

*Election Promises*

election campaign that he was 100 per cent behind President Carter's policy on Afghanistan. Then we heard from the hon. member for New Westminster-Coquitlam (Miss Jewett). She condemned her leader for that statement, so the Leader of the New Democratic Party turned around and said he was not 100 per cent behind Mr. Carter.

The New Democratic Party is on record against participation in both NORAD and NATO. Then the Leader of the NDP in the election campaign said that he wanted to review that position. After the campaign his Ontario council passed a resolution accusing him of flagrant disregard of party policy. So, with the election safely behind him, the Leader of the NDP said that he still might have a review but that it would not change the position. The New Democrats are still against NORAD. The New Democrats are still against NATO, regardless of any contrary impression which might unfortunately accidentally have been left during the election campaign.

On national unity, the Leader of the New Democratic Party gave a speech in this House in which he praised everything about the Parti Québécois except its *raison d'être*, sovereignty-association. Then he refused to participate in the No campaign in the Quebec referendum. I can understand that. Since their Quebec leader was an active member of the Yes campaign, I suppose they did not want to divide their energies.

Then at the first ministers' conference the NDP asked for a voice without a vote. They wanted to be heard, but they did not want to be counted. That was the first time they had been quite so straightforward about defining their role. They want to be kibitzers at the card game and to tell other people how to play but not to get into the action themselves. That proposal was rejected by all of the premiers, including the NDP premier of the province of Saskatchewan.

I point out that that is not the first time the NDP in office has disagreed with the NDP in motion. The party to my left opposed tax credits for mortgage interest. Allan Blakeney made them the law of the province of Saskatchewan. The party to my left said it would support only minor increases in oil prices. Premier Blakeney said, and I quote him exactly: "Prices should increase in regular steps and move toward the Chicago price".

Speaking of energy, the federal New Democratic Party produced in the last election campaign a campaign document advocating making the petroleum industry a regulated utility similar to Hydro. But that meant a federal bureaucracy would have to control provincial royalties, and they were not going to say that in the province of Saskatchewan. In fact, they were not prepared to discuss federal control of resources in Saskatchewan at all. It becomes a little embarrassing when your own premier has gone all the way to the Supreme Court of Canada to protect the provincial jurisdiction that you want to destroy.

The NDP talk about small business, and then they advocate taxes which would wipe out many family enterprises. They declare themselves in favour of freedom of speech and freedom of information, and their Nova Scotia party evicts an elected

member who had the temerity to speak out against what he regards as Marxist elements in the party in that province.

That is the New Democratic Party, the most unprincipled and inconsistent party in this Parliament, and I want on my behalf and on behalf of other hon. members to thank them for introducing a motion which gave us the opportunity to put their position on the record.

Now, if I might, I would like to turn to the government.

[*Translation*]

The Grits always boasted they were the low-income people's party. Isn't that beautiful! The truth of the matter is, Liberals have but contempt for those who can hardly make ends meet. There is ample proof of this. Who else but a party with contempt for low-income people could consider de-indexing personal income tax, as Liberals propose to do? Clearly the hardest hit Canadians will not be the high-income people. Indeed, the hardest hit by that barbaric step will be the citizens who have a hard time under the current inflationary period earning \$10,000 of taxable yearly income.

These Canadians will have their personal income tax increased 180 per cent over a five-year period. Moreover, thousands of Canadians who are not paying any income tax now will become taxable as soon as de-indexing is effective. They will have to pay because of the incompetence of a government that inflicted on us a deficit that is now standing at the \$14 billion level.

My party will not let such a mean and unjust proposal hit small wage earners, and I warn the government that we will be putting up a constant fight to prevent them from de-indexing personal income tax.

Mr. Speaker, you have there an example of the contempt felt by this government for small wage earners. It is not the only one. The Liberals are charlatans and their word is not worth more today than it was in 1974, when they fought price controls. Something similar is now happening in the energy area. Throughout the election campaign they fought the 18 cents tax on gasoline. But what are they now proposing, Mr. Speaker? They are considering a tax on oil sold to refineries. And the rate of that new tax will be 27 cents a gallon at the end of 1982. There is worse, however. As opposed to our tax, that only applied to gas used for transportation, the Liberal 27-cent-a-gallon tax will also apply to heating fuel. This means Quebeckers, whether rich or poor, will spend some \$200 more on heating over the 1982-83 winter.

● (1600)

[*English*]

I want to speak for a moment more about indexation. I noted earlier that the leader of the NDP indicated again today that he wants to abolish the proposal for indexation; he wants to impose upon Canadians earning \$10,000 a year a 180 per cent tax increase over the next five years. That is what the NDP believes in, that kind of abolition of the indexing pro-