

Taxation

The article states further:

Mr. Holman said the just-passed legislation covers only a one-year period and new legislation will be required if the assistance program is to be extended.

I have in my hand another article which I guess time will not permit me to read. The title of that article asks, "Is Home Ownership becoming a Myth?" When the hon. gentleman from London West was born and as he grew up, home ownership was considered to be as near a right of a citizen of this country as any right that we recognized. There was the right to have the ambition and opportunity to buy a home within a reasonable period of time. Now this article in *The Telegraph-Journal* asks, "Is it a Myth?" I am afraid that is exactly what it is becoming. We must get the interest rate down.

When we see an hon. member and a former premier such as the Secretary of State for Canada criticizing provincial governments anywhere in this nation of Canada for whatever budget they may bring down, after he was responsible for the rendering of medical, social, welfare, hospital and other services which government must provide, when he is fully aware that the real dollars going to the provinces are lower than they were the year before, and when he is fully aware that the government's objective is to save \$5.7 billion in reduction of these provincial payments from the federal structure, then that can be called whatever an honest man would like to call it. My definition of that would not be parliamentary at all.

● (1640)

I have to wonder when the obituaries will stop coming in. Is the obituary of small business in Canada to continue being written? Is the economic obituary of the farmer in Canada to continue being written? Have we had an obituary to Alsands and all the other megaprojects? Does this extend to Atlantic Canada? Do we have a miscarriage, perhaps, because those megaprojects that could bring energy from the seabed will never mature?

This budget, this tax structure, this government's management, this expansion of government while pleading for productivity, is absolutely contradictory and can only be referred to as an obituary for the things we have cherished in the past and which are gradually getting out of reach. The auto, the home, the apartment, the farm, the fishing boat, the forest woodlot—are these completely beyond our reach today? At the moment it would appear that with the policies of the government and their impact upon interest rates, these things are either beyond our reach now or are becoming beyond our reach.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Fred King (Okanagan-Similkameen): Mr. Speaker, I listened to the hon. member for London West (Mr. Burghardt) take on the impossible task of defending the unworthy policies for which he and his colleagues are responsible. I heard him recite the Liberal rote—that our national economic problems are simply related to what is going on all over the world. What a demonstration of blind political loyalty! It is totally unbecoming of any member of the House. I thought that this particular member would not accept so unthinkingly the

standard line of argument established by the Minister of Finance (Mr. MacEachen) and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau).

Who but the Liberal government is responsible for the Alsands and the pipeline fiasco? There are 1.5 million people unemployed in Canada and projects have been lost through the Liberals' careless exercise of power in search of political rather than national goals which would have given employment to one third of the people presently unemployed. Some 500,000 people who are unemployed today can point directly to the failure of the Government of Canada as the cause of their unemployment. These unemployed do not shrug off their circumstance as an inevitable consequence of international economics. They know better and so do hon. members opposite.

The calls made in this House today for the resignation of the Minister of Finance voiced the deepest sentiment of the people of Canada from coast to coast, from city and farm, from young and aged and, very significantly, from thousands of Canadians who formerly held membership in the Liberal Party of Canada. This disastrous government and all the docile, obedient members who disgrace responsible elected office should resign and give Canada the break it deserves.

Today we are dealing with Bill C-93 which combines the more conventional borrowing authority bill with a number of amendments to the Excise Tax Act. This is an omnibus bill in every sense. It is an omnibus bill which provokes many of the very same objections which were so clearly enunciated and understood by the people of Canada during the bell-ringing episode of a few weeks ago.

The average Canadian on the street, on the farm, in the factories, in the homes of our nation grasped the abuses inherent in Bill C-94. They understood the issue then and I think they will resent the fact that an arrogant government is proceeding with a bill in almost duplicate circumstances, as if the lesson had not been learned.

The situation with this bill is the same as with Bill C-94, namely, that standing committee examination will be denied because of the ways and means taxing authority inclusion. It is almost a repeat of the circumstances which, in more exaggerated form, brought about the ringing of the bells and the jelling of public opinion in opposition to the tactics of the government and, finally, to the capitulation of the government as a result of the pressure of public opinion.

Of interest and significance to all people across Canada who care about democracy and who can now see the concrete results of the actions of Her Majesty's loyal opposition regarding Bill C-94 is an advertisement which appeared in newspapers across Canada on Thursday, April 22. Under the heading of "Standing Committee on Energy Legislation" the advertisement reads as follows:

The Standing Committee on Energy Legislation of the House of Commons will be holding hearings on the following pieces of legislation: