

any studies to prove what has already been proven over the years.

Finally, a word about the monitoring agency which was mentioned and which I assume will be inside the Department of Finance. I have no confidence in the people in the Department of Finance monitoring a policy which they themselves have promoted and supported for years. They will no more come up with any real, valuable results from their study than anyone responsible for policy is likely to be objective about it.

• (1510)

I think it is wrong for the minister to package the 1972 and 1973 budget income tax proposals in one bill. If he is going to be fair and honest about it, I believe he should have two bills. But whether there are two bills or only one, the New Democratic Party will support nothing that involves further corporate concessions.

[Translation]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, on the one hand, we hear the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) accuse the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) of going to bed with the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Lewis) and on the other hand, we have just heard the Leader of the New Democratic Party say that the Prime Minister is sleeping with the Leader of the Official Opposition. We must conclude then that the Prime Minister has become a bigamist.

You may be assured, Mr. Speaker, that as far as we are concerned, we have not slept with the Prime Minister.

However, I have closely listened to the statement made by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner) where he seems to be deliberately confusing, referring to personal income tax exemptions that will be raised from \$1500 to \$1600 for single persons and from \$2850 to \$3000 for married couples, and going on to say that we should help the big corporations and grant them tax reductions up to 40 per cent in order to enable them to stimulate the Canadian economy.

[English]

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) says this is a complete surrender by the minister.

[Translation]

Then, the Leader of the New Democratic Party said:

[English]

There is no confusion at all; we are going to vote against those corporate welfare bums again.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, for example I would like to hear the minister talk about abolishing the sales tax on building materials which would have resulted in the creation of jobs in Canada.

I would have also liked to hear him say that not only professionals but miners and workers could deduct from their income tax the cost of the tools they need to work.

We overlook those aspects. When we deal with them we do so very parsimoniously. On the other hand, in order to help corporations become more competitive on international markets the government says: we are going to have

Ways and Means

a trial shot for a while and if 60 members express the wish to have the whole question discussed again in the House it will be brought back before the House so it can be decided.

Mr. Speaker, I have no compromise with any corporation in Canada. When we hear the Leader of the Opposition say that the government gives in to his wishes I say quite honestly that the two parties can hardly be separated from one another because their election campaigns are both financed by big corporations. If we are against socialism and for private enterprise it is not to get election funds but to allow this country to develop and be competitive across the world.

When I hear the leader of the New Democratic Party say: we are going to vote against corporate bums, I cannot help recall that the new NDP premier of B.C. is grovelling before European financiers to borrow funds to develop his province. I wonder if he goes to bed with European financiers.

Mr. Speaker, we must put an end to this hypocrisy of saying things here and doing the opposite elsewhere. The same thing goes for Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, as we advocate in our basic policy, the first role of a government is to stimulate personal initiative and not to crush it. When I hear these people say: power to the people! The power is in the hands of the people, in Russia and in Czechoslovakia, and look at the kind of power they have!

Mr. Speaker, I feel that this measure which encourages personal initiative and private enterprise, even though it is incomplete as far as individuals and workers are concerned, will contribute to the creation of jobs in Canada. It will help the country to be a better competitor on the international market. However, I would like the hon. Minister of Finance and the government to think of helping Canadian workers, especially the low income group in the area of income tax.

For example, not long ago when we moved a motion to grant old age security pensions at 60, how come the New Democratic Party voted against it?

How come the Progressive Conservatives also voted against it? And the Liberals who shout "It is true" voted against it too.

Mr. Speaker, I must admit that the independent member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle) voted with us.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would say as a measure of precaution that the motion of the government could be discussed anew within a year and a half, twenty months. So, let us make the experiment, let us see what happens: if there is no result, we will say so. If nothing comes out of this, we might possibly convince the New Democratic Party leader (Mr. Lewis) to back private enterprise.

* * *

[English]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

DESIGNATION OF WEDNESDAY, MAY 30, AS OPPOSITION DAY

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I should like to advise the House