

The Budget—Ms. McDonald

She then listed those agencies; Canada Council, \$5 million; Telefilm Canada, \$3 million; CRTC, \$2 million; National Film Board, \$1 million; National Library, \$1 million; National Museums, \$19 million; Public Archives, \$1 million; and the National Arts Centre, \$2 million. Unfortunately, these figures are fraudulent. The Minister has made up a totally new category called "resources", and people would be misled into thinking that this is what the taxpayer is providing these agencies. That is not the case. What the Minister has done is to add up the parliamentary appropriation plus other moneys available. Therefore, if the National Arts Centre increases the price of its food and drinks, and it is doing so, then its resources go up and it makes it look as if the Government were giving it more money, which is simply and totally untrue. Instead, the National Arts Centre is actually receiving a 4.1 per cent decrease in real terms in its parliamentary allocation. Instead of a \$2 million increase, it has received no increase in money. In real terms, that is a decrease. The Minister claimed a \$5 million increase for the Canada Council. In fact, it is about level. It turns out to be a 0.1 per cent decrease, a very slight decrease. I note that the moneys the Canada Council will have available to give out in grants will actually be \$2 million behind next year as compared to this year. That is not an increase and it means that artists will have less money available to them.

There have been increases for some areas such as museums, but, of course, they are moving into two new museums and so there are expenses regarding that. Of course, the CBC, our major cultural agency, suffered a very major decline of 13 per cent in its spending since the Government took office. The amount of money available to the CBC today is only 87 per cent of what it was in real terms when the Government took over and, of course, the Government promised at least cost of living increases. We see this as a really tragic loss to our cultural agencies.

[Translation]

The Government must be condemned for its lack of imagination and initiative in this Budget. It had an opportunity to promote job creation and investment in the future of this country. It could have supported post-secondary education, vocational training, and technological research and development. Unfortunately, instead of resolutely looking to the future, it failed miserably. Instead of boosting economic renewal, it chose to protect its friends the private companies. Instead of doing justice to families and ordinary Canadians, it saw fit to raise their taxes even more, directly and indirectly. The measures which benefit the rich, such as capital gains tax exemptions, are still there. It is not a realistic Budget, it is not a practical Budget, it is not a fair Budget, it is not a Budget—it is a scandal.

[English]

Why do we have such a stand pat, do nothing Budget? I suggest there is a reason. The Government has other fish to fry. It has other priorities. It thinks the way out of our economic difficulties is to rely on the economic renewal of

another country and to hitch our star to the United States in a free trade agreement. Of course, historically both Liberals and Conservatives have looked to trade as a panacea. There was the scandal in the 1930s in the midst of the Depression when both Parties advocated trade as a panacea. They were not prepared to spend. They were not prepared to put money into job creation or unemployment insurance or any other of those practical measures. They both vied for the title of being the Party most in favour of trade. So we have seen in the past that this issue has been treated as a panacea and, of course, it has not worked.

I am very proud of the record of the Government of Manitoba and of Yukon, both NDP Governments which have actually reduced unemployment. They have done this not by relying on illusory measures such as trade, but by making job creation a real priority, by developing measures of import substitution, by local purchasing plans, by very concerted practical, detailed plans to get their economies moving and to get people back to work, and of course they start to receive tax revenue and can support in a stronger way than ever before the social programs we need.

The New Democratic Party has positive, concrete proposals for economic renewal. Until we have the opportunity to implement them, we will be working as much as we can in opposition to advance those ideas. We will be favouring fair measures over unfair measures, job creation over acceptance of the status quo of a high rate of unemployment. This Budget is not in the interests of average Canadians. It is not in the long-term interests of our country. For these very good reasons, my colleagues and I in the New Democratic Party will be voting against this Budget.

Mr. Holtmann: Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the Hon. Member for Broadview—Greenwood (Ms. McDonald) and the position she put forward on behalf of the New Democratic Party. It has me just shuddering to think of that Party ever coming to power. With the type of attitude the Hon. Member expressed today, I wonder that she could even consider putting a government together with any kind of a policy.

She made some mention of Mr. Tommy Douglas and what he once did in Saskatchewan. I thought she was purposely going to avoid talking about Manitoba. However, toward the end of her speech she said that Manitoba is doing the right thing. I am proud of Manitoba. We do have the lowest unemployment rate in Canada, but it has a lot to do with the federal Government as well. If the Hon. Member had paid any attention to Manitoba she would have looked at the recent Budget of the Minister of Finance of that Province. We all know how the NDP represents the ordinary Canadian. As a result of the Budget in that Province someone earning \$18,000 a year will now have to pay \$400 per year in taxes. That is how the NDP Government looks after the interests of the average person in Manitoba.