

and other services to which Canadians have become accustomed. Unless very serious steps are taken to deal with the deficit, every Canadian will suffer. We in this generation will pay the price but, even worse, so will generations to come.

I should like to ask a common sense question of members of the Liberal Party and of the New Democratic Party: How long can we continue to spend money which we do not have? Obviously, from some of the remarks, it is of no concern to them. It has not been of any concern to them over the last 15 years. Apparently they continue to treat it as some sort of joke. It is not a joke. Responsible steps should be taken. The only way to deal with the problem in the short run would be either to borrow more funds or to print money. In other words, we would either have inflation through the printing of money and the debasing of our currency or we will have the problem down the road of being unable to service the national debt. My main motivation in coming to Parliament—and it was that of many others—was to face the deficit and to try to grapple with it in a meaningful way. I am disappointed, in fact appalled, to have found the slap-happy, casual attitude displayed to the deficit by members of the opposition Parties.

Bill C-84 was a reasonable approach to dealing with the deficit problem—a modest increase in taxes, some juggling around, nothing too severe. Yet, all we hear at this point is criticism from the opposition Parties which have their heads in the sand. Over the years the marriage between the two of them has created a deficit of impossible dimensions. Now, when a Government comes along which is prepared to take some reasonable and meaningful steps, what do we hear from them? We hear nothing but more whining and complaining. It is time for some reasonable response on the part of the Opposition. We should hear from them. In fact, we should have a vote in the House right now. Perhaps the opposition Parties would like to respond at this point, get their heads out of the sand and face up to the common sense approach. With the kind of deficit we have in the country, we have to take in more revenue, spend less and work toward balancing the books.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry-Prescott-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I was truly astonished to hear the speech of the Hon. Member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. Wilson). It was unbelievable. I am sure that Conservative Members across the way will agree that the Conservative Party is a different one than you and I used to know, Mr. Speaker. Do you remember the Conservative Party? Being the non-partisan person you are, Mr. Speaker, you will recall when the Conservative Party placed an advertisement in Canadian newspapers which indicated the following:

You've heard a lot about the Constitution lately, but how much have you heard about deindexing?

Actually that was the title of the advertisement which appeared in the early 1980s. It went on to indicate:

The Constitution is big news now. So big, that you probably haven't heard all that much about the Budget the Liberals are going to bring down soon.

● (1630)

Mr. Brisco: What about six and five, Boudria?

Income Tax Act, 1986

Mr. Boudria: Listen to this and you may learn something. In that Budget there could be something called deindexing. Well, no longer do we need to speculate about deindexing. It's here. It has arrived. It arrived on the Tory bus, not the Liberal machine. The Big Blue Machine brought us the much dreaded, the much feared deindexing that we heard so much about not that long ago.

It was worth buying full page ads in weekly newspapers across the country to incite fear among the people of Canada when the Tories were in opposition, but now that they are in Government deindexing is a sound and reasonable approach. Yet when they were in opposition it was bad. This morning the Minister of State for Finance (Mrs. McDougall) said to us—not that eloquently, but said to us in any case—that in her view we should have been deindexing. She repudiated Tory policies of decades which wanted indexation. What happened to the Minister of State for Finance? Has she not read speeches by previous Leaders of the Conservative Party? What has happened to that Minister, repudiating Tory policies right, left and centre? No progressiveness in that Conservative, Mr. Speaker. She may have been elected as a Progressive Conservative, but she is obviously of the regressive preservative persuasion, and that is what has happened. Let us look at that.

An Hon. Member: Better than—

Mr. Boudria: Let us look at that—I will ignore the unparliamentary language that is used by some members of the Conservative Party. I am concerned with issues and people, not unparliamentary language by some of those nasty Tories making remarks in the House at this point.

The bells rung in this building a few years ago over a Bill. How long did they ring? Days and days they rang over a so-called omnibus Bill. An omnibus Bill, Mr. Speaker, for you and I, is a large Bill like this Bill C-84. Look how large it is, hundreds and hundreds of clauses and subclauses. How long have we debated this omnibus Bill? About 10 hours. I am sure that the Secretary of State (Mr. Bouchard) has read this Bill from one end to the other. He will understand how complex it is and he will want the House of Commons to have the benefit of a thorough debate on this very vital and important issue to Canadians, this issue that his Party has fought for so eloquently in the past when it was afraid of deindexing. Yes, Tories were afraid in the past but the fear has gone. That lust for power, that craving for money that Tories have now has created this kind of attitude on their part. Why do they want that money, Mr. Speaker?

An Hon. Member: To pay the Bills.

Mr. Boudria: It is to give to the poor people? Surely not. Is it to use for useful purposes? Well, that is to be questioned. Let me give instances of how this money will be wasted, squandered by the Government.

Let me bring to the attention of the House the revenues, the direct tax on persons, and I take this from an official secret Government document that was leaked to the Opposition.