

ences, that members should not be allowed to refer to debates that are taking place in the other place.

I might read citation 314 to the hon. member. I agree that this Parliament might be found in a situation in which many of the subjects debated in this House are also debated over there in a more day to day manner than normal. However I have to follow the rules of the House. I will put on the record a citation that might be useful not only for this debate but for further debates in this session of Parliament. At page 102 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, fifth edition, citation 314 reads:

The rule that allusions to debates in the other House of the current session are out of order, prevents fruitless arguments between members of two distinct bodies who are unable to reply to each other, and guards against recrimination and offensive language in the absence of the party assailed; but it is mainly founded upon the understanding that the debates of the other House are not known.

Mr. Andras: Mr. Speaker, I will limit my comments and quotations from Gideon as written by certain people who shall be from this moment on nameless.

The thought was expressed about this problem of credibility and the damage done by cynicism and spectacular reversals.

Talk about cynicism—

Mr. Pepin: And reversals.

Mr. Andras: I will come to that, or you can do it too. To talk about cynicism, talk about their promise to move our embassy to Jerusalem; that takes absolutely top billing.

• (1520)

Reversals? Two billion dollars of tax cuts we were going to get, eh?

Mr. Taylor (Bow River): On a point of order, what has Jerusalem got to do with the income tax bill? We are talking about an income tax bill.

Mr. Andras: Well, many more of these incidents and they are going to have to raise their expenditure estimates to pay for Bob's expeditions, and they will have to raise the income tax accordingly! I have to ask the question: is that erstwhile ambassador of embarrassment off to Argentina to clean up the mess there? Will he be off next to Japan—

Mr. Kempling: Oh, we would like you to open up your Argentina mess. We would enjoy that, I think.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I have difficulty in hearing what the hon. member is saying.

Mr. Andras: Mr. Speaker, I really do feel sorry for the Minister of Finance. Originally, as he took office, or shortly after, with that delightful candour of his he indicated that he was expendable. Well, ministers of finance are probably the closest to being expendable than any of the ministers of the Crown and probably should be, particularly this one. He must

Income Tax Act

have had some serious disappointments, I would think, because on occasion he shows some glimmering of ability to add one and one and make two, though often it is two and a half—it used to be two and a half but now it is one and a half because he is talking about restraint rather than stimulative deficits. He has had to reverse his position with regard to the deputy minister of finance.

Mr. Herbert: He was overruled.

Mr. Andras: He was overruled, we do not know by whom but he was overruled, certainly. Most embarrassing. The Minister of Finance holds one of the most prestigious ministerial positions in the country and the way in which he is treated has a lot to do with the credibility of the government and so forth. I could be disappointed in him, but I suspect that the Minister of Finance must have fought pretty hard against this crazy mortgage deductibility scheme he was forced to bring in when he discussed the matter in cabinet. If there is any validity whatsoever to the extravagant argument that the government is tight for fiscal room in which to move, ministers have, with that \$2.5 billion a year under that program, blown one of the only options they may have for any really important stimulative measure they might have taken with regard to economic development, regional development, small business or anything else. He has only been in office ten minutes or so, but you can see him wearing down already—

Some hon. Members: Oh!

Mr. Andras: —because he knows he is mouthing a lot of garbage. He cannot honour the promises to which he was party during the campaign except for those he most probably disagrees with, and he really isn't going to make his story stick with regard to many of the answers he has given to the House in which he continues to blame everything on the past. That will wear very thin. He has had to reverse himself time after time, though. Page after page of *Hansard*—that's for this place, not anywhere else. You should read it. It should be required reading for every Conservative member. The hon. member for St. John's West when he was brilliantly elucidating, wittily elucidated his horror at the idea of high interest rates. Really! Put those back to back with his statements now. Even my good friends over on the other side—and I have some—must, I am sure, be terribly embarrassed. I should like to have a little—I won't use the word "bug"—in their caucus because there is a nasty connotation to that, but it would be most interesting if we could listen in to the Conservative party caucus and hear what they said—and many of them are still saying it—about interest rates, as compared to what the Minister of Finance is doing about them.

Mr. Rae: What do you think?

Mr. Andras: The hon. member over here, who is making his mark—

An hon. Member: On Broadway. The hon. member for Broadway.