

The Budget—Mr. Rae

An hon. Member: You should know.

Mr. Rae: There are alternatives to the policies of this government, Mr. Speaker. This is the last time we should be taking Canada on a forced march to a reduced deficit of \$4 or \$5 billion in 1984. On the government's own figures, this will lead to unemployment of 7.5 per cent, which is an increase. Inflation will remain at exactly the level it is at now, but next year will be higher. We have to ask ourselves what we are getting. We are getting Herbert Hoover and R. B. Bennett, but I do not see any advantage to the policy.

The minister says that we have terrible unemployment and terrible inflation in Canada and that we need a five-year plan to deal with these horrendous problems. But with this five-year plan we find we have exactly the same inflation and the same unemployment as there is now. If that is the kind of long march the minister now wants to take us on, I suggest he put on his mukluks and head off by himself. He will not be followed by the rest of the Canadian people.

In his closing remarks the minister mentioned his grandfather. I should like to mention my grandfather. Seventy years ago he came to Canada as an immigrant, worked hard, fought in a war, suffered through a depression. Were he alive today, I doubt very much that he would find anything has changed in the consecutive budgets produced by Liberal and Conservative governments.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rae: I should like to recite to hon. members a poem by T. S. Eliot, which goes as follows:

Though you have shelters and institutions,
Precarious lodgings while the rent is paid,
Subsiding basements where the rat breeds
Or sanitary dwellings with numbered doors
Or a house a little better than your neighbour's;
When the Stranger says: 'What is the meaning of this city
Do you huddle close together because you love each other?'
What will you answer? 'We all dwell together
To make money from each other?' or 'This is a community'?

Mr. Grafftey: You look like a college boy now.

Mr. Rae: I see the minister with his usual knowledge and common sense has a comment. I should like to tell him where I first saw this poem. It was in a United Auto Workers' hall in Port Elgin, Ontario. If he wants to go and see it himself, he can. The message that came from that union movement is one with which I am not the least bit ashamed to associate myself. It is:

What will you answer? 'We all dwell together
To make money from each other?' or 'This is a community'?

Let me suggest that there is a very clear alternative to the policy of this government which is about to be defeated, and that alternative is a policy which recognizes that Canada is a community—not a community of communities only, but a community. It is a community in which the critical question in

[Mr. Grafftey.]

the 1980s will be: are we simply here "to make money from each other" or are we here to do something different?

In the policies which this party suggested during the election campaign, such as a cost of living tax credit, the need for an industrial strategy, the importance of providing jobs for Canadians and looking at the real health of the economy, and not some abstractions which so upset hon. members opposite, we have suggested that there is an alternative to the policies of the government. That alternative is the social democratic alternative.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rae: Let me suggest that between the new Conservatism and the new democracy there is no middle ground. It has something which my friends to the far right in the Liberal party are quickly going to discover, that there is a message in this budget—the government has thrown down the gauntlet, the government has waved its flag and said, "We dare you in these trying political times, with the resignation of the leader of the Liberal party, to oppose the policies with which we want to take Canada into the eighties." We accept that challenge, Mr. Speaker. We accept it happily. We accept it with confidence and with vigour, because we are convinced that the message contained in this budget is a message of injustice. It is a mean message, not a generous or compassionate message; it is a message which will be rejected by the Canadian people because it is so mean and not compassionate.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rae: Mr. Speaker, I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That the amendment be amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma, and by adding immediately thereafter the following words:
and this House unreservedly condemns the government for its outright betrayal of its election promises to lower interest rates, to cut taxes, and to stimulate the growth of the Canadian economy, without a mandate from the Canadian people for such a reversal.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

● (1710)

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, I rise in this House as the first new member of Parliament to speak on the budget debate. As I sat here and listened to hon. members opposite, I was reminded of some phrases that were thrown at us that I might like to twist and throw back at them.

There is a choice for Canadians, and the hon. member is correct when he says that our budget clarifies that choice. One of the choices we have is to continue to deal with poetry or choose to deal with reality. Are we going to become a nation of doers, or are we going to continue to be a nation of dreamers? Are we going to deal with promises, or are we going to deal with plans?

I am particularly proud to stand up in this House today, because about three years ago I committed a significant portion of my life working within this political party to develop plans for governing this nation. As most new members of