

*The Budget—Mr. Langdon*

the people right across this country. The economic consequences are going to be sad. I say that with regret. I did not want to see a Budget that would destroy the economic credibility of the Minister of Finance further. Yet that is what is happening.

In my constituency 31 per cent of the people voted Conservative in the election. At this stage there is not a chance that half that number will do that again. People come up to me on the street continually and say: "We voted Conservative last time. Never again. It's clear that Tory times are taxing times. Tories take money from our pockets when we thought they were going to cut taxes and give us a chance to get the economy moving once more."

What we need in this country is a long-run response to our deficit problems, a response that gets people back to work. When that happens we will get rid of the deficit, and do it far faster than this Government is prepared to. This Government, for all its promises in the last election, will, by the year 1990, be paying a higher percentage of Government revenues to service the public debt than did the Liberals who they attacked so strongly out on the hustings. This Government has not been serious in its talk about reducing the deficit. It has the cart before the horse. You have to get the economy moving before you can get the deficit down. Making that basic error will ultimately cost this Government, not just its majority but its chance to govern after the next election. This is not just a Budget that is mistaken in its goals and faulty in its implementation of those goals, it is a Budget which is, above all, unfair to the people of Canada. We find with the tax probe, which is cutting across the country for the New Democratic Party, that above all Canadians in this country want tax fairness. They want tax reform. That is what this Budget is not giving them.

● (1200)

Instead we have very clear statistics, again in the Budget's own documents, that corporate taxes are going up faster, but not nearly as fast as individual taxes. We have clear evidence that the people in this country who are rich will get a tax decrease next year from the present surtax they pay of 5.5 per cent or 10.5 per cent down to 3 per cent, while the ordinary average middle-income family sees its taxes go up by 3 per cent.

It is a Budget which has disappointed farmers, that group across this country which has been particularly hard hit in the past two years and looked for help from this Government which before the election made it very clear that: "We will eliminate completely the taxes that farmers have to pay on fuel". I ask you, has it happened? The answer clearly is no. The Government can engage in as much rhetoric as it wants. It can send its Ministers across the country to propagandize as much as they wish, but the farmer will know when he goes to the pumps and pays tax on his fuel that on this promise, as on so many others, this Party has failed to come through on its commitments.

It is also a Budget which will have a great human cost. I talked to some of our people this weekend who handle our

constituency offices and already the calls are starting to come in from people making do on a family income of \$15,000, \$16,000 or \$17,000. They are saying: "We simply cannot live with increased taxes. It is not a question of being squeezed a little bit, it is a question of just not being able to live". Yet those are the people who will pay the 1 per cent sales tax increase, the 3 per cent income tax increase, the increases on cigarettes and increases on liquor. They are the human beings which this Minister has forgotten. They are the human beings who are our fellow Canadians. We should not, as a House, endorse a Budget which has so badly failed those human beings.

**Mr. Attewell:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to take issue with a number of comments made by the Hon. Member for Essex-Windsor (Mr. Langdon). He has used words like destruction, time bomb, disaster. I find that quite incredible if one takes the time to really read that Budget and to talk to average Canadians out there, which he said he did. He also implied that the Government should take no credit whatsoever for some 580,000 new jobs. He knows as an economist that that statement is ridiculous. The Government does have a real role in setting a climate in the country. We can look back on the dismantling of the National Energy Program, which was a disaster in this country. We can look upon the steps that were taken to change FIRA—not just the name—to Investment Canada. It changed the climate of that organization to one which really welcomes new investment. I say we have had a very positive effect as a Government on that job-creation program.

**An Hon. Member:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Attewell:** Just to recount the steps I personally took to be in touch with people, last Thursday morning I had a breakfast organized to discuss the Budget. It was a non-partisan group, I would underscore, comprised of 163 people. We had the President, John Maplesden of the North York Business Association on the panel. We had Maureen Pappin, a tax partner with Deloitte Haskins & Sells, and we had Jim Crysdale from Nesbitt Thomson, investment dealer. It was an excellent meeting. Not everybody is unhappy with a certain amount of tax increase. Those people had no idea what they were going to say ahead of time. I simply invited them as residents of Don Valley East to speak. While they do not totally embrace the Budget they see the gravity of the situation, and we are willing to be part of the process that is essential.

During the day on Friday I met with several individuals. In the evening I had the honour to be at a special celebration for Dr. Ubale, who is the first Race Relations Commissioner in Ontario. There were some 500 people there from the South Asian community. As we mingled, the general comments were that the Conservative Government is doing what is necessary for the good of Canada.

Saturday morning I did a Rogers cable TV show on the Budget. In the afternoon I wrote to newspaper columnists. That evening I attended the Overseas Chinese Women's Asso-