

Mr. Riis: That is most of Manitoba. The best example is Manitoba.

Mr. Holtmann: But the Liberals should show how they would do it. We do not need their lip service. Never once since I have been in this House, Mr. Speaker, have I heard a member of the Opposition rise and describe how he could create more employment. All I have heard is: "Why don't you give more money here and more money there? We knew how to print it when we were in power". And the Liberals are prepared to do it all over again. The Canadian people have to be told what the Liberals have in their minds.

Mr. Riis: Howard Pawley.

Mr. Holtmann: Yes, Howard Pawley, you know that gentleman really well.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Holtmann: And you had better get to know him well because he is not going to be around for a long time.

Mr. Riis: He has the lowest unemployment in Canada.

Mr. Holtmann: The Hon. Member mentions Howard Pawley, who is in fact considering selling off a Crown corporation in Manitoba. He is losing \$200 million to \$300 million a year and is scratching his head asking: "How long can we do that?"

Mr. Riis: You should stand up and praise him.

Mr. Holtmann: He takes the attitude of the Conservatives sometimes. We like Crown corporations, they say. On the one hand, you people over there protect them, then we have a Premier of Manitoba who says we do not know how to run them. It is starting to show. Manitoba taxpayers are sick and tired of paying for that kind of foolishness. This Government recognizes that big Government does not run big companies in the right way. Past experience involving de Havilland will prove that.

● (1230)

It is about time that the Opposition started to realize this Government's objectives and to support them. It supported the concept during the campaign. Opposition Members said we have to change direction. Now they are back in the House saying that, although we are doing so, it is not the right direction. We are having a seesaw battle back and forth on this issue.

The Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap (Mr. Riis) talks about the danger of this Bill taking \$4 billion from taxpayers. I would like him to stand up and say where he will find the revenue to reduce our debt. I would like to know. We put in place a minimum tax for the rich. His leader praised that. He stood up and said that that is the right direction. Everything was positive. However, now the Member says, "Oh, it is not really what we thought it was". In front of the cameras he says it is great but now it is not. His Leader campaigned for that

Income Tax Act, 1986

tax. As a matter of fact, so did the Leader of the Liberal Party. We all remember how he campaigned on that. However, when it was introduced the Liberal Opposition slammed it. Liberal Members said it was no good, too little, too late. We heard the whole exercise.

Mr. Schellenberg: He had no option.

Mr. Holtmann: "We would have done it a little differently", he said. Well, they have not fooled the people of my riding with that kind of rhetoric. They thought it was a good idea. I have countless letters saying it was about time.

This Government is going in the right direction and every Member in this Party will tell the truth about what is happening to our tax revenues.

Some Hon. Members: More!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Order, please.

Mr. Mayer: Let the record show that even Don Johnston clapped.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Let me remind those Members who are yelling for more that we are debating Motion No. 4 to amend Bill C-84. I understand that everyone is in a good mood coming back as they do from the Christmas break, but the rule of relevancy may creep up at some time. All Members would do well to keep in mind that we are debating specific amendments.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Raymond Garneau (Laval-des-Rapides): Mr. Speaker, I wonder where the previous speaker was when the Budget was brought down on May 23 last year. Did he read the Budget Speech? Is he aware of the tax measures it contained? After listening to his speech, I really wonder whether he does know. He stands up and tells us that the reason why we should not adopt Motion No. 4 to delete Clause 65 from Bill C-84, so that income tax tables will continue to be indexed, and that the reason why this Government intended to vote against the motion, was, that it wanted to control the deficit—

How can he tell us today that it is absolutely necessary to tax individuals on the first three per cent of inflation, year after year after year, when that same Budget, that same Government, had enough financial resources, and was certainly not considering the deficit, when it decided to give the oil multinationals \$2.5 billion in 1990-91 alone, and when this year, their decision to remove taxes on the oil multinationals will cost the Government twice as much in foregone revenue as the amount they want to raise through partial de-indexing of the income tax tables.

Mr. Boudria: Shame!

Mr. Garneau: Mr. Speaker, there is a very interesting point to be made here, and that is that the political philosophy of the Government opposite could be expressed as follows: tax the