

Excise Tax Act

per cent increase in a four-year period that was considered to be good times.

What happened? How did government Members do it? When the times were good, they spent more. They got caught up in their own rhetoric of being the direct cause of the good times. They got caught up in patting themselves on the back for the jobs created because of good times. What else did they do? They sure as hell did not make their rich friends pay more for record profits. No, in fact, they gave away the store. They gave it all away.

Every time there was a profitable corporation which had been built with taxpayers' money so that each and every one of us owned a piece of it, without fail the Government sold it. For what? Crown corporations are accountable to the taxpayers who own them. Why wait until we see some activity and then sell?

Mr. Dionne: If they are in power for much longer, there won't be much left to see.

Mr. Flis: I am glad that my hon. friend from the Atlantic region said that. As far as I know, it does not make good, sound business sense.

An example of this is the Pearson International Airport. Despite the horror stories about the safety elements of the airport, which I may add are in large part due to the Government's deregulation philosophy and its bungling, the Pearson Airport, in terms of profit, is a success. Now a third terminal is being added to the airport and it is being handled by the private sector. Why? Because it is a profit-making project so naturally government Members give it to the private sector instead of bringing those revenues in and keeping the taxes down. Is this because the Government feels that it owes something to its business friends so that in the next election, it may go on the same kind of questionable propaganda spree it went on during the last election campaign? I think the answer is obvious.

Then we have our infamous Canada Post. It made record profits at the expense of the Canadian public. I would have been very concerned if, considering the cut-backs in service and the rise in postage rates, Canada Post had not shown some profit. However, that is not the

priority of our essential services. Quality service and a reasonable rate should be.

Tomorrow I will be tabling petitions in the House from constituents of mine who had been serviced by Postal Station V in Toronto. The Government decided to give Postal Station V over to a corner drug store. The corner drug store went bankrupt and so did the postal service so it went back to the post office. The people were happy. They could register their letters and pick up parcels. What happened then? Without any notice from the Minister or from anyone, we see that there is a for rent sign in the post office window. People are up in arms because again because for the second time, they are losing their postal service. Elderly people in their 80s and 90s will have to go three, four or five miles to post registered letters or pick up parcels. Yet Canada Post prides itself that its main goal is to increase service. That is what it calls efficiency in management.

Government Members sit there and gloat about big profits, not caring about seniors losing the service right under their noses.

Mr. Milliken: They don't give two hoots about it.

Mr. Flis: Exactly. Four years of good times, and in those four years, what else did we see from the Government? The Government did not give Canadians a tax break but increased taxes.

Now what do we see in Bill C-20 and in the Budget? We see the Tory philosophy at work again. Middle and low-income earners will continue to carry the largest burden of the taxes, whether the times are good or whether the times are bad.

The Tory philosophy knows no bounds. In fact, it knows no boundaries. It carries over the oceans into the countries that most need our help. At a time when the world is strife with wars and poverty and literally millions of children are starving, the Government is taking the food right out of their mouths.

In 1984, when the Government first came to power, it promised to commit .5 per cent of GNP to foreign aid and development for 1985. However, the percentage of aid actually dropped and did not reach the target of 1986-87. It also promised that by 1995 foreign aid would receive 0.7 per cent of GNP. Again, it reneged on its promises. In the report entitled: "Sharing Our Future" which was released in 1987, the Government pushed