

Income Tax Act

The minister cannot be consistent even in the same paragraph. He talks about holding down government expenditures, restraint, bringing down the deficit and then he says that through government spending he is going to support industrial development, energy development, and economic adjustment. Through government spending he is going to restrain spending, but then through government spending he is going to support these figures. He cannot be consistent within the same paragraph.

Let us examine what he says. He is going to support industrial development. Who can be opposed to that? However, when the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, who would have responsibility in this area, was asked for his industrial development strategy which during the election campaign was absolutely promised to be forthcoming just as soon as the Liberals were returned to power, he said it has a lower priority than the constitution, and that they cannot get after it because they are working on the constitution. He cannot walk and chew gum at the same time!

Are all the economists, planners and so on, in the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce sitting around moaning and groaning about the constitution? I have not seen the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce at any of the constitutional meetings. I did not know that the Department of Finance and the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce were involved in the constitution. Is the whole apparatus of the Government of Canada coming to a grinding halt while they try to convince Mr. Duclos and others like him who have a little bit of spine, that they had to support this imposition—

Mr. Cullen: Oh, oh!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. It is the practice in the House to refer to hon. members by their constituencies. I am sure that the hon. member, being an experienced parliamentarian is aware of this.

Mr. Cullen: Oh, oh!

Mr. Andre: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I refer to the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Duclos). The hon. member for Sarnia (Mr. Cullen) should have as much character and fortitude as the hon. member for Montmorency.

● (1450)

Mr. Cullen: I have more, but I talk some sense.

Mr. Andre: The hon. member for Sarnia is well trained; he knows when to say aye.

I think it was the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pepin), in an earlier incarnation as Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, even before I was here, who coined the phrase "industrial development strategy". He started work on it then. I do not know how many years ago that was, but we are still waiting. In any event, this Minister of Finance says he is going to do it. How is he going to do it? By restraining government spending and holding the deficit in check. Then the government talks about energy development.

It is totally baffling how the Minister of Finance could on Monday, January 12, after seeing the impact of his October 28 energy policy, still maintain that there will be energy development in this country anything like what is needed. Obviously the Minister of Finance is not an ignorant man. He is not dumb. He is aware of what is happening. But because it does not fit in with the politics of the moment to acknowledge it, we carry on with this policy of the big lie.

We hear things such as, "This is what we are going to do. We are going to have energy development." The minister knows that is not what is happening. I know that his officials, below the deputy level, are scurrying for cover and saying that they did not have anything to do with that October 28 document, that they did not see it. We hear them say that it was done by EMR, the deputy, and one or two people around him. No one in finance had any say, and there are some honourable people in that department who would have liked to have had some say in producing a budget for this country. However, for some reason or other that task was turned over to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and he produced that body blow.

Unfortunately for the Minister of Finance, he is the one who will have to pick up the political credit for it. He will find that unemployment this year will be far greater than he had expected or planned. His officials never really had a chance to look at that energy policy. I gather no one in government did, other than the department of energy. But the Minister of Finance is the one who will have to pay the political price of accounting for that increased unemployment, the increased drain on the public treasury for its subsidies on the imports, and the increased strain on the dollar because of our increased balance of payments deficit, and on and on. The Minister of Finance will have to bear that cross put on his shoulders by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources who somehow conned him into reading his energy policy.

Economic adjustment is another thing to which the minister is committed. What does economic adjustment mean? Is it another Department of Regional Economic Expansion? Do you remember that, Mr. Speaker? The Department of Regional Economic Expansion was supposed to cure regional disparity in Canada. How many years have we had of that department? And out of it we have regional disparity which gets worse and worse. What kind of economic adjustment is he planning here? I can only wonder and worry.

Sometime soon there needs to be a reawakening and a sensitivity to politics and to our political leaders in Canada. A closer examination is needed of what politicians and governments are saying and doing. We need a better way of holding them accountable. It is intolerable and of great concern, with potential enormous damage to our society, to our nation and to our democratic future, to have these kinds of big lie techniques utilized, apparently with some success.

For example, we can hear "our goal is that of self-sufficiency and increased Canadianization" but under that they introduce policies which produce exactly the opposite effect. We can see something of this sort in the October 28 budget