

Income Tax Act

the fiscal policy of this Government. I am sure all Members on the other side would want that just as much as I do because we want to know what the policies of this Government are.

An Hon. Member: This is the House of Commons, not Queen's Park.

Mr. Boudria: The Member on the other side said that this is the House of Commons and not Queen's Park. That is quite true. Maybe the Government should also realize, when it presents its plans to bring forward its budgetary document, that this is in fact the House of Commons. Maybe the Government should have planned its Budget for the benefit of Canadians instead of for the benefit of the Ontario Conservative Party, which is what the Government did.

I have another suggestion for deficit reduction, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Chartrand: What was your first one?

Mr. Boudria: Today I placed question No. 319 on the Order Paper. You may want to read question No. 319, Mr. Speaker. It takes up about a page and a half. It concerns the Shamrock Summit. The Irish eyes were smiling, but do you know at what cost, Mr. Speaker? If I had spent \$320,000 in Quebec City, my Irish eyes would be smiling too, but the Irish eyes of the taxpayers will not be smiling when they foot the bill.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Boudria: I say to them over there, do not think this is funny. I am sure the people of Quebec want meaningful employment.

[*Translation*]

My constituents of Glengarry-Prescott-Russell would like to get better jobs too. But the government will certainly not provide better jobs by squandering taxpayers' money on worthless programs to please our Prime Minister's boss, the President of the United States. Because you are quite objective and are not biased like PC members opposite, Mr. Speaker, you can understand that spending \$320,000 over a weekend to entertain the President of the United States is a complete waste. All the while, of course, the Prime Minister of Canada claimed to be a head of state.

[*English*]

The Prime Minister, while he was in Quebec City, while he was spending all this money, increasing our deficit in doing it—this is so you don't bring me to order, Mr. Speaker, and so you are sure I speak to the Bill—was having delusions of grandeur pretending that he was a head of state. We could see the seal on the front of the podium. We could see him meeting the U.S. head of state at the airport. I do not mind the fellow having delusions of grandeur. All of us have them at one time or another. But sometimes he was referring to Cabinet Ministers as "my Ministers". Mr. Speaker, I think the man thinks he is the Queen. He is suffering from something which needs to be cured. He needs to be brought down to earth. This is just

terrible. In any case, the cost of that particular weekend in Quebec City to Canadian taxpayers was \$320,000.

● (1730)

Let us have a look at the promises which were made during the election campaign.

An Hon. Member: You can't say that with a straight face.

Mr. Boudria: I laugh at this, but actually some of those Tory promises are enough to make one cry. There were 338 of them. During the election campaign the Tories were going to reduce the deficit, and again we are talking about deficit reduction. Approximately 113 of those promises were to spend more money. How does one reduce the deficit by spending more money? There were five promises to spend less money. How does one reconcile those two points? Perhaps a Tory Member could tell us how Conservative mathematics work. In terms of raising money, they made two particular promises to increase the revenue of the country and 26 promises to reduce it. This is rather interesting in terms of deficit reduction and initiative on the part of the Government to reduce the deficit. It is symptomatic of the schizophrenic behaviour of the Government.

This particular Government may say that it wants to reduce the deficit. That is about the same amount of truth as when the President of the United States claimed that he wanted to reduce the deficit. Perhaps government Members want to change their spending priorities. They want to remove programs which have helped poor people and the needy. They clearly said that in their document entitled *Expenditure and Program Review*, also known as the blue book of cut-backs, introduced last November 8. On black Thursday, November 8, when this particular document was introduced, they said that they did not want to reduce the deficit but that they wanted to rearrange their spending priorities. They wanted to spend more on arms, on military uniforms, on limousines for Cabinet Ministers and on porkbarrelling, which brings me to another topic. They did not want to reduce the deficit. They wanted to spend money on things that were different. They wanted to spend money on the things which I have enumerated. They wanted to spend less on people who need it most. They wanted to spend less for farmers who saw many cut-backs in that particular document. They wanted to spend less on those who needed it and more on Tory friends.

Where is the deficit cutting measure when it comes to giving salary increases to Roy McMurtry and Lawrence Hannigan? We know how much money we should be paying these particular people. After all, Mr. Hannigan only had 20 strikes in 10 years where he used to work! They appointed that gentleman and gave him a raise which brought his salary to \$135,000 per year. He was a defeated Conservative candidate, defeated by the Hon. Member for Laval-des-Rapides (Mr. Garneau). After being defeated, Mr. Hannigan got a big job at \$135,000 per year. That is almost enough to make Tory back-benchers and the surfers on this side wish they had lost.

An Hon. Member: Who are the surfers?