

home. But trying to do this without at the same time considering ways in which we could increase the revenue of government instead of considering raiding other programs is unacceptable to us. I believe it is unacceptable to the Canadian people both on practical and on philosophical grounds.

It seems to me that mothers and families who lose income through adjustment in the family allowance program, changes to it or the elimination thereof, or through changes in the tax deductions for dependants, and then who may gain through this program, will not be fooled. They will know that in the long run, or in the short run for that matter, their situation is not improved significantly. Then there will be those who do have a net benefit from this legislation. In my opinion, they will not be happy either. They will not be happy to know that their benefit comes at the expense of other people because of the intention of this government to pay for this particular piece of legislation at the expense of other programs already in place.

I suggest that the government, if it is intent on pursuing this proposal to the state of implementation, should start to get serious about the other side of the question of government spending, that is, government revenue. It should seek out ways in which more revenue can accrue to the Canadian public purse by getting a bigger share of the wealth which is created through the abundant resources of our country. In this way we will not always be in a position, as we have been of late, of having to choose between social programs because we mistakenly believe that we have reached the limit of economic capability to engage in various social programs.

I do not believe for one minute that we have reached that limit of our ability to innovate and to do new things. But I sense in the country, and particularly on the part of this government, a feeling that we have reached the limit of the funds available for social programs.

In my view this is a terrible premise on which to act as a government. I suggest to the government that it get serious, not just about restraint on ways to raise new money. We should not have to face the kinds of difficult decisions that we now mistakenly believe we have to face because we do not address the other side of the restraint argument, which is the raising of new moneys.

**Mr. Blaine A. Thacker (Lethbridge-Foothills):** Mr. Speaker, I speak as a person committed to Bill C-20 which is before the House. I think that it is a good measure and should be passed.

As a new member of this House, I must say that for a number of days it was interesting to listen to members of the New Democratic Party and their rhetoric on various bills and motions before us. I now have no doubt that the purpose of members of the New Democratic Party and some members opposite in the loyal opposition is to filibuster this bill, or certainly to stall it. It has become boring to listen to the NDP rhetoric. It is true that certain people walk through life backwards opposing everything and having no creative ideas on the various matters before this House. This is a party that

### *Mortgage Tax Credit*

lacks dynamic ideas and the ability to lead. It is not dealing with the real problems of the country. On all bills that we have faced to this point we have heard criticism with no alternatives. That applies whether the finance committee is dealing with high interest rates or whether it is this bill before us. How limited is the view of that party, with no real alternatives? It has a repertoire limited really to three phrases—"attack on profits", "multinational corporations" and "rip-off".

First let me deal with the phrase "attack on profits". Anyone who has been in business, certainly the small business community in this nation, understands that the word "profit" is simply gross revenues less the cost of producing that product and putting it on the market. We all know, except members of the NDP, that profit is necessary if plants are to be expanded and if new capital equipment is to be bought to fulfil future needs.

Next, with respect to multinationals, there is always an attack on multinationals whenever that word comes up in the Income Tax Act. It is only through the multinationals that highly complex and technical oil sands plants can be developed and highly technical machines can be produced. It is only through a multinational corporation that the money and the skills can be brought together in order to develop a huge project. It cannot be done by simple corporations or by proprietors. It certainly cannot be done by government. It is interesting that the NDP have made such vicious attacks on the multinational corporations when in fact the union pension plans and members of the unions hold thousands and millions of shares in those multinational firms.

Concerning rip-offs, I have heard these two words constantly used with never a stitch of evidence in support, and certainly no hard evidence.

It was gratifying to hear the hon. member for Winnipeg-Birds Hill (Mr. Blaikie) refer to revenue. He should have been concerned with revenue. Over the last ten years the Liberal-NDP love affair has driven this nation into a budgetary deficit of \$11 billion each year, and into a current account deficit of \$7 billion. That has to be laid directly at their feet; it is their responsibility.

What is their philosophy? Again, we are always faced with a great deal of hoo-haw and rudeness from their side of the House. If they were running the country they would not permit the same free expression that we permit here. Their philosophy is the philosophy of the ant hill, of the beehive, that everybody has to be reduced to the same, that there should not be a chance of opportunity for people to build and to grow in this country. Sir, they will always remain in their present position with that attitude.

With respect to this bill, the hon. member for Broadview-Greenwood (Mr. Rae) has argued that the bill will not help solve the problem of the inner cities. There is no doubt that the problem of the inner cities is great. This bill does have a provision in it that could go some substantial way toward helping that problem. Anyone in the inner city who wants to renovate their home can do so and deduct the interest on any mortgage against their income tax pursuant to this bill.