

the Throne. The pursuit of consensus seems to have taken on the same kind of timetable as the pursuit of a national energy policy—if you can imagine anything as slow as that in the Year of the Hare!

And the world restraint, or the understanding of what makes up restraint on the part of the government establishment, seems to be totally confused in the mind of the minister. Here is something else the minister said on January 27, and if this statement does not demonstrate confusion then it can only be another example of intellectual dishonesty on the part of the minister.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** That is a great option you have given me.

**Mr. Stanfield:** I am very glad to give the minister a little leeway, but I will remind him of what he said, about next May, and then perhaps he will not think I was too niggardly in the options I gave him. In Toronto the minister said:

I notice, incidentally, that Mr. Stanfield recently suggested we should provide still further stimulus by yet a further cut in taxes. That represents something of a conversion on his part, since during the election campaign last summer he also was preaching the old time religion—tight fiscal and monetary policies, budget balance, consumer credit controls and, of course, wage and price controls.

Is the minister confused, or what? During the election campaign I proposed specific tax cuts. I outlined how money for such cuts and other expenditures could be provided by some discipline in government spending—particularly a serious program to cut waste. In terms of expenditure, however, I was a piker compared to the Minister of Finance. I should like to hear him defend his party's indefensible election promises, particularly in this atmosphere of restraint we have heard so much about. That would be a real lesson in adroitness in the Year of the Hare.

I think it is very interesting and significant that the Minister of Finance continues to misrepresent my position. I do not know why he bothers. After all, they won the election. Why does he continue to misrepresent my position during the campaign? It is true that I proposed a balanced budget—a balance to be achieved basically by the government getting its own spending in order. I did mention the possibility of credit controls on the basis of something that we would consider—as something that would be involved in monetary restraint.

I certainly promoted the need for comprehensive price and income controls. Of course the minister referred to price and wage controls because that suits his purpose, but it was price and income control just as he is now trying to achieve consensus in this country. I guess I was even trying to preach old time religion, but not the way the minister defined it.

At no time, however, did I advocate tight fiscal and monetary measures as a cure for inflation. As a matter of fact the entire premise of our program—and I think the minister understood this—was that although it would be a tough program it was the only way to attack inflation which would not have to involve highly restrictive fiscal and monetary approaches and massive unemployment in Canada. I put that program forward—and the minister well knows it—as a framework in which we could fight

### *Income Tax*

inflation and, at the same time, continue a policy of reasonable expansion of our economy. I certainly spoke a good deal about the government's inane monetary policy over a number of years and how much this had contributed to inflation, but I never preached a tight money policy and higher income taxes as the minister suggests I did.

Why does the minister feel it necessary at this stage in his career—and mine—to misrepresent a position I took in the past? The only excuse I can think of is the feeling of insecurity he has about his position. I am not referring to his position as Minister of Finance but the position of his policies as Minister of Finance. It is only because of the lack of confidence that he has in the policies he is advocating that he feels it necessary to continue to misrepresent the policies I advocated.

I do not know what the government takes seriously aside from its own perpetuation in power, and I am certainly not prepared to believe that it is serious about discipline and restraint, or even elimination of wasteful practices in the expenditure of public funds. It will have to go a long way to make me change my assessment on that score.

I repeat our three objectives in putting forward this amendment: first, to protest the government's continued lack of leadership and growing lack of credibility in the face of severe economic and social problems; second, to draw attention to the unconscionable increase in personal income tax revenues; and third, to focus attention on the need for concepts like restraint and discipline in spending to be taken seriously by the government.

Members of the Official Opposition will support the amendment for the reasons which I have outlined and we would welcome the support of members of other parties in the House who consider these objectives to be worth-while.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** The hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent).

**Mr. Stanfield:** Madam Speaker, on a question of privilege I should like to withdraw a reference I made which was not intended to be as offensive as it sounded—associating the minister with a snake changing its skin. I do not think that was appropriate. I should like to apologize and withdraw the remark.

**Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby):** Madam Speaker, it would have been very enlightening for the 817,000 Canadians who are unemployed today to have witnessed this afternoon's question period in the House of Commons. On the one hand they would have seen the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner) smiling his way through the worst economic situation in Canadian history since the depression and, on the other, they would have seen the Conservative Party in the guise of a military band whistling its way through the same economic situation. Of course, the tune they were playing would have had some specific reference to the royalty. On neither side of the House was there any serious attempt to recognize or deal with the kind of economic situation we are faced with in Canada, which is comparable to that in most countries in