

*Effect of Budgetary Proposals*

which hopefully can come to grips with the problems that underlie the current crisis. No one, however, can yet be confident about the outcome. These developments only serve to underline the urgency of implementing the measures proposed to help reinforce the competitive position of Canadian manufacturers in a very uncertain world.

While the motion before the House expresses non-confidence in the government, what it really does is to demonstrate beyond any doubt why the Canadian people should have no confidence in the Conservative party.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

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

**An hon. Member:** Go to the people now.

**Some hon. Members:** Resign.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger):** Order, please. I am not sure which side of the House is making the most noise, but the Chair is having a difficult time following the speech of the minister.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** This motion also demonstrates that the Conservative party, and I think this was admirably pointed out by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis)—

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

**Mr. Lewis:** It's O.K., John.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** —has not the slightest intention, will or desire to make this parliament work to serve the best interests of the nation as a whole.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** This sham motion demonstrates that the Conservative party is prepared to play any game at all with the Canadian economy, the Canadian working man and woman, that might serve its own narrow, partisan interests.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** This motion demonstrates that the Conservative party is prepared to seek power whatever the price may be to the Canadian people. In short, this motion demonstrates that in its desperation the Conservative party has totally abandoned any sense of responsibility to Canadians that it might once have possessed.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Paul Hellyer (Trinity):** Mr. Speaker, it was, as Your Honour suggested, difficult to follow the minister's speech both because of its content and the repartee in the House. It may be a hard act to follow, but I hope that the one I have to offer will be more constructive, not partisan and not in the nature of mere political bantering such as we just heard from the minister.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hellyer:** This afternoon I was very disappointed in the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis). As one who for many years held the New Democratic Party in some respect, believing that they were often true at least to principles that were comprehensible, I admit to particular disillusionment at this time.

• (2120)

The hon. member for York South seemed to be criticizing the Conservative party for huffing and puffing but not blowing down the house. But he should be reminded that just one small puff from him tonight, the big, bad wolf in sheep's clothing, and the house would fall. The hon. member insists upon being apologetically grateful for a few bones thrown by the government which enables him to rationalize his desire for self-preservation. He has given the House some examples of these bones, including reductions in personal income tax and increases in old age pensions. Let us examine these two briefly to see whether the Canadian people should be as grateful as the hon. member appears to be. First, the modest income tax cuts. The typical taxpayer, we are told, will add \$1.97 a week to his take-home pay.

**An hon. Member:** Big deal.

**Mr. Hellyer:** That calculation is based on figures for a married man earning \$150 a week, with two children under 16. But here is the rub. The same man will lose \$445 a year through inflation. That amounts to \$8.55 a week. Imagine it. The typical taxpayer loses \$8.55 a week through inflation and gains \$1.97 through the benevolence of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner) who spoke so eloquently earlier. This leaves the taxpayer, notwithstanding the eloquence of the Minister of Finance, with a net amount of \$6.58 a week less than he might otherwise have had.

Is this the kind of situation which deserves the applause of the New Democratic Party? Is this the treatment they feel the average Canadian taxpayer deserves? Do they feel the average Canadian taxpayer is deserving of this \$6.58 cut in take-home pay due to the maladministration of an incompetent and inept Liberal government? Of course, the average "poor sucker" taxpayer would need a pay increase well in excess of \$6.58 a week in order to break even, because any increase would be subject to both tax and to erosion due to inflation. Consequently, the average taxpayer earning \$150 a week, with two children under 16, would need a wage increase well in excess of \$6.58 a week in order to wind up the year where he started under the benevolence of this great Liberal party!

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hellyer:** It is a sad story, and it applies to old age pensions as well. The increase in the old age pension is welcome. Our senior citizens have suffered too long at the hands of this unfeeling and unsympathetic government. Now the government is increasing the old age pension by an extra \$13.39 in one year. It would have been increased automatically from \$82.88 to \$86.61 in April in any event, but now this benevolent government is going all out to add the extra \$13.39 to bring the total to \$100 a month. My hon. friend from Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie) pointed