

• (1250)

We Liberals measure our success much differently than do Tories, that much is evident. The Tories look for comparisons with the giant economic unit to the south. We Liberals, on the other hand, measure success by finding ways to meet the needs of Canadians now and in the future.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Questions or comments? the Hon. Member for Swift Current—Maple Creek.

**Mr. Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with some interest to the comments of the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Ms. Phinney) and felt compelled to make a couple of comments and ask her a question.

The Hon. Member's speech contained the mandatory criticism, of course, criticizing the expenditure reductions in the Budget and criticizing the tax increases. She went on to accuse the Government of hypocrisy and, yet, in the Hon. Member's speech she criticized the Government for expenditure reductions. At the same time, she suggested the Government has not gone far enough in chopping the fat out and in reducing expenditures. I find the Hon. Member's message rather contradictory.

I believe she went on to say that we paid a premium for being Canadians. I think, if anything, what we have done is mortgaged the future in order to pay for the programs of the past and that is what has led us into this debt problem that we have today, the interest charges on which are consuming so much of our national revenue and which threaten the social programs of tomorrow and, indeed, the future of our children.

I heard the Hon. Member criticize tax increases on the one hand, criticize expenditure reductions on the other. I would like the Hon. Member to say here today what she and her Party would do to meet the problem that we have out there. We will not even bother getting into recriminations about how that debt arose, but let us just talk about addressing the problem today. What would the Hon. Member and her Party do in place of the measures which the Hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) has put forward?

**Ms. Phinney:** Mr. Speaker, I do not think the Liberals have to take any lessons from the Conservatives about the way the Budget has been run. The Conservative Party, our present Government, has doubled the debt in

*The Budget—Mr. G. Wilson*

the last four years. We have a Budget now that will not cut the deficit and will not cut down on the debt.

I think one thing is apparent to the public, and I have probably 40 or 50 letters from my riding coming in every day explaining how people feel about the Budget. It is the people who have to pay for these cuts, the same people over and over again, those people who can least afford them. I think an example in the Minister's *Budget in Brief* that we saw the night before the Budget was brought down in the House. It explains the philosophy of this Government when it is talking about the cut in foreign aid and considers it a saving. Savings will amount to \$1.8 billion. When we cut the budget to foreign aid, the present Government is calling that a saving. Our Party would not consider it a saving to cut foreign aid by \$1.8 billion.

**Mr. Harvard:** I have a question, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Ms. Phinney) whether she feels this Government has the mandate to do some of the things that it proposes to do in the current Budget. For example, does the Government have the mandate to privatize unemployment insurance? The Tories certainly did not talk about privatizing unemployment insurance during the election campaign. Does this Government have the mandate to bring an end to universality? There was no discussion in the campaign about bringing universality to an end. There was no discussion about further severe cuts to the CBC. There is talk now, for example, of perhaps changing the mandate of the CBC as a result of cuts, closing down stations, for example, at Sydney, in Labrador, in Saskatchewan.

Given the rhetoric from this Government during the election campaign, does the Hon. Member feel that this Government has the mandate to do what it is proposing to do?

**Ms. Phinney:** Mr. Speaker, I think probably it could be argued that the Government does not have the mandate to do what it is proposing. The Government discussed before the election that the Party which managed this country should be given the mandate and the power for another four or five years because they, the Tories, had done such a good job managing the economy over the last five years. As I have already mentioned, that management consisted of doubling the debt over the past four years. The Government asked us to give it the mandate for another five years but unfortunately, as