

*Supply*

coverage will experience a reduction in their take-home wages. He said:

For the vast majority of our membership who earn between \$15,000 and \$24,000 annually there will be no tax reduction whatsoever.

I challenge the Minister of Finance, who keeps insisting that 12 million Canadians will benefit from his budget measures, to dispute Mr. Fryer's assessment.

Mr. Fryer says these facts cannot be denied. He asks:

Where is the equity for provincial government employees whose real wages have already declined in each of the last five years as a direct result of inflation. It is obvious that Mr. MacEachen's concept of fairness and equity differs sharply from those of working people in Canada.

Mr. Fryer admits that he is not a member of our party. However, he joins us in agreeing to the solution to the problems created by the budget. Mr. Fryer told us:

People who pay my salary say that the budget is no damn good. Throw it away and start again.

That is the intent of the amendment before the House today and also of the subamendment, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** May I ask the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Miss Carney) to provide a copy of the subamendment?

**Miss Carney:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** After deep consideration, I find the subamendment to be in order.

**Mr. Deans:** Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member has time remaining, would she allow me to ask her a question with regard to her subamendment?

**Miss Carney:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Deans:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to be able to support this subamendment, but I am curious about the section that says "shall review the said measures to ascertain their effect." May I ask the hon. member, their effect on what, the banks, the economy, or the people involved? We will then be able to determine whether or not we should be supporting this change.

**Some hon. Members:** All of those.

**Miss Carney:** Mr. Speaker, I would think that it was clear, even to the NDP, that the purpose of this subamendment is to review the effect of these measures introduced by the Liberal government on the people of the country and on the economy of the country.

● (2020)

**An hon. Member:** Nothing is obvious to them, Pat.

**Hon. Bud Cullen (Sarnia-Lambton):** Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to participate in this particular debate because I am satisfied, as are most Canadians who have read the budget and all the supporting documents, that home builders, small-business men, farmers and ordinary Canadians have the most to gain if the thrust of the budget is successful.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. MacEachen) indicated to us that his main concern and purpose in bringing in this particular budget is for it to have an impact on the invidious effects of inflation.

**An hon. Member:** I wish I had said that.

**Mr. Cullen:** Interest rates will not come down unless we get inflation under control. Recently, three leading economists appearing on that Conservative program "Canada AM"—

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

**Mr. Cullen:**—indicated, in answer to a question from Miss Pamela Wallen that the three leading indicators were such as to indicate that the cost of living as reflected in the consumer price index would in fact come down, much to the chagrin of the interviewer and of those who were trying to make a point that the inflation rate would rise even higher than 12.5 per cent. However, these three leading economists selected by the CTV network, not by the Liberal, Conservative or New Democratic parties, were unanimous in their view that the leading indicators indicate that the consumer price index would in fact be coming down; that the media were playing it all wrong by talking about the four tenths increase in the last quarter as being aberrational.

**An hon. Member:** Where else is it going to go? It has gone through the roof.

**An hon. Member:** It cannot go any higher.

**Mr. Stevens:** That was the U.S.; tell us about Canada.

**An hon. Member:** You are so bad we will give you more time.

**Mr. Cullen:** Mr. Speaker, I was here this afternoon and listened very intently to the leaders of the two parties opposite, and I did not heckle once. I do not know what they are afraid of over there. It is one thing to be running a road show across the country telling everybody, "Oh, gee, that is too bad. I am sorry to hear that. Yes, we definitely agree with you. We will sure hammer it to them when we get back in the House." However, when they come back, they are not prepared to listen to the other side. They do not want to have a debate; all they can do is heckle.

This afternoon the two leaders of the opposition spoke, the Minister of Finance listened very attentively, but when he got up to speak about some of the inaccuracies in their particular approach, he was, of course, howled and hooted down because they did not want to hear the other side.

**An hon. Member:** Poor fellow.

**Mr. Cullen:** Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that both the Minister of Finance and I can stand a little heckling, but the opposition cannot stand the heat when they are faced with the facts.

**Mr. Stevens:** Well, try us.