he could no longer understand anything because the hon. member for Bellechasse had not had enough time to say everything that needed to be said on these proposals. The hon. member for Edmonton West, for one, was surprised. He is in favour of the guaranteed annual income. He even said that his leader and his party had taken position for the guaranteed annual income.

Mr. Speaker, before lunch, the hon. member for Edmonton West was quite mistaken. He is a dreamer, lost in the clouds, and the situation is not new. His mind is—

**Mr. Fortin:** —narrow—

**Mr. Caouette:** —not only narrow but stuck in the mud, shall I say, so that he can no longer move.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Edmonton West is always asking himself: But where have the hon. members of the Ralliement Créditiste applied their theory? Indeed, where is The Social Credit Theory being applied? But at the same time, we can tell him that we have