

by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance as being the profligate energy wasters. These are the new profligates, the new sinners in our society, Mr. and Mrs. Jones.

● (1640)

I want to ask the Minister of Finance to answer these questions. Perhaps he can give these answers during the next election campaign when he has an opportunity to meet Mr. and Mrs. Jones if he comes into my riding. Did Mr. and Mrs. Jones build the factory that is on the outskirts of Toronto, requiring Mr. Jones to drive 20 miles to get to work? Did Mr. Jones design the car that gets 16 or 18 miles to the gallon? Did Mr. Jones design an urban transportation system that does not serve industrial parks such as we have in metropolitan Toronto? How can Mr. Jones buy a new, more fuel-efficient car, with consumer loans now running somewhere between 16 per cent and 20 per cent, and higher if Mr. Jones has had the bad luck to run into credit problems earlier? How can he do this when he is getting constant lectures from governor Bouey and others that he is over-consuming, that he is sinning and that he should be restrained?

How can Mr. and Mrs. Jones afford to buy a gas furnace when that involves a capital expenditure of over \$1,000 and the interest rates are running at 16 per cent to 20 per cent? How can they do that when the Minister of Finance admitted in this House today that there is nothing in this budget that allows people to write off the cost of changing from oil to gas?

Another question that comes to mind, Mr. Speaker is this: are Mrs. Jones and her children encouraged to take public transportation when she is paying an excise tax of 15 cents a gallon? That is one of the things, along with the charge to the farmer and along with the charge to the fisherman, that puts the lie to this government when it says this is a conservation tax. If it is a conservation tax, why in the name of goodness are they putting it on urban transportation when that is precisely the means of transportation the government wants the people to use to replace the sinful car? If they want to replace the sinful car, what are they asking the farmers of Canada to do—go back to the horse and the oxen? Is that the standard of conservation the government is seeking to apply to the farmer?

Is the government seriously suggesting that the farmers of Canada will be able to conserve, that they are the profligate energy wasters? All the government is doing is passing this on to the consumer, or putting the farmer out of business. The government is giving the farmer two choices. Those farmers who have a lot of market power will be able to pass this on to the consumer. Those farmers, the vast majority of them, who do not have a lot of market power will get stuck. That is the policy and the result of the policy of this government.

Should the Joneses take advantage of the CHIP program, that program which the minister just two months ago was making such fun of and now has come out in favour of, and which is a substitute for a policy on insulation—should they take advantage of the CHIP program to insulate their home when their neighbour has just had wet cellulose poured into his walls by a night flyer insulation company and his house is

The Budget—Mr. Rae

suffering from undue damp and mildew with no reduction in heating cost? Is that the model the government wants to put forward when there is no inspection? I can give the figures, the people, and the houses, for the minister's information. I have done it already in one or two cases of people who have been taken to the cleaners by companies in the city of Toronto, and who have had no inspection from CMHC because CMHC does not provide that kind of inspection.

I want to ask this government where Mr. and Mrs. Jones will conserve? They will not conserve on energy because the energy costs which they are undergoing are constant. There is no way they can conserve without a dramatic change, but not in their lifestyle as has been suggested. The Joneses are not suddenly going to be transformed into upper income civil servants running around Ottawa in Volvos, Mr. Speaker. The Joneses are facing the realities of life. Mr. Jones' factory is not suddenly going to be moved next door to his house. He cannot suddenly demand that the Toronto Transit Commission, which has just had a \$61 million deficit, start providing decent 24-hour transit for a 24-hour factory 20 miles from his house outside the city. He must have his car.

The hard fact of the matter is that it is lower and middle-income Canadians who have the gas guzzling cars because those were the cars they bought years ago and cannot now afford to replace.

An hon. Member: They cannot afford to drive them.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: The Tories say they cannot afford to drive them; "let them eat cake."

Mr. Rae: Where will they conserve? They will conserve on other items. They will not buy a new fridge which might be more fuel efficient. They will not be able to afford to buy it. They will not be able to buy furniture. Let me give the minister an elementary lesson in the realities of life. The people who make fridges and furniture are laid off when people do not buy their products. Mr. Jones' neighbour who works at the John Inglis factory making fridges is going to be laid off because the market for consumer durables like fridges is going to go down. That is the meaning of the multiplier effect. It was not invented by the anti-Christ Keynes. It was somebody looking at the reality of an industrial situation who said this is what happens. When you put people out of work, that puts more people out of work, and that puts more people out of work. If you take money out of the economy and tax people to death that is exactly what is going to happen. The people will cut down on entertainment. They will not drink so much, they will not smoke so much, and they will not have such a good time. They will cut down on clothing, and perhaps they will even cut down on food.

An hon. Member: It might save on health care costs.

Mr. Rae: If you cut down on food it might not save on health care costs. I suppose the hon. member who has just spoken might suggest that the only perfect energy conservers