

*The Budget—Mr. Deniger*

has been criticized at length. But how can we maintain what has been gained? How can we help those who have been most severely affected by the recession, while injecting funds to create jobs and stimulate the economy, without increasing expenditures? In the worst of the recession, we could not reduce the deficit because that would have aggravated the impact of the recession. And if we cut government expenditures tomorrow, if we increase taxes to a considerable extent, what would that do? It would paralyze our present economy, which is starting to gain momentum and is in the midst of its recovery. And what do our Progressive Conservative friends opposite say? They want to reduce the deficit for a certain group, but they also want a bigger defence budget; they are talking about additional transfer payments to the provinces and they also want more tax relief for business. The Member representing the New Democratic Party pointed out earlier a number of similar contradictions in what the Opposition Members were saying, for instance when they told people in the forest industry that the Budget had to do more for forestry, the people in the fisheries industry that it had to do more for fisheries and people on welfare that benefits had to be increased, and yet they want to reduce the deficit! Mr. Speaker, perhaps this debate on the Budget will at last give Opposition Members a chance to tell the House exactly what they intend to do. The Member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) failed to do so earlier, Mr. Speaker. He put on a show and it was a very good one. He is the best showman we ever had in the House. He is good for a laugh a minute! But that is not what government is about. Mr. Speaker, to govern means to decide to help the poor and the needy, those who come to see us, both Opposition Members and Government Members, to talk about real problems. That is what the Budget is about, Mr. Speaker. It is a recovery Budget, a Budget with momentum, that will reassure the Canadian people.

My constituents in the riding of La Prairie are mostly homeowners. Many of them came to see me, and many other Canadians went to see their Members, to complain about mortgages they were unable to pay off in advance because of the penalty involved. I am referring to mortgages they had to put up with for five years because they had renewed them for five years, at very high rates.

Mr. Speaker, these complaints were brought to the attention of the Minister of Finance. He looked into the matter and he took action. I think the real estate sector which provides employment for many Canadians will respond in a positive way to the Government's generosity, which will make mortgage holders heave a sigh of relief and also enable many young people who are looking for a house to purchase their first home.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal to say about this Budget. I realize my time has expired. However, I just want to tell the people in the riding of La Prairie who often bother to complete the surveys I send them, that today, they have authentic proof

that their complaints and requests and desires have not fallen on deaf ears. The Minister of Finance has brought down a Budget that is humane, a Budget for the average person, for the man in the street, for ordinary people, for the people who elect us as Members of Parliament, both Opposition Members and Government Members.

Mr. Speaker, I have the following message for my colleagues in the Opposition who will be voting on the Budget in a few days. Are you going to vote for the future and endorse this Budget or are you finally going to admit that generosity is confined to one Party and that Party is certainly not the Progressive Conservative Party?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert):** Ten-minute period allowed for questions, answers and comments.

[*English*]

**Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member wanted a few more minutes we would certainly have no objection. However, if he is finished, I would like to ask a question or two.

● (1250)

Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed the Hon. Member's address and particularly what he said about helping the people who need it the most. I agree with that philosophy. I realize there is a limit to which any Government may go. I am wondering why the Government has left the tremendous void in the present social services program. We have something for the aged, we are doing more for the single pensioners who are below the poverty line, and we have helped some spouses. There are still spouses whose husbands died before the change came who are presently getting nothing and must wait till they are 65. There is a tremendous void, particularly among women between the ages of 50 and 65. That can be broken down as 55 to 65 or 60 to 65. There is a large body of women who are getting absolutely nothing. Some of these women have spent their lives looking after an aged parent, crippled brother or others who needed help. They have saved the Government a tremendous amount of money because they were prepared to stay home. They have no Canada Pension. It is difficult for a woman to compete in the marketplace when she is 50 or 55. Many of them have brought a family into the world. Now their only resource is welfare. Personally I do not think it is any blight on a person to accept welfare, but many people feel that welfare is not really a pension. They feel they are getting something they do not deserve.

Does the Hon. Member feel there is a void here? I am wondering why the Government did not at least start to fill that void so that these women would be able to get something and live somewhat of a dignified life during their last years.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Deniger:** Mr. Speaker, I have fully appreciated the remarks made by my hon. friend opposite. I must say I have enjoyed hearing him speak and ever since I have known him, it