

The Budget

colleagues, saying that they do not want any more taxes and, believe me, I do not want any more taxes. Not even the NDP wants any more taxes. To that extent, we think similarly.

Now they are indicating to me that that is not their position. Is it their position that they do want more taxes? I mean, that is the converse. I have to expect that that is what they are saying. However, we will let them have the opportunity of really telling us what they mean if they can bring their consciences to the table and make it clear as to whether or not they want new taxes.

It is our position that Canadians do not want new taxes. I understand from the far end of the room that the NDP wants new taxes. We will find out whether or not the public of Canada can tolerate socialism and the obsession that socialists have for sneaking taxes in the back door in direct contrast to the program that our Minister of Finance has attempted to lay before the citizens of Canada.

Canadians want to rid themselves of the burden of increased taxes. At the same time, they want to maintain the same level of social services that they have been accustomed to and this budget in no way, shape or form affects the provinces' capability of delivering those services to their people.

This budget has no new spending plans either. It has no new ways to spend more borrowed money. In Saskatchewan and across Canada people are telling us to cut spending. Members of Parliament have been telling Michael Wilson to cut spending, and now we have the minister's answer. It is: "Yes, I will cut spending and cut spending again. I will do it across the board on a wide range of programs." The Minister of Finance and the Conservative party are listening to the people of Canada and we have acted on what we have been told to do.

At the same time, we have taken the pill to address the cavernous debt that is strangling our ability to be free Canadians. No other political party has the intestinal fortitude or the plain guts to address this problem. It is a difficult time.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I must interrupt the hon. member.

[*Translation*]

It being 5.45 p.m., it is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 84(4), to interrupt the proceedings and to put to a vote forthwith all questions needed to dispose of the subamendment now before the House.

[*English*]

The question is on the amendment to the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment to the amendment?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those in favour of the amendment to the amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Call in the members.

The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 195*)

YEAS

Members

Allmand	Althouse
Angus	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Baker
Barrett	Benjamin
Black	Blackburn (Brant)
Blondin	Boudria
Butland	Catterall
Finestone	Funk
Gagliano	Gardiner
Gray (Windsor West)	Harvard
Harvey (Edmonton East)	Hopkins
Hovdebo	Keyes
Langdon (Essex—Windsor)	Manley
Murphy	Nault
Nystrom	Ouellet
Pagtakhan	Parker
Peterson	Prud'homme
Rodriguez	Simmons
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)	Stewart
Vanclief	Waddell
Walker	Wappel
Whittaker—43	