

*Distribution of Goods and Services*

Mr. Speaker, today we see on our television screen, things which may be happening thousands of miles away. The mad illusions of a few years back have become a fact.

Closer to home and this comparison has even more value I think—we have a saying: To promise the moon and stars, which means something impossible, an illusion. Well, this afternoon, we were only nine miles from the moon—

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Matte:** —and next month, American cosmonauts will land on the moon.

The illusions, the fancies, the mad ideas of yesteryear have come true.

Mr. Speaker, should we be blamed for a policy, a doctrine that is so much in the van of progress that when it was set forth in the thirties it was like asking for the moon and the stars.

But today, after partial attempts made in British Columbia, in Alberta, no reform such as the one we advocate has been achieved. It remains that Social Credit governments in those provinces are firmly established.

It remains that the illusions, the phantasms, the utopias forecast by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion can become real, at least in part. And we have the proof of that. This comparison proves that one should never say in this world that a thing is not good just because it has not been attempted.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the simplest calculation should be a cause for more serious reflection. Is a thing not good just because it is advocated by the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette), leader of the Ralliement créditiste? The Minister of Regional Economic Expansion addressed the hon. member by his name during his speech, instead of mentioning his riding as required by the standing orders of the house.

● (9:30 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, is it because our members come from rural areas, from Eastern Canada, specially from Quebec, that this is no good. If we helped as he said to get things moving, if we helped in making the government take more serious consideration of the problems of poverty, of the distribution of goods, is that demagogy? And what is the difference between that and demagogy that makes people believe that there will be a just society thanks to legislations such as those that have been enacted since last September? That, is the utmost in demagogy, indeed!

[Mr. Matte.]

As compared to the one used by the government, our kind of demagogy—if you want to call it that—is at least much closer to reality and it seems to me that they should not blame and send to the devil people who spare no effort to promote progress, advancement, and who want only to provide all the people with a system that is really adequate, a system that would help to solve the problem of distribution.

The Minister has also admitted that it is a problem of distribution and that the government was trying hard to solve it. The funny thing is that distribution as set up by the government—and we have all kinds of evidence of this—tends to distribute always in the same place. And the poor remain poor, and the rich continue of course to be rich and even to get richer as they are always at the receiving end.

Mr. Speaker, there is no need to exert ourselves to find programs to make that kind of a distribution. When we recommend another kind of distribution by an easy method, that is to increase the purchasing power, I do not see why it should be called utopia or demagogy.

In my opinion, the very statements of these ministers are the proof that we are right.

They prove that we are taken seriously, since they took the trouble to appeal to the big guns to try and stop our irresistible progress towards the total understanding of what we have been preaching for years.

Mr. Speaker, the minister said, at the beginning of his speech when he commended the leader of the Ralliement créditiste, that he found it very pleasant to listen to the leader of the Ralliement créditiste, especially as he could guess in advance what his speech would be, the same as always, but nevertheless, he enjoyed listening to him.

I have already said, during that famous debate on the omnibus bill, that as a former teacher who taught for thirteen years, I have long learned that when you deal with blockheads, it is quite necessary to repeat the same thing over and over again in order to be understood.

Mr. Speaker, when a truth is obvious, does one have to use other words? Should one find other subjects, other reasons, in order to explain something which is real in itself and cannot be changed? If we advocate a monetary reform, and expect through it to radically change society and the freedoms of the human being, we shall keep on repeating the same thing. That is our purpose. To