

*Government Orders*

**Mr. Herb Grubel (Capilano—Howe Sound, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, does the member who just spoke have any sense of embarrassment whatsoever for saying that the red book was still their Bible?

I heard throughout the campaign and many times here that the immigration level would be 300,000 and it is 200,000; that the GST would be gone; that there would be a renegotiation of NAFTA; and there would be no cuts in social programs.

Unfortunately I am running out of time, but the list is so embarrassingly large that if I had made those comments I could not speak for blushing.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Mr. Speaker, I agree with the member that there are some embarrassing things going around today, the most embarrassing of which is the dismal performance of the Reform Party's response to the budget that has resulted in its popularity in the country going right down the you know what, Mr. Speaker. We can hear it flushing.

**Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the debate and have come to one conclusion, that Liberals are the only Tories left in Canada.

*[Translation]*

This budget represents a profound change in Canada's basic structures and a total break with the principles that built this country. At issue here is much more than just a simple budget. This is about the kind of country we want to leave to our children. It is about the very essence of our national identity. The Liberal government has just set the parameters of policies that will take us into the 21st century, not as a strong and united Canada but as a fragmented Canada.

The Liberals maintain that we have no choice and that there is only one way to reduce the deficit. The New Democratic Party agrees that debts and deficits are unacceptable and that we cannot continue to live on credit, but we absolutely disagree that this is the way to do it. The Liberals are wrong. There is an alternative.

There are two ways to reduce the deficit: one way is to make decisions collectively, and the other way is to turn the regions, social groups and interest groups in this country into rivals, all competing for the same dollar.

*[English]*

The budget is not straight from the heart. The budget is straight through the heart of the future of the country that I believe the majority of Canadians thought they were going to get when they voted for the government.

• (1720)

The minister has said that this is a tough budget. However, it is much more than that. It fundamentally breaks the social

consensus that has been built up over a number of years, often through vigorous debate, to build a country based on bilingualism, multiculturalism and a sense of community that by working together we will accomplish more for each individual.

Many parts of the budget will not be felt by Canadians for one or two years down the road. There is no question that the government has turned its back on much of the Liberal tradition. In a year or two Canadians will be asking what it means to be a Canadian. We should all be concerned about whether we will be citizens of a country or simply citizens of one region or another?

As I mentioned earlier, there is no disagreement about the need to address the debt and deficit. We do not see any serious attempt to deal with the inequities in the tax system. There is some work around the fringes, but there could be much more fundamental work done in the budget.

On the day after the budget individuals earning \$100,000 with a nice subsidized box at the SkyDome and who eat in expensive restaurants were happy because their lives were not touched at all. However there was great cause for concern by senior citizens, single mothers and young people.

A country is more than a bond market or more than just how the economy functions, although that is obviously important. It is about how the economy functions for the people. I want to address very briefly in the time I have several ways in which I feel the budget has made us a lesser nation.

How ironic it is that just two weeks ago we celebrated the 30th anniversary of the Canadian flag. The question people might be asking two years from now is: What kind of Canada will that flag fly over?

Several aspects of the budget have fundamentally changed the social consensus I spoke of earlier. One is the issue of globalization. Globalization is not just economic. It is about Canada's role as an international citizen. It is about the common security between other countries and ours. In many ways the budget largely turns its back on the poor of the world.

A very important part of any country is freedom. I ask my friends on the other side whether they can truly say that the budget has given more freedom to Canadians. Certainly a mother living in poverty has no freedom. An elderly person who cannot get adequate health care has no freedom. A young person who cannot attend college, university or technical school has no freedom. The budget limits freedoms and the potential of citizenship for many groups. Also the budget limits the freedom of such fundamentals as collective bargaining by breaking collective bargaining with the public servants.

The budget does not mention poverty, job creation or youth. It is important to point out that unemployment is not free. It costs the country approximately \$42 billion a year in direct payouts. If the government would have set a target to reduce unemployment by 1 per cent, \$5.16 billion would have been added to the tax