

Election Promises

determined fiscal and monetary restraint to break inflationary expectations. That is the agreement reached in Venice.

How is the minister going to enforce that? He got up here today and said it is entirely meaningless, that he does not propose to do anything more. Why did they make this agreement in Venice? When the minister said that he supports governor Bouey's policy, the governor said on May 29 to the Senate that he thinks you really do have to stick with the monetary and fiscal policy approach limiting aggregate demand. The minister will not even tell us whether he plans to limit aggregate demand in this country even further, despite the 904,000 unemployed and despite the 0.5 per cent drop of the GNP in the first quarter.

We were in office and put forward detailed proposals for solving the economic problems of this country, we were defeated by the Liberals and the NDP and not put back in office by the people. Now the onus is on the people who put us out to come forward with their proposals and plans. But they are afraid to do so. Having defeated us, they have nothing to substitute for themselves.

On the tax question, the hon. member for Mercier (Mrs. Hervieux-Payette), in a 74-page platform paper for the Winnipeg meeting next week, says this. She noted in passing that Canadians are undertaxed compared with people in many countries. The Liberal MPs on the other side of the House think the Canadian people are undertaxed. Well, the MP for Mercier did not campaign on that basis; she did not rampage through Quebec before February 18 telling the people there they were undertaxed. But now she has prepared a discussion paper for the Liberal party in Winnipeg in which she suggests that the Canadian people are undertaxed compared with people in many other countries. What countries? How are we undertaxed? Who is she comparing us with?

● (1700)

The minister says it is terrible to propose this amendment because he would not dream of indexing the income tax. Well, his deputy minister of finance said to the Senate committee that they require more finances and taxes will have to go up. Who is the deputy minister of finance? The same man who was deputy minister of energy, mines and resources a few short months ago.

What have the seven Summiteers accomplished? They have accomplished nothing except this: the Prime Minister has agreed—he is agreed, now, with us, he has made full circle—that the maximum reliance should be placed on the price mechanism in restraining energy demands. This is what he admitted to at the Summit.

An hon. Member: What do you know?

Mr. Crosbie: What did they agree on? That is exactly what they agreed upon. They changed some wording so that they could pretend that world oil prices had nothing to do with it. We read this:

Yesterday's communiqué says that in order to conserve oil and increase the use of alternative energy sources "maximum reliance should be placed on the

price mechanism and domestic prices for oil should take into account representative oil prices".

So the government opposite is taking into account representative oil prices and it is going to put maximum reliance on the price mechanism. To do what? To conserve oil and increase the use of alternate energy sources. Well, to do that the price of oil has to go up. That is the policy of the government. They try to persuade the people of Canada that when prices go up they haven't gone up, they have gone down. And when the minister talks about his burgeoning deficit, it is not because he is stimulating the economy, it is because he is paying the money to foreign oil producers for the oil import subsidy. Because the cost of that has gone up, from \$1.6 billion to \$4 billion, as a result of the dishonest policy the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister put to the country just before the February 18 election. Four billion dollars is going right out of this country to foreigners—to the Mexicans, the Venezuelans. The Venezuelans are putting their prices up by another \$2 a barrel in the next few days. All of that money is leaving Canada. And who pays the bill? The income tax payers pay it, not the person using the gasoline to drive his car. It is being borrowed now but the taxpayer will have to pay it back. The government has put a \$4 billion burden on the taxpayers this year. The government has given the consumers of gasoline a break of a couple of billion dollars, but they have given the Canadian taxpayers a \$4 billion blow.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order. I hesitate to interrupt the hon. gentleman but his time has expired. He can continue, however, if there is unanimous consent.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Crosbie: If there is not unanimous consent, I will retire, simply saying we intend to vote for the motion.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of State, Finance): Mr. Speaker, we are debating today the motion proposed by the leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent) asking the government to lower taxes, increase government expenditures in order to stimulate the economy, and to—

Mr. Clark: Who is this guy?

Mr. Bussières: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition has already spoken. As usual, he seems to be muttering. He could show the same courtesy as other members and listen attentively to another member's speech.

The Leader of the New Democratic Party also asks the government to control interest rates and to ensure that the banks and the large corporations which will benefit from a drop in interest rate pass this on to Canadian taxpayers and consumers.

For his part, the leader of the Progressive Conservative opposition mumbled, as he did earlier, that he blamed the government for considering de-indexation of the income tax