

really could not care less about the common good, as shown when those Parties' policies are examined.

There is an ethical dimension to our economic problems. And it can best be approached by examining the moral poverty of recent budgets. In November, 1981, certain tax loopholes for the rich were closed. In order to compensate for this, the marginal tax rate for the rich was dropped by 10 per cent, to ensure that closing those loopholes would not really hurt anyone but would look good on paper nevertheless. At the same time the federal Government announced in the same budget a cut of \$5.7 billion from its funding of medicare and post-secondary education, programs which benefit all Canadians from coast to coast, regardless of their income.

In the spring of 1982 the Liberals, supported by the Conservatives, arranged to give \$6.5 billion to the oil companies through the Petroleum Incentives Program in order to get these so-called free enterprisers off their "derrières" to look for more oil. Despite all the rhetoric about risk and free enterprise, the oil companies have both nostrils in the public trough all the way up to their eyebrows. The Conservatives never object to this. It is public spending for the poor and powerless that they enjoy actively discrediting. Hypocrites that they are, they pretend to be outraged when social programs are cut when it is they who systematically over the years have undermined the credibility of social programs in this country. Yet, they have the nerve to feign outrage when these programs are threatened. The real policy of the Progressive Conservatives, as has been said before, is socialism for the rich and free enterprise for the poor.

In June of 1982 the Government proceeded with its six and five program. Included in this 6 per cent and 5 per cent limit on future increases is a limit on the increases for old age security payments, family allowances and civil service pensions. The Government is therefore asking once again for average Canadians—pensioned average Canadians and mothers in this case—to carry the burden.

Now, in October of 1982, we must witness the spectacle of the Liberals opening the tax loopholes that they closed in November of 1981. These tax loopholes for the rich have been re-opened yet they have not increased the tax rate for these same people which was lowered in November of 1981. Therefore, this group of Canadians who fall into that higher income bracket will now have the benefit of both loopholes and a lower marginal tax rate. No doubt, this will have its intended effect on the donations to the Liberal Party coffers prior to the next election, for "he who pays the piper has just called the tune" it seems to me.

What about the average working Canadians who are already carrying more of the tax burden while corporations and individual wealthy Canadians pay less and less of their fair share in Canada? What news was there in the Minister's statement on Wednesday for the average working Canadians who, are paying their fair share and, do not mind doing it? The good news was for the wealthy and powerful. The bad news was saved for the lower and middle-income Canadians who

Supplementary Borrowing Authority

will be hit with a 40 per cent—not 6 per cent or 5 per cent— increase in unemployment insurance premiums.

When unemployment insurance was last significantly reformed, I am told that the Minister indicated that the cost incurred by UIC as a result of unemployment higher than 4 per cent should be borne by the public and not by the contributors. The Liberals have clearly abandoned this policy. While they are shamelessly giving in to the blackmail of the corporate community in this country, they have no hesitation in becoming tough with the majority of Canadians by asking them to pay for Liberal mistakes. Perhaps it is time for them to pick on someone their own size.

We also saw in the Minister's statement on Wednesday a renewed reliance on the private sector. This is most interesting. The prodigal son, the Minister of Finance, has retreated from his interventionist binge, mild as it was, a chastened and broken man. No more for him; of the dangers and pitfalls of even talking about Canadian control of the economy or even one sector of the economy. He and the Prime Minister, the prodigal twins, with their tails between their legs can be seen running back into the safe enveloping arms of the private corporate establishment asking forgiveness and trying to show by their latest actions that they will be good boys in the future. The Prime Minister, for his part, has recanted all that he had said in the last election campaign about the need to build an independent Canadian economy and to strengthen the Foreign Investment Review Agency. He was either lying to the public then or he is the biggest coward we have seen in a long time. But then to watch the Prime Minister back down when it comes to putting his often noble sentiments into action has become the expected rather than the unusual in this Parliament or, indeed, in other Parliaments.

• (1520)

But who is the angry brother in this story about the prodigal twin? The angry brother is and will be the Progressive Conservative Party in this Parliament for, you see, the Progressive Conservatives never ventured out of the front yard. They were the good sons, the loyal sons of the corporate elite, always obedient, always faithful, never questioning the values and the dictates of Old Man Profit and his buddies Power and Privilege.

Mr. Wilson: You would think we were the Government.

Mr. Blaikie: The Conservatives might as well be the Government. They would be doing exactly the same thing.

Mr. Fennell: No way.

Mr. Blaikie: The Conservatives are the loyal sons of the corporate elite and were critical of the prodigal son, the prodigal twins all along. They knew they were wrong. They said so even as far back as the early seventies.

I listened to the Progressive Conservative finance critic the other day. He went as far back as the Benson tax reforms, at the time when we went ever so slightly in the direction of a fair taxation policy. That was the beginning of the end, in the