

*The Budget—Mr. Lalonde*

spending and the provision of social services for all our people will go down.

That is not an abstraction. It means, quite simply, poorer people, more poorly clothed people, more poorly housed people, more poorly fed people and more poorly educated people. It is a tragic abdication of even the minister's professed interest in being progressive. I was reminded of the ultimate statement of bankruptcy when the minister said that the concept of sharing seems to be close to the distinctive fibre of the Canadian tradition, and that he does not think the state should do it all. What are we going to rely on, the United Way? Is that the answer, that we go back to the United Way and the handouts of lady dowagers who come down to the poor people of Broadview-Greenwood and say, "Here is a handout. I am sharing with you by bringing you a turkey at Christmas and a cake on your birthday."? Is that the kind of sharing about which the minister is talking?

The return to private charity is an abdication of the fundamental social rights of the Canadian people. The notion that we should return to some kind of private sharing is worthy of the rotarian that the Minister of Finance has now become.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, France had a socialist government 45 years ago. The premier of that government was a great socialist of democratic tradition, Léon Blum. At the end of his life someone asked him: Are you satisfied with what you have accomplished with your government, that popular government during the 1930s, those very difficult years? He replied: Well, yes, because I received a letter from a grandfather who wrote to me: "Thanks to you and to your government I was able to see the beach and the sea before dying."

[English]

There is not one Canadian, be he in Broadview-Greenwood, or be he anywhere else who will be able to write the Minister of Finance or the Prime Minister and say, "As the result of this budget, thanks to you, I will finally be able to see the sea and the beach", because the seas and the beaches are reserved to exactly those people for whom they have been reserved for far too long in our society and nothing has been done to change that.

That is the simple reason why it gives me the greatest pride to move the amendment that I have moved to stand as firmly and as resolutely opposed to this phony budget, a mile wide and an inch deep, with its statement of intellectual bankruptcy and its condemnation of the Canadian people to a future far less bright, far less generous, far less hopeful and far less compassionate than the one they deserve.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** After consultation, the Chair has found the subamendment put by the hon. member to be in order. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

**Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, I can see that the NDP is disappearing, but I hope it is only physically. It is my privilege to speak

today in this debate about the national energy program and what it will do for Canada and for Canadians. Before getting into the more substantive elements of my remarks, I would like to spend a minute on the long rumination of the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) on the, as it was called, "budget of a dead government".

The hon. member referred last night to a 30 per cent cubic foot increase in the price of gas. I am not surprised that he had so much trouble as the minister of finance because he cannot tell the difference between one cubic foot and 1,000 cubic feet. The hon. member cited many figures today. For the record, I would like to put a certain number of figures in *Hansard* and before the Canadian public so that they may judge what the Conservative budget of last year may have meant in terms of their prices for gasoline, home heating oil and natural gas. I will satisfy myself by putting the figures on the record. I think they speak for themselves. According to our estimation the 1979 budget, the so-called "Crosbie budget", would have meant that the per gallon price of gasoline would have gone up to \$1.56 in 1981; \$1.75 in 1982; \$2.32 in 1983 and \$2.63 in 1984. If these figures are compared with the present budget with its per gallon price of \$1.36 in 1981; \$1.53 in 1982; \$1.71 in 1983 and \$1.95 in 1984 there is a difference of over 60 cents in the price of a gallon of gasoline between our budget and the budget proposed by the hon. member for St. John's West last year.

The difference in the figures on natural gas prices is even more telling. If one were to take the price of natural gas at the Toronto city gate in terms of dollars per 1,000 cubic feet, not per cubic foot, the 1979 budget proposal meant the following prices: 1980, \$2.75; 1981, \$3.45; 1982, \$4.10; 1983, \$6.55 and 1984, \$7.90. Our program will mean the following prices for those years: \$2.90 for 1980, \$3.05 for 1981, \$3.50 for 1982, \$3.95 for 1983 and \$4.60 for 1984.

● (1740)

The difference between \$7.90 and \$4.60 per thousand cubic feet in 1984 means a difference of over \$3.30 between the so-called "Crosbie budget" and the budget presented by the government last night.

The hon. member made a lot of references to heating oil. He was crying about the fate reserved to people who are going to heat their homes with oil in the next few years. I would remind the hon. member, and the Canadian public at large, that the 1979 "Crosbie budget" would have meant, under the present assumptions and assuming no substantial and large increases in the international price of oil, \$1.96 per gallon. Under our proposal there will be a maximum of \$1.51, a difference of about 45 cents for every gallon of heating oil. Yet the hon. member for St. John's West dares to shed tears, though he was trying to do this to the Canadian public last year. I think the Canadian public saw through this last February so I do not intend to spend more time talking about the consequences of that dead budget—dead, fortunately for the country.

In energy, as in other things, the essence of good politics is to make sensible promises to the electorate and the essence of