

We must also be looking at the resources which this country has, and deciding who owns those resources. For me, Mr. Speaker, it is the Canadian people. And those resources, as Premiers Blakeney, Schreyer and Barrett have said, should be developed primarily under public ownership between the provinces and Ottawa so that the benefit can stay at home with the Canadian people, so that we keep those profits at home and plan the whole economy for all of us. Those resources should be processed in this country to provide jobs for Canadian people.

It is time, too, that we took a look at our financial institutions and at investment in Canada, and that we as a people through our federal government, through our provinces and municipalities, made the decisions as to where the investment capital should go. We should make the decision, not leave it to the large multinational corporations to decide where it should or should not go.

We need a national development plan so that we can have balanced growth, a dispersment of growth all across Canada. People in Toronto, Vancouver and Montreal, in large part, are worried about growth in this country—growth in the cities. But there are areas in our country, such as the prairies and in the north, the Atlantic provinces and parts of Quebec, that need growth, that need more jobs, that need greater development. The only way we are going to get this development is if the people, if governments in this country acting for the people, make the investment decisions, not the private sector.

If we are to plan this country we also need a transportation system which removes the inequities and anomalies which exist in the freight rate structure we have today. We need an agricultural economy which is sound; we need guaranteed prices giving farmers the assurance of a decent standard of living. That, Mr. Speaker, is what our party is talking about.

We are talking about a more egalitarian society, one in which all Canadians, regardless of the colour of their skins, or whether they are male or female, or born in Toronto or Northern Quebec, will have an equal opportunity to enjoy the benefits of this country. We do not just mean equal opportunity in the sense of just saying the words or hearing the words spouted off. We mean equality of conditions, we mean people in all regions having the same basic conditions from which to start. That, Mr. Speaker, is what our party finds needs changing, and that is what we find is lacking in the budget today.

● (2120)

Mr. Arnold Malone (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, I personally believe that every member of parliament ought to be as constructive and positive as possible in any debate in this chamber. With that premise in mind I set about to analyze the budget speech delivered by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner) on the evening of June 23 in an attempt to discover and congratulate him for his constructive contribution to the country. That task was an awesome challenge. A positive speech in response to the June 23 budget would take approximately 22 seconds.

In fairness, however, I think there can be little doubt that the Minister of Finance has clearly identified a number of the problems facing the Canadian society at the present time. A very careful content analysis of his

The Budget—Mr. Malone

address will indicate that the minister has pinpointed many of the major problems that face Canadians.

He was not thorough, however, in his search, and notably missing is any relief for Canada's senior citizens, those on fixed incomes, and the 20 per cent of Canadians who are considered poor by international standards.

For whatever mild congratulation the foregoing may have been toward the minister's attempt to rectify Canada's problems, I am sincerely afraid that is the limit to which I can extend myself. For on the one hand, while the June 23 budget speech identified many of the major problems that are facing Canadians, the solutions offered to rectify those problems in almost every case are either non-workable or, in fact, will worsen the situation the minister identified. Even if he were to get full marks for recognizing Canada's major problems, it would be only reasonably that he be graded a zero for his offering of solutions.

It is now my intention to analyze parts of the budget speech in an attempt to illustrate the attachment of the wrong methods to some correctly stated needs.

The minister commenced his speech by proclaiming:

This has been a tough budget to prepare.

If the minister thinks it was a tough budget to prepare he should have tried listening to it. He also told us that:

World recession has put the brakes on our own economy.

In truth what he should have told us is that our economy has put the brakes on our economy. Five successive budgets by the same minister have finally got entangled in their own mesh, to the point where nothing seems clear as directives for the Canadian people.

On the first page of the minister's budget speech he stated:

The disposable incomes of the average Canadian remain high.

That statement was intended to bolster the Canadian public with a feeling of hope. However, even the most insensitive person must be compelled to ask the question, so what? What does it matter if the average disposable income is high, if those who are indigent, those who are senior citizens, and all those who are on fixed incomes are boxed into an insulting economic strait-jacket? To be persuaded by the mathematics of averaging simply means that the Minister of Finance has chosen to ignore one end of the human spectrum. Without a doubt this minister would conclude, if his head were in a fire-box and his feet on a block of ice, that on the average he would feel pretty good. To proclaim that Canada's average disposable income remains high is admitting in this House that one simply does not care about the economic condition of the senior citizens and all others on fixed incomes. That is a deplorable admission, and the fact is there was no hope in the budget for them.

I wish to continue with consideration of comments by the minister in the very first page of his budget speech. He stated:

At the same time we are confronted with major problems in the field of energy . . . We are fully conscious of the short-term adverse effects of a sharp increase in domestic price of oil and natural gas . . . We have to recognize the long-term need to develop new sources of supply in