

Supply

to consumers. Again the minister has tried to hide a tax grab. He claims that replacing income-averaging annuity contracts with forward-averaging will not harm taxpayers. Again, no expert outside the tax department believes that. The only way it can be true, and I am quoting the minister's example, is not to earn money. Well, he is certainly making that possible.

That, Mr. Speaker, is also the case in the matter of indexing. The minister claims indexing is a tax cut. It is only a tax cut if income does not increase. The minister will not change his budget just because it is wrong. He says, and I quote his speech in Toronto:

I believe that we must resist the temptation to veer away from restraint—whether to gain a temporary and minimal increase in jobs, or simply to reap the transitory political benefit.

This minister speaks of restraint, yet his government spends \$70 million on government advertising. One day in October last year he and his colleagues spent \$27,000 to fly three cabinet ministers in three separate JetStars to the city of Winnipeg, a flight which, had they gone commercial—and let them fly first-class—would have cost the taxpayers only \$1,770 for the round trip. This government, as we learned today, is prepared to write off \$125 million on Consolidated Computer Inc. This government, Sir, was spending \$40 a day to have a Quebec City newspaper flown directly to Ottawa when they could walk over to the Chateau Laurier and buy the same paper for 50 cents. That is restraint for this government. The clumsy and stupid way they handled the Petrofina purchase means that Canadians paid \$300 million to \$400 million more than was necessary to buy the shares.

The list of extravagances goes on. This government can find plenty of money to increase the pay of senior civil servants; it can find plenty of money to jet ministers around the country, because there is no restraint on ministers or senior civil servants. Restraint is for those 40,000 Canadians who will be forced out of their homes. Restraint is for those 35,000 Canadians who lose their jobs each month. Restraint is for the people that this letter and our motion talk about. What is being proposed by the government is not restraint, it is simple and cruel injustice; and any Liberal with a conscience will tell the Minister of Finance to cut his spending on advertising, to cut his spending on Petrofina shares, to cut his spending on \$40 newspapers which he can buy for 50 cents, and to start to care about the people who are suffering in this country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: This particular motion speaks of two kinds of changes concerning jobs and homes. There are other changes being sought by other Members of Parliament for equally legitimate reasons, because this is a bad budget which was drawn up with no understanding of the real world. Let it be clear that if the government is able to force Liberal members into line on this issue, they will try to force them into line on every other issue. The minister has said very clearly that he does not intend to make changes in his budget. He is trying to take the heat off here in the House of Commons and shunt the question off to the committee where he hopes it will be

forgotten. He was very clear about that in answering my colleague, the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Kilgour), the other day when the minister said:

Quite a number of representations were made following the budget in November and December. As the hon. member knows, on December 18 I made a number of changes which I regarded as necessary and urgent. It is my view that any further changes based upon representations and arguments of hon. members ought to be made when we reach the appropriate stage of the legislative process.

That means, Mr. Speaker, they ought never to be made. This minister has his pride at stake. He made a mistake, he was taken in by his public servants, but he is not man enough to stand up in the House of Commons and admit he made that mistake.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: He wants the whole country to pay the price. Individual Liberal members opposite will have to decide whether they put their minister's pride ahead of the interests of the people they represent here in the House of Commons.

Just one last thing about committees, Mr. Speaker. Committees take time and most Canadians do not have time. Thirty-five thousand Canadians are losing their jobs each month in this country. By the time the committee starts to sit, another 70,000 Canadians will be out of work. By the time the committee begins to report there will be another 100,000 Canadians out of work. Mr. Speaker, members of this House have an obligation to act now and not wait for another 100,000 or 200,000 Canadians to be forced out of work by the policies of this government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

The Canadian people cannot wait any longer, they want action and that is what the ten Montreal Liberals have understood. They said so to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and they went on to publish their views as an official statement of their recommendations. I shall now quote from their letter:

The message given by our fellow citizens is clear and easy to understand because it conveys a single central preoccupation: the economy. People are deeply concerned about their economic future, and while recognizing the importance of the fight against inflation, they believe the government should deal more directly with the alarming unemployment situation.

As members of the central-eastern part of Montreal, we realize that a real and lasting improvement (in the long term) of the job situation must necessarily come about through control of the inflation rate. However, we believe that it is possible to create jobs immediately in certain critical sectors without overstimulating the economy.

That was the letter signed by ten members, namely, the members for Saint-Léonard-Anjou (Miss Bégin), Laurier (Mr. Berger), Montréal-Mercier (Mrs. Hervieux-Payette), Rosemont (Mr. Lachance), Gamelin (Mr. Portelance), Hochelaga-Maisonneuve (Mr. Joyal), Saint-Jacques (Mr. Guilbault), Saint-Michel (Mrs. Killens), Montréal-Sainte-Marie (Mr. Malépart) and Bourassa (Mr. Rossi). We shall see today if they vote the way they talk. If these ten members vote against