

and the householder in that strait-jacket. All that remains is for the voters, at the next election—and it cannot come too soon—to place the Liberal party in a strait-jacket from which it will not wriggle free for a long time to come.

I want to close by quoting, for the benefit of the hon. member for Ottawa Centre, the words that he missed because he was taking umbrage, in a very agitated way, because they are strong words. To accuse any hon. member of deliberately lying is to use strong words. But I am doing that tonight with respect to the Prime Minister and I am doing it on the basis of a speech that he made in Whitehorse on January 21, 1980. I have a transcript of the words he used on that occasion. Here it is in black and white. The hon. member will recall that the Crosbie budget did not tax home heating fuels, only transportation fuels. I see him nodding his assent to that.

An hon. Member: The excise tax only.

Mr. Nielsen: It did not apply to home heating fuels.

An hon. Member: That is correct.

Mr. Nielsen: That is my point. He agrees it is correct. The Prime Minister was speaking about the north, and he said:

The climate, more extreme than southern Canada, your communications, your transportation, are more difficult, and your costs are considerably higher than they are in the south, but what you need is a national government which is practical and which is sensible, that's consistent—and what you had with the Joe Clark government is a giant doublecross. The last thing you need in the north—

Pay attention to that.

—is an eighteen cent per gallon tax on gasoline and on diesel and I repeat will serve entirely to pay for that mortgage plan, and nowhere will that Joe Clark tax hurt more than here in the north, because under that energy plan, every household here in Whitehorse—every household will be paying nearly five hundred dollars a year more for home heating oil by 1982.

Nothing could be clearer than this outright, deliberate falsehood by the Prime Minister. He directly stated there what he would not say in Toronto or Halifax for the sake of gaining a seat which he has been after for a good many years. If the hon. member for Ottawa Centre wants to try to explain to me—

Mr. Evans: I can.

Mr. Nielsen:—and to the people of the Yukon, that that did not mean a promise by the Prime Minister that the Clark budget would mean an additional \$500 fuel cost to them as a result of those taxes, if he can turn that around, he would be even more of a magician than the Minister of Finance. It is very clear.

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I ran out of time, but I am glad I had the opportunity to put that on the record for the hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Bud Cullen (Sarnia): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Edmonton North (Mr. Paproski), in endeavouring to introduce Leslie Nielsen as one of Canada's outstanding

The Budget—Mr. Cullen

actors, by a slip of the tongue said “Erik Nielsen, one of Canada's most outstanding actors”.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: That is right.

Mr. Cullen: I think we have had a demonstration of that today because it is hard to believe that the hon. member for Yukon believed everything he was reading. He had his lines down pretty well, but I do not really think he felt that what he was saying was in accord with what the policies and what the promises of this party were during the last election campaign. I have to give the hon. member the benefit of the doubt. Possibly he was not listening when the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde), in concluding his remarks, stated quite clearly what our promises were during that election campaign, namely, that we will keep price increases to less than \$4 a barrel in 1980 and \$4.50 a barrel in 1981, 1982 and 1983, and thereafter prices will rise more steeply. Then he illustrated his point by reference to the December 11 budget proposals. He said that under those proposals the wellhead price of conventional oil would have been \$52 a barrel on January 1, 1984, but under the national energy program, it will be \$25 a barrel, enough to get the oil supply job done but also fair to the consumer.

That is what the Liberal party was talking about during the election campaign, and we heard about the made-in-Canada price and the blended price. No Liberal during that campaign ever suggested that the prices would not go up. What we did indicate is that we would not put the 18-cent excise tax on and that our increases on the per barrel level would be lower than those provided for in the ill-fated budget of 1979.

It is a particular pleasure for me, Mr. Speaker, to be here today to participate in this debate. It is somewhat ironic that, because of the last budget which was introduced in the House, I am now back in the House of Commons and able to participate in a budget debate, on a budget which, I guarantee, will help me to stay in this party on this side of the House.

● (1710)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cullen: It was my privilege to serve as parliamentary secretary to a former minister of finance when the indexing element was introduced. When I hear members opposite say that there is nothing in this budget for the ordinary Canadian, I wonder if they are trying once again to underestimate, or if they are underestimating the intelligence of the Canadian public. The Canadian public knew what indexing was all about, and they have been reading that it represents a saving of \$1.6 billion in one year alone. That is revenue the government is forgoing so that it will be in the hands of ordinary taxpayers. At that time the opposition indicated how wonderful the indexing system was, how great it was, and that it had a most beneficial impact on the ordinary Canadian taxpayer. So, the indexing program was left in, it was not taken out, and the ordinary consumer and taxpayer of Canada has received a