

Effect of Budgetary Proposals

as it remains in office. It is our duty to take every opportunity available to us to minimize that period of wasted time.

As was the case during the budget debate, one must keep asking oneself about the question of confidence. What do the members of government really believe? Do they believe, for example, that we have to improve the competitive position of Canadian industry, as they emphasized last May? Or do they believe that the competition facing Canadian industry should be increased, as they seem to believe in 1973? We have gone all through this in regard to tax cuts, income tax indexing and so on. I do not have the time, and there is no need for me today, to go over once again the inadequacy of the government's program with regard to employment or the inadequacy of the budget as a stimulus to the creation of employment. I do not need to go over the weakness of the budget with regard to inflation. I went over all of that during the budget debate and we put before the House clearly what we called a two-pronged attack on unemployment and on inflation. Really, it is a three-pronged attack because it ought to include the encouragement of new investment in small Canadian business, a point that I have put forward here this afternoon. We have an attack on unemployment, and perhaps the best method available to us for increasing ownership by Canadians of Canadian business.

Therefore, I say that in view of these considerations the government's package of proposals is neither adequate nor equitable among Canadians; and of that I think there can be no doubt.

• (1700)

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, ever since this parliament opened early in January the Conservative opposition has been huffing and puffing but has failed to bring the House down, and because it has failed to bring the House down its huffs and its puffs become more tiresome and less meaningful as the days go by. The opposition keeps trying ploy after ploy, and trick after trick, and thinks that we in the NDP will be intimidated by its huffing and puffing. Let me tell hon. members of that opposition that they are wasting their time and wasting the time of this House.

Let me tell the right hon. gentleman from Prince Albert, and I am sorry he is not here, for, I am sure, very good reasons, that his thunder is always amusing. We listen to him with a great deal of respect and with a great deal of chortling as he speaks, but I ask him not to exaggerate his power. His thunder will not bring down the House either, Mr. Speaker.

We set a course for ourselves when this parliament opened, and we set that course before the people of Canada. It has been approved by the vast majority of the people of this country—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Lewis: My mail and the feedback of all my colleagues across this country indicate that the people of Canada want to see this parliament work and produce useful legislation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lewis: No hokery-pokery or imaginative Conservative party is going to change that course, Mr. Speaker. In view of what has been said by some—not since the debate started on the motion, I must say, but during the procedural debate—I want to make one thing very clear. I have done this, I suppose, dozens of times since October. I want to make it clear that I believe, and my colleagues believe, that both aspects of the May 1972 budget in respect of concessions to corporations should be before parliament and decided by parliament, and we will insist on that.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: When?

Mr. Lewis: When those resolutions and bills that come from the May 1972 budget in respect of corporate concessions come before this House, we will oppose them just as we have constantly opposed them ever since we heard them.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lewis: We do not intend to be caught by the kind of hokery-pokery the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) has indulged in and vote for a motion that is meaningless and purposeless because it makes some reference to the corporate situation in the May 1972 budget.

As I listened to the Leader of the Opposition I thought: What in heaven's name is this gentleman doing? I heard that speech just a week ago, almost word for word and thought for thought. He added some new material about small business, which he had enunciated, and I will come back to that in a moment, during the election campaign, but he repeated the same type of thing he said in two speeches during the budget debate. He is merely using the time of this House for games, and he is welcome to play them if he wants because he is doing it so often and with such obvious political maladroitness the people of Canada realize what is happening.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lewis: The new thing in the speech of the Leader of the Opposition had reference to small business. What was he really saying to us and the people of Canada? He was saying: I am dissatisfied with the corporate concessions made by the Minister of Finance in his May 1972 budget. I want more. I do not want corporate concessions to go alone to businesses that exist, I want the corporate tax concessions to go to the corporations that start new businesses or that invest in new businesses. The Leader of the Opposition parades himself as wanting to defend the situation. I want every member of this House to understand, as I do and I am quite certain I understand it correctly, that what he is suggesting is that the tax concessions the Minister of Finance proposed in May, 1972 are inadequate and do not go far enough. He wants further tax concessions to investors in new business.

He thinks that by this kind of thing he can catch us and throw us over with his huffing and puffing. We do not go for that, Mr. Speaker. His statement on this matter reminded me of some things he said before when we had the Liberal tax bill before us, the so-called reform bill which made a very few minor changes in the corporate