

in this budget that Canadians who want to preserve our system are going to get as much support and consideration from the Secretary of State and the Prime Minister as the hippies, the creeps and the weirdos.

**Mr. Boulanger:** Who wrote this speech for you?

**Mr. Cadieu:** I am getting fed up right to the teeth with this government's obvious attempts to change Canada into something that the majority of Canadians do not want. I will go a step further and say that the majority of Canadians are ready to face up to those who have their priorities so confused that they have to check their programs to see what country it is they are trying to run.

As a westerner, I should be scorching the government for what it has failed to do for the farmers, Mr. Speaker, but I am afraid that it will be some time before we can sort out the jargon in the budget and make a full appraisal of how much damage this document will inflict on the farms and ranches in our country. I have determined, however, that this budget continues the avowed intention of the government to put the nation's farmers in a straitjacket and to put the squeeze on until they are prepared to accept absolute government control in order to survive.

**Mr. Boulanger:** The western farmers have never had it so good.

**Mr. Cadieu:** That is what hon. gentlemen opposite would like to think. If they would go west they would see what the facts are. As in other budgets, the hidden and insidious provisions with regard to agriculture will rise up and strike the farmer down in his tracks, Mr. Speaker, there never has been a government in the history of Canada that had so little use for the farmer. I have watched, year after year, as this government has introduced measures to get farmers off the farms and into the city. They go into the city, and without a trade or profession that is compatible with the new environment they more often than not end up on welfare. This does not make sense anywhere else, but it makes a lot of sense in Canada where we have a government bent on establishing a welfare state.

● (5:40 p.m.)

I want to make way for another of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, so I will cut short my remarks. I would not want to resume my seat without making an observation about the way the government has failed the Canadian people and the Canadian system. While there are a multitude of programs and projects being funded by the government to support underground newspapers and other aspects of the drug culture and anti-social elements in the country, this government is failing utterly in providing a rallying point for those Canadians who want to improve rather than to destroy Canada.

It is time for the Prime Minister to accept the fundamental truth that the Secretary of State has outlived his usefulness to Canada. I know that the Secretary of State is still useful to the Prime Minister. Nevertheless, it is time for the Prime Minister to make a decision in favour

### *The Budget—Mr. Latulippe*

of the country instead of making one always in favour of his inner cabinet. A change is as good as a rest and the removal of the Secretary of State should give the public treasury a rest if only for a short time. And our treasury does need a rest. The hippies and freaks and revolutionaries would lose a good friend if the Secretary of State were removed, Mr. Speaker, but I cannot think of a better present to hand the Canadian people in these troubled times.

[Translation]

**Mr. Henry Latulippe (Compton):** Mr. Speaker, I am anxious to express my opinion concerning the beneficial effects anticipated from the budget. I can say, Mr. Speaker, that the changes brought about in the budget will not change general conditions very much since our economy was already unbalanced and the proposals advocated cannot stabilize the national budget so that Canadians can benefit from it.

Mr. Speaker, a budget must above all maintain and stimulate economic growth. I feel that this budget will not maintain economic growth; I am in fact convinced that there will be a regression because we will have to invest and investments will be made through loans, that is through debts, taxes and levies for repaying debts and interests. Therefore this cannot change anything.

Mr. Speaker, the budget speech is in this respect the most ill-advised that could be found anywhere. Help is being given to people or economic growth is being brought about through selfishness and fear, not on behalf of justice. Afterwards, we are surprised at the growth of mistrust aggressiveness and hate. The tax reductions are nothing more than mere window-dressing. Let us face the facts: it is obvious that there is just a transfer of taxes from one sector to another. The 3 per cent surtax will be replaced by a 50 per cent levy or capital gains. The tax on capital gains will be more appealing to the government than the surtax of 3 per cent deducted at the source.

The government will certainly be squeezing more money from the public than before. Taxpayers' purchasing power will shrink accordingly and there will be less and less money in spite of plentiful production. It is hard to speak of an economic recovery, knowing that a tethered economy can go no further than the end of the chain. That kind of economy will still lead to suicide, although this might be in a somewhat more distant future.

The present budget has not taken into consideration balancing production and consumption. It is becoming increasingly difficult to take the right road to desirable economic expansion. Incentives to contracting debts are constantly increasing. Provinces and public agencies get into debt at unprecedented spectacular rates of interest.

Over and above public indebtedness, debts of individuals are increasing from day to day, to the extent that 28 per cent of family budgets are now earmarked for reimbursement of individually contracted debts. The cost of living in Canada has jumped by 33 per cent in the last few years. Industry can only grow and modernize by