

The Budget

The province of Ontario has traditionally been considered one of the engines that is vital to the economic health of this country.

Does the member for Essex—Windsor not think that maybe some of that advice that he is giving this Minister of Finance—and by the way I agree with a lot of it—could also be given it the treasurer in the province of Ontario?

In the province of Ontario right now the unemployment situation is a disaster. The video business in Toronto is a good business to be in because we seem to be paying people to stay at home. We are not getting them back to work.

I caution the member for Essex—Windsor that as he is criticizing—and I am certainly going to be critical of this government—we should also be putting some ideas forward.

Those same ideas should be presented to the premier of Ontario who is doing a disastrous job right now in the province and not helping this engine of recovery at all. I was wondering if he could maybe comment on that.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Before giving the floor to the hon. member, I received the amendment to the amendment from the hon. member for Essex—Windsor. That amendment is under consideration by the Speaker.

Mr. Langdon: Mr. Speaker, I would say two things.

First, it is interesting the provincial Liberals in Ontario attack the New Democrat government in Ontario because it is doing too much, because it is being too expansive, because it is trying to do too much for people. And this federal Liberal wing attacks that government for not doing enough. It would be interesting if they would at least get their act together. As far as we are concerned there is no difference, which will be reflected in my comments.

What I have said this government should be doing is precisely the kinds of things which the Ontario government has been emphasizing and has been putting into effect so as to get people back to work.

I can list for members the various plants which have been saved by the aggressive action of a government that is providing leadership in Ontario, for example, in Sault

Ste. Marie there is Algoma Steel with over 3,000. We can talk about de Havilland which has been saved. We can talk about Kapuskasing which has been saved.

In area after area in my province the New Democrat government is being aggressive and providing leadership because it does care about people.

It is also putting tax changes into effect. For instance, in its last budget it saw to it that for every dollar in tax breaks that went to the average working family, there was not \$6 that went to the rich as this government is putting into effect. Instead, there was an increased tax burden on the rich so that they contributed a fair share of taxation in the province of Ontario. That is the direction which has to be taken.

It is a direction which I think we all recognize cannot represent a vast expansion in the deficit. That is something on which there is broad agreement, but a reallocation of money is essential, and this government has not given us that reallocation of money.

It has played a shell game which has tried to suggest that such reallocation is taking place, but no such change has really occurred to put money in the hands of those who need it to get people back to work.

Mr. John Harvard (Winnipeg—St. James): Mr. Speaker, I want to raise the matter of universality because it certainly comes up in this budget.

There is no doubt in my mind that with respect to family allowances universality is dead and gone. You can thank the Tories for that. It was Liberal governments in the past that brought universality to this country.

If Tory government members can end universality with respect to family allowances, where do they go next? Do they stop at family allowances or can they then attack universality at the level of medicare? If they can attack universality at the level of medicare, can they go further? For example, can they go on to pension plans? Why not?

It seems to me that if you can argue that upper middle income people or so-called rich people in this country do not need the benefits of universality, then you can equally argue that upper middle-income people, rich people, do not need the benefits of medicare. If you can argue that, you can go down the road farther and you can argue that upper middle income people and rich people