

*The Budget—Mr. Stanfield*

mental pictures we all had as boys, of the terror and catastrophe created on old warships by a wild cannon careening around the deck as the ship pitches and tosses.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Stanfield:** I don't know what is so amusing to the Prime Minister, but perhaps he would let me in on it.

**Mr. Trudeau:** The mental picture you are presenting.

**Mr. Stanfield:** I don't think that that's very relevant. The world today is like the deck of one of those ancient ships, with many cannons secured only by a very slender rope, ready to careen if somebody cuts the rope. I suggest, with regret, that no one is offering real leadership in attempting to make these cannons secure.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Stanfield:** The Prime Minister laughs.

**Mr. Trudeau:** I sure do at the metaphor.

**Mr. Stanfield:** That is a pretty good metaphor, and if the Prime Minister reflects on it I am sure he will agree.

Our Minister of Finance rattles around the world, and he talks like a cannon, at least in comparison with the rate at which I talk. If he has offered one constructive thought as to how these cannons should be made secure we have yet to hear it, and the budget address on Monday night did not contain any hint of it.

As far as we can tell, the government's international economic policy is like its domestic policy; it is fatuous, cowardly, inconsistent and dishonest.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Stanfield:** The government has its mandate to govern and to lead, but what in fact is it offering? Here we have a government picking a fight within our own country; dividing the country, endangering the development of future supplies of energy for Canadians, talking about a consensus but pursuing a confrontation. There was no attempt to come to grips with inflation. Yes, there was some language of warning; but what comes through essentially is complacency. How fortunate we are! If only those in charge of other countries could run their affairs as well as this government runs Canada!

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Stanfield:** There is nothing in the budget to summon Canadians to do battle with a mortal enemy that may destroy us. There is nothing here in the budget that encourages Canadians to accept some temporary sacrifice, to accept restraint in order to bring inflation under control. There was certainly no call to arms. There was a battle plan against the provinces, but there was certainly no battle plan against inflation.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Stanfield:** Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe (Mr. Wagner):

[Mr. Stanfield.]

That all the words after "that" shall be deleted and there be substituted the following:

"This House condemns the budget as failing to mount a concerted attack on domestic inflation while at the same time proposing measures which contribute to national disunity."

**Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to begin by commending the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) for what I thought was an excellent speech, and to indicate to you, Sir, and to the House, that we agree with his position on the constitutional issue. He put that issue very well and in very concise terms. I agree that the federal budget presented on Monday is a breach of confidence with the oil producing provinces of this country, and is something the government will dearly pay for in the future.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Nystrom:** Let me also say that the same thing holds true when it comes to equalization with respect to the province of Saskatchewan. Our province had a commitment from the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner), that equalization would not be touched if that province agreed to the oil agreement of last March. That, of course, is not going to be the result of the budget brought down last Monday.

I want to say that to me the budget brought down Monday night seemed like a classical Liberal 19th century type of approach to the economy. We might almost have seen Gladstone rather than the Minister of Finance presenting the budget on the evening of November 18, or we might have seen the ghost of Ben Benson, puffing his pipe and drafting the economic policies of this country. These are the things of which the budget reminded me, as a member of the New Democratic Party.

● (1600)

The budget in my terms is a rich man's budget. It proposes nothing new to improve the lot of the average and low income people of this country. Nearly all the measures in the budget will give more to those who have money. Nearly all the measures are regressive. They follow the old Liberal theory called the trickle down theory. They prime the pump at the top, and pour in money at the top, to the wealthy and the corporations, in the hope that it will trickle down to those at the bottom, those at the bottom who are able to live, who have jobs and who work in this country. That is the theory our party rejects. It is one which our party feels strongly will not work, and has never worked in this country.

If you look at the proposals in the budget you will find that almost everything fits into that type of pattern. There is the registered home ownership plan, and the exemption of the first \$1,000 of interest income which has now been expanded to include dividends, or a combination of dividends and interest. There is the first \$1,000 for extra pension other than pensions which are universal in this country. There is a new provision to exempt income in respect of building an apartment building. All these proposals assist far more the wealthy and the haves in this country than the ordinary citizen whom we represent. The same is true for corporations.