

This is why the situation, that had been excellent in 1972, changed considerably when Mr. McKenna came to power. He never lies. Very recently Mr. McKenna blamed my minister, my M.P., Mr. Valcourt, for the Tragedy Rage decision.

He went on and on about Mr. Valcourt's partisanship and his aggressivity! He never gave him credit, for example, for preserving the Acadian Peninsula from an expansion of those same shipyards, nor for all the agreements which benefit the province of New Brunswick. He never gave credit to Mr. Valcourt. I find this quite regrettable because I think it would make for a much better relationship, like we had from 1970 to 1987 under Mr. Richard Hatfield, even if we did not always agree, even if some decisions came down against us at the time. And we even supported the repatriation of the Constitution, although it was a bad agreement, and all this pleased the people of New Brunswick.

Therefore, Senator Corbin, I think you for having raised the level of debate in this House today. Thank you for having made those points and I fully agree with you when you preach for better co-operation in federal-provincial relations. I would encourage you, and your colleagues, to talk to Mr. McKenna, to talk to your Minister of Finance and to all those who would be tempted and who often succumb to the temptation to criticize unduly our present federal government. Thank you!

Senator Corbin: I thank Senator Simard for these kind words. Personally, I have always held him in high regard except, as I said earlier, at election time—no more tango then, only tangles. But otherwise our relationship has been rather good. But I am disappointed to see Senator Simard claim for himself all the credit for the many successful initiatives which have benefitted New Brunswick at the time of Mr. Hatfield's government.

If there had not been a Trudeau government in Ottawa at the time what would have happened to the Hatfield government? Would these people have stayed in power for so long? This was just to react to the question and the comments of Senator Simard—comments following the question I had asked of Senator Gigantès. Coming back to our subject, would you be so kind, dear colleague Gigantès, to answer my two or three previous questions?

Senator Gigantès: What really moves me in Senator Simard is his Dr. Jekyll personality which he has shown us tonight. Usually, it is Mr. Hyde. I am moved nevertheless. It is nice to see him try and one understands why he shouted earlier "Trudeau, Trudeau", because these were his best years at the time of the Trudeau government. He got everything he wanted.

The federal government allowed him to look good and it is understandable that he would turn into a zen buddhist and preach his faith in Mr. Trudeau, shouting his mantra like he did this morning. Could you not recommend the man who wrote that speech to Mr. Mulroney? It is a much better speech than those the prime minister is making. Where is that young man or that young lady who wrote for you in New Brunswick?

Somebody must have written that speech for him, do you not think?

That statement you read, was it not a speech he made? We have to get to the bottom of this, do we not? We must establish the facts because it is a historical event . . .

Senator Corbin: Senator Gigantès, I was quoting the synoptic report of the Proceedings of the New Brunswick Legislature (1972 Session, Volume 2) and the quotes were from page 481 onward. Does it answer your question?

Senator Gigantès: Certainly, you quoted Senator Simard's statements. He had an extraordinary script. I wish his speech writer were here to resume his brilliant work. Maybe Senator Simard could loan him from time to time to Mr. Mulroney and maybe even to me. I am very humble about this. I have always recognized that there are people who write better than I, who speak better than I, who understand better than I and I would be very happy to see that person join us here.

I believe our capital has an absolute need for this person because if there is someone who can put in Senator Simard's mouth the character of Dr. Jekyll instead of that of Mr. Hyde which we have been seeing here all the time, this must be an extraordinary person; we need him or her in this capital. Really, Senator Corbin, since you have a good relationship with Senator Simard, urge him to get this person to come here. Maybe he could ask his guru, his mentor, Mr. Trudeau, when he returns from his trip, to convince this person to come here to moderate Mr. Simard's statements like before. Finally, he has left me. I am trying. It is awful! I miss him already.

So, I will return to the writings of our good professor Neil Brooks who says he used the model prepared by Statistics Canada to determine the tax shift.

Percentage-wise, increase in the cost of men's clothing, 6 per cent; increase in women's and children's clothing, 5.8 per cent; shoes, 6 per cent; gross rents, three tenths of 1 per cent; gross rent paid, 2.49 per cent; hydro, 6.5 per cent; natural gas, 4.9 per cent; other fuels, 5.8 per cent.

He figured out this way how much prices would increase because of the GST. It is very difficult to reconcile these figures arrived at by Mr. Brooks and by the government and which are based on the same data bank. It is very, very difficult to reconcile these results with the government claim that prices would increase by only 1.25 per cent. According to Professor Brooks' figures which I mentioned earlier, the main price increase would result from the increase in administration costs due to the GST which businesses will pass on to consumers.

After those figures, which show that the GST will certainly not be an improvement, let us look at the income tax alternative. He says:

● (1620)

[English]

Compared to the proposed GST reforms—and any of you who missed any of this may care to come Tuesday morning when I will be reading it for Senator MacDonald; and if that does not suit you I am prepared to go on on Wednesday—the