

When the Minister of Agriculture announced that subsidy, the hon. member for Compton applauded and did not understand. Tonight, the same thing is proposed with respect to the whole of food production in Canada and the same hon. Member who found that all right when it came from the Liberals finds it ridiculous when it comes from the Social Crediters.

Madam Speaker, people from that constituency were losers in that. A \$109 million consumption subsidy was granted by the Liberals. It sounded fine; the government were said to be generous. But not to worry, Madam Speaker, this government are bright and intelligent. They went and fetched the money, it did not take them long. On February 24, 1975, we learned from a tabled document—let us refer to Question No. 519 on the order paper, raised again by my colleague the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert)—that 24,949,700 pounds of butter were imported from various countries. That butter is for sale, the government buys it from other countries at an average cost of 54 cents a pound. But the same pound of butter imported by the Canadian government is sold for 94 cents to the consumer.

Madam Speaker, the government themselves act in the same way as Dominion Stores, Steinberg's, Argus or Power Corporation. They import butter from foreign countries, bring it onto the Canadian market, fiddle, as the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) said, with the ticketing, launch the product on the market, buy it for 54 cents and sell it back for 95 cents, and again it is the consumer who pays for the subsidy he was to benefit from.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** Order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but his allotted time has now expired.

**Some hon. members:** Proceed!

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** Is the House agreed for the hon. Member to proceed with his speech?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Fortin:** I thank my colleagues, Madam Speaker.

Let us note that this subsidy relating to the price of milk, this consumption subsidy was granted by the minority government. We then got a lot more with respect to the problem of Canadian consumption that we do now. We now have a strong government, and farmers in my constituency who are asking \$11.60 per hundredweight today, Madam Speaker, are the victims of this situation because they do not manage to make both ends meet. This government makes promises to them, but does not consult them, and a little later they will play politics and say: We are the ones who did that.

Madam Speaker, are Canadians actually partners of this government with regard to the economy of this country or are they always to be considered as poor relations in our economy, as marginal people? That is the question.

The President of the Privy Council also said this afternoon that if a financial help to consumers creates inflation. So, in his great wisdom, the president of the Privy Council suggests that financial assistance to the consum-

### *Inflation*

er, the journeyman, the labourer, would create inflation. However, the president of the Privy Council, in the same government, is launching numerous programs to create employment, to increase production. On the one hand, they say that it is a lack of production and on the other, hand, they say: Restrain yourself, your income is too high.

Madam Speaker, there is something wrong in this Parliament. Do members visit their riding? Do they listen to the people to learn about their situation? When an unemployed comes to our office and has been waiting for two months for his first unemployment cheque, and that man has three children, Madam Speaker, here is a Canadian who deserves our attention. He deserves to be heard, to be welcomed, and to be helped. Then he goes back home and hears on television that night the President of the Privy Council or the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner) say: "Old chap, if you don't mind tighten your belt". Then he switches to another station and hears, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Macdonald) say: "If you want to save energy, tighten your belt, turn off the lights when not needed". Sometimes the ministry uses Mrs. Lise Payette for that kind of advertising, and I would be interested to know how much she gets for that.

**An hon. Member:** It must be "heavy".

**Mr. Fortin:** It really is "heavy", Madam Speaker.

We ask the working poor to make the sacrifices that the big shots cannot and do not want to make.

Madam Speaker, in my last remarks, I will simply say this: the Social Credit Party is not a socialist party. We believe in the free enterprise system, everybody knows it. We believe that the only aim of production is to meet consumption, because production as such makes no sense, and to build a tractor for the sake of it or to cut out a dress for the sake of it does not make any sense. When you cut out a dress, it is to meet a need. Now, Madam Speaker, money in a country is exactly no more than a means of exchange so that production meets needs, that is consumption. Now, over the years, governments have given chartered banks the power to issue our currency and our credit. They have given them the power to extend loans based on absolutely nothing. How can you reimburse \$150, when you have been lent only \$100?

Members on the other side may solve this mathematic quizz, but you cannot return \$150 when you have received only \$100. Even if you work, because of the depreciation of money and the lack of balance between total income in Canada and total production, it is mathematically impossible to buy this production.

Madam Speaker, this is the tragedy we are in. Money, which is already insufficient, is being depreciated by almost 50 per cent. Some will probably still refuse to accept that money is being depreciated.

**An hon. Member:** With the Social Credit, it cannot be devaluated!

**Mr. Fortin:** Madam Speaker, with the Social Credit it cannot be devaluated since money is based on production. I see that the hon. member for St. Boniface (Mr. Guay) finds it funny. Madam Speaker, I would like to see the