

The Budget—Mr. Domm

kind and not in quality or quantity from those of other provinces, how can the Minister of Finance justify his marshalling of revenue from one particular resource?

We in Ontario, particularly the members of Parliament from the province, should ask ourselves when will he be instituting a hydro export tax, a coal export tax, a uranium export tax, ownership funds to nationalize our copper, iron ore, zinc, silver, gold, platinum, and indeed, all the other resources Ontario claims—or rather has no need to claim as they are constitutionally protected to develop and market as Ontario sees fit. Why does the minister not penalize Ontario's resource markets by adopting punitive measures against her foreign ventures and her development capital?

Why does the Minister of Finance not reduce Inco's net profits overnight by 12 per cent? Why does he not scoff with his colleague's bravado at the possibility of the mineral companies leaving our borders for more hospitable political atmospheres elsewhere? Watch out, Ontario! Perhaps consideration is even now being given to pegging the selling price for nickel at 85 per cent of the world price.

Ontario, beware of the socialistic trends clearly evident in this Liberal budget. What is happening in the west could be the forerunner of things to happen in Ontario. The government is charting a dangerous course in this respect. The people of Canada must realize that this is a punitive exercise, not only upon them through their tax dollars, but against their futures. We may be witnessing not only the perpetration of irrevocable damage to our oil industry—for it is our oil industry one way or the other—but we may also become horrified observers of the destruction of our dearly held and highly valued constitutional system, our economic freedom and our liberty to pursue prosperity through personal determination, not through the high-handed interference of a God-like central government.

The Conservative budget was a reasonable, straight-forward, honest and compassionate document. It was a realistic program for the 1980s. But how the Liberals vilified it! How passionately they cried foul against the excise tax of 18 cents on gasoline. They appealed to the electorate saying they could not specify the exact price of gasoline "until negotiations with the provinces have taken place". The so-called "made-in-Canada" price or, should I say, "made-in-Ottawa" price would result in a lower price to consumers than the one proposed in the defeated Conservative budget because it would not include, as members opposite said, an 18-cent excise tax on gasoline. The ironic mockery of that phrase haunts every Canadian householder who cares to admit that they have been bamboozled and befuddled by the backroom subterfuge and the absolute self-interest of this Liberal government. "A lower price to consumers." Let us see how substantive that a phrase is. The Minister of Finance states in his budget:

● (2030)

The blended price will never exceed 85 per cent of the international price or the average price in the U.S. whichever is lower.

And what did the Crosbie budget say? It said:

All increases in the domestic price of oil would be subject to the condition that the average delivered price in Toronto would not exceed 85 per cent of the lower of the Chicago price or the international price.

What is the sum difference between this budget and the Crosbie commitment to 85 per cent in that much maligned budget? There is no difference whatsoever. This is the consumer protectionism with which ministers opposite have befuddled the people.

It pains me that the Minister of Finance obliges me to point out such an obvious and logical fact to him and to this House—but then, they all know it perfectly well. Certainly everyone in this country now knows that they have been "had" by the Liberals with their broken election commitments to lower oil prices.

Confronted by the expected resistance from the producing provinces to a tax on natural gas exports, the Minister of Finance did the obvious thing. He did not tax natural gas exports—he taxed natural gas. He taxed all natural gas—domestic, exported, still in the ground—any gas that is obviously around. Now there is an obvious man. And Canadians are seeing how obvious he is.

He knew that the modern, sophisticated voter is far too aware, far too smart to be taken in by the clever ploy of calling a spade a spade—and calling an excise tax an excise tax. He called it, therefore, and logically, by another name, or, rather, by several other names. The Crosbie excise tax was changed, to the more aristocratic sounding "Canadian ownership account", "wellhead price", "petroleum compensation charge", and the "oil export tax". Through these new energy taxes, the government will take an extra \$3 billion in revenue from the pockets of consumers. As the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) mentioned this weekend, this amount will not be spread equally and fairly across the whole country but will be focused like a penalty on those who are now at the centre of the drive for an energy and industrial base in Canada—the energy producing provinces.

When these budget measures are combined with the new taxes imposed last April, they will raise taxes by \$3.5 billion more than the Crosbie budget which, as the hon. members opposite will remember, was condemned utterly for uncontrolled spending.

The budget raises the price of oil this year by a total of \$4.55 per barrel. The Crosbie budget raised it by \$4 per barrel yet the former Liberal opposition condemned it for that. Now the government has increased the price by \$4.55 at the wellhead—made up of \$3 at the wellhead, 75 cents for Syncrude and 80 cents in the current budget. The Crosbie budget would have increased oil prices by \$4.50 per barrel every year until 1985 but the present budget will increase them by a greater amount. In all logic, Mr. Speaker, how can the Minister of Finance claim he is not increasing prices more than was the case in the Crosbie budget? There is one big reason, Mr. Speaker. The Canadian electorate made a mistake in February. The minister proposes to increase the price of oil at the wellhead in 1986 by \$7 per barrel.