

often led to controversy, such as changes relating to the Criminal Code and concerning abortion and homosexuality, or still the all too notorious emergency measures of 1970.

After that, the Prime Minister's attitude changed. The cool and casual intellectual became a politician. Following his disappointment in the 1972 election, he even became a "political manoeuvrer" and a demagogue. May I be permitted to prove these assertions with a brief analysis of the last election campaign.

Following the confusion that prevailed during the last Parliament, confusion resulting from the unquenchable desire on the part of our Progressive Conservative friends to launch an election, and maintained by reporters always on the lookout for new sensations, during summer, the die was cast, the people had to go through another election.

● (2100)

We expected to see in public a serious analysis of the economic situation, the suggestion of concrete solutions and the wish of the outgoing government to fill in certain gaps and face the inflation problems, the price spiral and the social injustice.

On the contrary, the Liberal strategists played vote-catching. We witnessed a backward propaganda game where trickery went alongside demagoguery. The great defender of the worker's rights, the collaborator of *Cité Libre*, the swashbuckler of the Duplessis regime of the fifties, was being engulfed in petty stretches-of-roads politics and gut promises.

Madam Speaker, I was in my constituency during the election campaign where, in this day and age jets and satellites orbiting Venus, people were invited to see the train pass. Behind Margaret's charm and the little Trudeau's innocence were deliberately hidden inflation, the extravagant price rise and unemployment.

The former Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien) came several times in the Champlain constituency and talked nonsense which often were within a hair's breadth of personal attacks, vulgar and pernicious comments.

The Minister of Transport (Mr. Marchand) also came. More polite than his colleague from Saint-Maurice, he nonetheless stated that you had to be on the right side if you wanted to get grants, retaining walls and all the "goodies" promised by the Prime Minister in 1972.

That was a far cry from the just society of 1968! Making people believe that the government exists and administers only red ridings. Vote for Social Credit and you will get nothing! You must vote Liberal to get something. I said this during the election campaign and I am repeating it in this House; I challenge all members of the government to declare publicly in this House that nothing will be given to the riding of Champlain or to other opposition ridings under the pretext that only those who voted red are to be given any favours.

There follows one of two things, Madam Speaker: either favouritism is being openly flaunted as a policy or someone is a barefaced liar. The insults being flung at the people of this country are all the more inadmissible as the government administers with everyone's money and it is

*The Address—Mr. Matte*

certainly not a favour when the people receive, in one guise or another, their own money. That is pure demagoguery! I cannot put any faith in a government who gets elected by using such procedures.

During that time, the real problems are staying hidden. The government itself has created inflation. At first it was said there was inflation but it was not true. How could there be a lack of products when our country, overflowing with raw materials and offering all kinds of possibilities, had to deal with surpluses? Milk producers were penalized for producing more than their quota, grain producers were being paid not to sow, interest rates were allowed to rise to paralyze small industry, the number of unemployed was allowed to increase. There are the ill-conceived policies which sooner or later had to give way to inflation.

But adequate policies are still not being considered. The alleged explanation for the whole situation is that inflation is a world phenomenon.

Madam Speaker, that famous key phrase hides from people the possibilities of a government willing to solve the problems of production and consumption in Canada. I think that is laughing at people. Indeed how can we explain that there is trouble in Japan, Europe, or Africa? How can that stop trees from growing in Canada, cows from giving milk, grain from growing, and how can that empty our oil wells?

Madam Speaker, that is telling us things that are absolutely stupid since the true solutions will be found only when there will be a return to measures based on common sense, a policy based on a quiet elementary principle that this country must get down to work and produce everything people need. So it is not a matter of knowing what is happening in the United States, in Europe, or in South America. The question to be asked is rather the following, do we have what we need in our own country to produce the goods we need?

Madam Speaker, the answer to that question is the solution. We have come to the point where inflation is being created artificially. Madam Speaker, that is obvious. Many small dairy producers were forced out of business. Last week at least three beef producers in the riding of Champlain told me they were giving up their business because the income they derived from it is insufficient. If the government does not find anything to remedy that situation, in a year or two there will surely be a shortage of beef. Then that will really be inflation. That a country like Canada cannot produce all the beef, all the vegetables, all the sugar that we need, Madam Speaker, I think that this is scandalous.

And last week I asked the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) if studies had been made to allow his department to help sugar production in Canada, to prevent us from falling into the hands of international monopolies. This is a very easy problem to solve in Canada. But, Madam Speaker, when at the same time we are told that if the price of sugar is increased twice, three times, four times and finally five times, this is due to the fact that sugar is controlled internationally. It is stupid to think this way when Quebec has so much land that could be used for sugar beet production. And only a few years ago, the producers of the Saint-Hilaire and Saint-Hyacinthe areas