

Mr. Nielsen: —who were the originators of the highest spending in our history—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCain): Order. Let the speaker be heard.

Mr. Nielsen: —who were the originators of the highest deficits in our history—do I hear any nays on that from members opposite—who were the originators of the highest national debt in our history, who were the originators of the highest bankruptcy rate in our history.

Mr. Evans: Not any more.

Mr. Nielsen: Let the hon. member still check the figures. In spite of this, the hon. member for Ottawa Centre speaks of fraud on this side of the House. I could not believe my ears when they are led—at least one assumes they are from time to time led—by a man who, in 1974, said there would be no wage and price controls, and within a year we had them. Does that fall within the hon. member's contemplation of fraud?

An hon. Member: You have been in power for six months and what have you done?

Mr. Nielsen: I will get to that. I cannot identify the voice of the hon. member with the black moustache and glasses. I cannot identify his riding.

An hon. Member: High River.

Mr. Nielsen: That will be the frosty Sunday that the hon. member is ever from High River or even gets a look in there. This is a simple measure, a really simple measure. It is very easy to understand. It should not require any great effort on the part of members opposite in approving its implementation. For the life of me, I cannot figure out what they are going to do when it comes to the crunch. Are they going to vote for or against it?

Mr. Parent: Against it.

Mr. Nielsen: They are going to vote against providing mortgage interest deductibility and property tax deductibility to Canadians. I really cannot understand.

An hon. Member: You do not listen very well.

Mr. Nielsen: I fully expect there are divided opinions over there. It has been said that this measure is a result of a political promise. That is so. What's wrong with that? That is exactly so. I hope it will not be too difficult for some hon. members to accept the fact that there is a party in the political life of this country which attempts to carry out its promises.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nielsen: I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure the Minister of Finance (Mr. Crosbie) will bear me out, it is as close to the measure placed before Canadians in the election as

Mortgage Tax Credit

it is possible to come, given the constitutional and fiscal ramifications of government responsibility. We promised tax relief to Canadians based on mortgage and property tax payments, and we are here in this House, doing our very best to carry out that promise. What do we get from members opposite?

An hon. Member: Praise.

Mr. Nielsen: We get opposition. We get opposition for wanting to provide that very relief that was the primary result of them being there. I am astounded that they do not come to that realization.

Mr. Lefebvre: You are not through being astounded.

Mr. Nielsen: I did not hear the interjection. If the hon. member would like to stand up and make it—

Mr. Lefebvre: You are in the government now, forget your old style.

Mr. Nielsen: I realize that we are in government. My astonishment is that members opposite do not yet realize that they are in opposition.

Mr. Lefebvre: Start speaking like a minister and not an opposition member.

Mr. Nielsen: If the opposition whip will give me an opportunity to be heard, he will realize that I am trying to impress upon them the reasonableness of this proposal.

I want to speak to the merits of the proposal. Who can in all reason doubt that it promises substantial relief, and soon, to that category of taxpayers, mostly in the middle age group, who can most positively and directly benefit from the proposal? It is not without significance, I suggest, for the prosperity of the nation that the measure will return close to \$600 million in personal spending power to the economy. This may be shocking to certain members opposite who subscribe to the theory that the government is better able to dispose of individual income than the people who earned it. That was the philosophy of those who now sit opposite. That is not and never has been the theory of this party, and it is not the theory of this government.

● (2030)

When the program reaches its culmination in four years it will return to those Canadians who are qualified, that is, to several millions of Canadians, \$1,250 a year. What is wrong with that? Surely even our friends in the New Democratic Party cannot object to that. Or do they object to the Canadians who qualify receiving at the end of that term \$1,250 a year? Is that what they are going to vote against? In addition there will be a property tax credit of \$250 a year. Are hon. members opposite opposed to that? Do they want to deny that benefit to Canadians? Those are the hard facts they are glossing over in their political partisanship. This is a policy which a great number of Canadians voted for in the election