

better than to make the claims which he made in this House yesterday.

This is but a tiny Bill. It has only four pages. We are taking much time in the House of Commons to debate this Bill. However, in addition to debating the Bill, we are debating the inaccurate comments made in the House yesterday. I think the Government should be held to account for that. It is our duty to hold it accountable. We are trying to do that, but it is pretty hard to keep the Government straight. We are doing our best because we know the kind of Government that this is.

I have read the translation of the Bill before us. The French text and the English text do not appear to be the same. I consider them to be different. I invite you, Mr. Speaker, and the Table Officers to examine the text of the Bill. I believe that in the English text of the Bill we are talking about rounding off the salary at the level of the total indemnity, including the expense allowance. However, that is not explicitly written in the French text. You are learned in the law, Mr. Speaker. I invite you to read page 2 of the Bill. I believe there are discrepancies in the translation of the Bill. I invite Members to look at this because it does not appear, at first glance, to be identical in both official languages.

I will take a moment to talk about more of the fiscal policies of the Government. After all, we are talking about a budget Bill. The Hon. Member for Saint-Léonard—Anjou is paying very close attention to these remarks. I know he would want me to bring to your attention the fact that there has been a tax increase on certain construction goods and other products. I know he is very concerned about this because he has spoken to me about this in the past. The Member for Saint-Léonard—Anjou is a very fine Member of Parliament and is obviously very concerned about these things. As you know, he is the small business critic for our Party, a duty which he discharges very well. He wanted me to bring to your attention that the tax rate on construction goods after the 1985 Budget was 7 per cent, and 8 per cent after the 1986 Budget. Of course, that will increase the price of housing and commercial structures in Canada.

● (1140)

It is time that these facts were brought to the attention of the House, and I congratulate the Member for Saint-Léonard—Anjou for bringing this to my attention so I could raise it with the House. Let me expand on the fiscal policy of the Conservative regime.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, we could talk, for instance, about the 1 per cent increase in sales tax on alcohol and tobacco. Well, most Canadians may not object that much, because these taxes do not affect so-called essential goods. That may be true, but the fact remains that increasing the cost of these goods means increasing the cost of living. Whether they are essential or not, these products are purchased by the Canadian consumer, and price increases in this area help increase inflation. Mr. Speaker, these are problems we have to consider.

*Senate and House of Commons Act*

All things considered, we are still talking about a Bill which flows from the Budget. I draw your attention to the increase in the air transportation tax, and I do so for the significant reason that, as I said, a lot of goods are transported by aircraft. It is still a working tool for quite a few Canadians such as northern residents and businessmen. So again this tax will fuel inflation since it will boost the price of products and goods marketed by these companies, and all Canadians will eventually feel the pinch.

Mr. Speaker, a word about the telecommunication programming services tax, another case of an increase to 7 and 8 per cent by the Conservative Government.

[*English*]

The Government has been less than sincere in its statements about these tax increases. I would not want to use other words in the fear that they may not be parliamentary. I certainly would not want to do that, out of my great respect for the House. However, let me point out that the Government made commitments to the people of Canada during the election campaign. I may have already said that the Government made 338 Tory promises during the last election. I have listed them in a book called "338 Tory Promises". A copy of this book is available to any Canadian who wants to write me. There is no postage necessary and I will send them a copy of the book "338 Tory Promises".

Let me quote from this book so we can compare what the Conservatives promised with what they have done. I know that you have had to endure, as I have, listening to those partisan Tory promises during the last election campaign. I know that you look at those promises objectively since the Speaker is always non-partisan.

I believe it is important to remind those partisan Tories opposite about those promises that were made in the last election, and I invite my colleague from Saint-Léonard—Anjou to note some of the contradictions between the Tory promises and the budget Bills, including the Bill before us today.

In the category of Government management, the Tories said that they would adopt a positive approach to productivity management through the development of incentives to meet objectives specified in any programs placed before Cabinet or Parliament. What was the positive approach to productivity in delaying for seven months the appointment of a consultant to finish the building? I suggest to the Hon. Member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle) that it simply does not coincide with that promise.

The Conservatives promised to ensure that Parliament performs a stronger role in creating and monitoring the expenditures of the Government. Was Parliament consulted before the prison was built at Port-Cartier?

**Mr. Gagliano:** The Member for Drummond (Mr. Guilbault) was not even consulted.