

The Budget—Mr. McCain

without any reciprocity of other markets for our food producers. That has happened. We removed the duty on red meat coming into Canada, and then had to introduce a bill to regulate the flow of imports. That bill has been considered for quite a period of time, and it is still subject to approval in this House. That is but one example of the steps that we may have to take. If we continue to give away our own market to other people, Third World countries or others, the food processing industry of Canada cannot help but suffer more and, as a result, so too will the farmers of Canada. The disincentive is there in the industry. The employment opportunity may very well decline, or the consumer will pay more, or the farmer will get less. I ask hon. members opposite to read what is in the budget and they will understand what I mean.

I would like to refer to another question raised in the same document. It asks whether in those cases where new policies will require expenditures, we should seek in general to re-deploy government spending by discontinuing those programs now focused on our prime objectives, or should we alter the government's fiscal stance by raising taxes? The answer obviously was that we shall raise taxes.

Here is something which the provinces must worry about. The conclusion suggested in the document is that there should be management of the resources development, and industrial reorientation projects will be of considerable and possibly mutual interest to provincial governments. The extent to which a joint planning approach is followed is likely to affect the speed and ease with which we conclude our major new projects. Should we actively endeavour to pursue a co-operative planning effort with maximum federal visibility on delivery—and I emphasize that phrase “maximum federal visibility”—or should we primarily rely on federal spending and prerogative as the means to pursue these policies?

I draw your attention to those remarks, Mr. Speaker because it was only last week that we heard a delayed budget. It was delayed because the premiers of the provinces were meeting with the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) to discuss the Constitution. The Prime Minister very adeptly avoided bringing in this budget prior to the discussion of the Constitution. Here we have a document which was then in the hands of the government advising the government about resources, which is a provincial field. The question was, should the government go with joint projects and demand the co-operation of the provinces, or should the federal government get the highest visibility it could by going it alone to develop resources, the property of the provinces?

It is incredible, it is bad faith and it is treachery to have demanded that the premiers meet before the introduction of this budget which was going to curtail their future to the degree that it has. Whether you come from Quebec, which disagrees in principle, or whether you come from any other province in Canada which has disagreed in philosophy with the proposals put forward, to find this kind of treachery introduced in the House as a confrontation to those provinces which we represent here is incredible treachery. These are low-level procedures at best.

Mr. Tousignant: Who represents the federal government?

Mr. McCain: Who represents the federal government where? The Prime Minister represented the federal government, and he committed treachery by insisting that this budget come in only after the meeting. When it begins to hurt, you begin to squeak. I do not know how your wheel was greased so that you did not squeak when you were in caucus, but do not squeak now, it is too late. It is out in the open. There is negligence there in your province and mine as evidenced in the budget and the treachery of the budget succeeding the federal-provincial meetings. I think it is rather significant that the provincial first officers wanted to meet on the economy long since, and I would not want to be the finance minister, the minister of health or the minister responsible for education who has to come to me as the provincial minister and discuss finances of this nation after this budget was brought down, and you will hear more about that a little later.

● (2040)

The treacheries have been committed. I never thought we would have traitors to the concept of Canada, but we have and they are here among us.

An hon. Member: On which side?

Mr. McCain: Mr. Speaker, when a member asks a question to which the answer is so obvious he is only asking for deprecatory remarks in response, and I do not choose to address them to him.

This afternoon we heard the Secretary of State (Mr. Regan), the minister from Halifax, discuss the future of education in Canada as this government would like to conduct it. Again I want to refer to resources, one of which is forestry, and I will do so without quoting from the document which was leaked.

In this document prepared for the government forestry is referred to as a renewable resource, and the question is how the Government of Canada could gain the highest possible profile by spending money in the forest industry. The advice of the bureaucrats to the government is, well the trees themselves are provincial property. If we spend money on the trees in the forests, we will not get the profile because they are provincial. But, if perchance we happen to spend some money on education, and that is a mere pittance in terms of the financial response compared to what the forests really need, we would have a profile which would give us the credit we need in the political world. That in effect is what that document said. We find there that the government is advised to play politics with two things at the same time; with the renewable forestry resource and with education with respect to the resource—neglect the resource and get the profile from education. That is a rather ridiculous suggestion when Canada needs the whole deal.

An hon. Member: What is your suggestion?