

failure of the Government to meet that commitment. That was a commitment made by the Prime Minister who has reversed himself and swallowed himself, as he has done so often in the last four and a half years, with the help of all the Liberal leadership candidates who are now all out swallowing themselves as well.

We believe that can be done. It will not be easy, Mr. Speaker, but we can do it. If we had not been interrupted by a selfish, grasping Liberal Party, helped by its unindicted co-conspirators, the New Democratic Party, in December of 1979, we would have done it and Canada today would be that much better off than it is now.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault):** Are there any questions or comments relating to the remarks of the hon. gentleman?

**Mr. Althouse:** Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member rightly accused some of the Liberal leadership candidates of lacking specificity in their solutions to the economic problems. The second item in the Hon. Member's program to reverse government policy was that there would have to be an increase in revenues which, I understand, means an increase in the amount of taxes collected.

I would like the Hon. Member to be a little more specific now and to tell us whether he is indeed talking about increasing taxes. If he is simply making a vague reference to increasing the size of the economy, could he tell us how he intends to approach that particular problem so that we can, in fact, have increased revenues? Where is the Hon. Member going to get the increased revenues? By which method?

**Mr. Crosbie:** I tried to explain in my brief remarks, Mr. Speaker, that one would have to look both at the expenditure side and the revenue side. The New Democratic Party always advocates tax increases. As a matter of fact, in this House in recent days I have heard the hon. gentleman's Party urging a speculator's tax, whatever a speculator's tax is. If there is such a thing as a speculator's tax, I suppose that could be looked at. However, the kind of revenue increases which we prefer to think of are the kind which will come naturally and inexorably from a better Government which gives confidence, which in turn results in economic growth. That will reverse the decline in revenue which we now see happening in the economy.

There may well have to be other revenue increases. One would have to be in the Government to be able to look carefully at all sources to see which would be most conducive to economic growth or the least damaging to economic growth. One would have to look to see what is the exact economic condition at the time. Are we going to be in government in a month's time? Or are we going to be in government perhaps not for another year? The hon. gentleman must remember that members of this Government can sneak and skulk in their offices around Ottawa. They do not have to call an election until March of 1985. I do not know what the economic conditions are going to be in March, 1985, although I fear they will be a lot worse than they are now.

### *Supply*

Therefore, I cannot say now what I would do in March of 1985, not knowing the economic conditions in March of 1985. Will those Hon. Members opposite continue to cower in their offices, afraid to meet the electorate, afraid to go to an election, breaking all the parliamentary conventions, showing their lack of responsibility? Or will they call an election in June and let us take office in August? When will they choose to get out and let someone else get in? When I know the answer to that, I will tell the hon. gentleman with great specificity from where the revenue increases might come.

I am not like John Turner. John Turner knows that he is going to be in power by the middle of June. As soon as the Liberal convention is held, John Turner is anointed. The Turner butterfly takes over from the Trudeau caterpillar. He knows what the economic conditions are now. He can be asked properly and reasonably to be more specific. As a matter of fact, if the Liberal delegates were worth a darn, they would be pinning him down by asking: "What are you going to do?" They should be asking him: "What social programs are you going to streamline? What redundant services are you going to do away with? How are you going to be more efficient? You are going to be in office in June".

**Mr. Evans:** What would you do?

**Mr. Riis:** Mean and nasty things.

**Mr. Crosbie:** And Mr. Turner knows what the economic conditions of the day are. Despite my burning desire to show more specificity, I cannot do it until I know when the hon. gentleman will call an election. Then I will be as specific as you like.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault):** Are there any further questions?

**Mr. Althouse:** Mr. Speaker, I believe I am beginning to understand a slightly different meaning for the word "specificity" as a result of the Hon. Member's answer. Again, following up on an attempt to understand what "specificity" means, I wonder if the Hon. Member could clarify for us—since it was one of his criteria for reversing the current government approach—the matter of Canada-U.S. relations and restoring confidence among businessmen in Canada. That statement did not tell us very much. I wonder if the Hon. Member could take a couple of minutes to clarify and expand and, if possible, be specific as to precisely what sort of programs he is proposing to ease relations between Canada and the United States and to make businessmen feel welcome in this country. Perhaps the Hon. Member could also tell us just which areas of government policy are now causing businessmen to feel unwelcome and what sore spots exist between Canada and the United States which are hurting our economy.

**Mr. Crosbie:** Mr. Speaker, our relationship with the United States has, of course, improved a little since Mr. Hyde turned himself into Doctor Jekyll. We had the present Minister of Finance in his Mr. Hyde character role when he was Minister of Energy and brought in a so-called national energy policy