

Time Allocation for Bill C-30

We want him to come to this House and explain what that statement means. Does it mean that the government is going to attack inflation as its first priority, and that until it does that and beats inflation we can expect no improvement in employment? What direction is he going in? How is he going to achieve this?

The minister is a world traveller. He attended a luncheon meeting of the France-Canada Chamber of Commerce in Paris—"Gay Paree".

An hon. Member: How was it?

Mr. Crosbie: While the unemployment figures are increasing in Canada the minister is in "Gay Paree". What did he say his priorities were on June 2? He said the first one was:

Reduce in an orderly way our current budget deficit.

That is the priority of the Minister of Finance but back here in Canada it is not the priority of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), who says this government is not obsessed with the deficit in the same way the previous government was and will not reduce the deficit at the expense of creating more unemployment. The people of Canada want to know how the minister is going to reduce the deficit without increasing and creating more unemployment.

The Prime Minister also said that the government does not need to reduce the deficit to help the economy, because it is a healthy economy. The people of Canada do not understand this economy to be healthy when unemployment is rising.

The deputy minister of finance, Dr. Stewart, has said it is recognized that the federal government is in a deep budget deficit. The Prime Minister does not realize that. Dr. Stewart says the deficit problem will have to be solved by generalized tax increases ultimately across the board. The people of Canada want to know what these generalized tax increases are. When is the minister going to tell us about them? Who is going to be struck? Who are the geese whose geese are going to be cooked, or whose geese are going to be goosed? This is what we want to know. It is what the people of Canada want to know.

Is the minister seriously going to take indexing off the income tax? Will there be a special levy on refinery products? The minister may say that there is a great rush for this bill, Madam Speaker, because the government cannot borrow another sou unless the bill is passed. They will not be able to pay the mothers' allowance or the old age pension if they cannot borrow this money. What a confession of failure that would be! I warn the minister not to say that because an article in *The Globe and Mail* of June 5 reports as follows:

Finance department officials emphasize they still have room to handle this month's bond issue even if the new legislation does not go through by the end of the month.

In other words, they think they can borrow another billion dollars this month without the legislation; they do not need it during June. What is the rush now to bring in closure—the guillotine, Madam Speaker—if they do not need further borrowing authority this month?

It is said that small business fears the future of the bond plan. The minister is happily back now from the sustained dangers of Paris—anyone who goes to Paris is in danger of having too good a time. When is he going to tell us and small businessmen about the future of the small business development bond that he introduced in his mini budget on April 21? He took that from my budget and I congratulate him for that. When is he going to act on it and when will the legislation come before the House? When are the people of Canada going to be told what his economic plans are?

Does the minister know the recession has started in the United States? The National Bureau of Economic Research has said that it started in January. According to a report in *The Globe and Mail* on June 5 a member of the board stated as follows:

'Things are going down very rapidly,' Mr. Feldstein said, 'more so than in previous recessions.'

The recession in the United States is apparently more severe than any recession since World War II. What does the government plan to do about that? That is why we want to know when the minister will bring in a budget. When will he indicate the government's long-term, medium-term and short-term economic and financial plans? How can he reduce the deficit and still try to counteract unemployment? Does he know about the forecast of the deputy minister of Finance that the unemployment rate that we thought might go to 8.3 per cent in 1980-81 will be worse than that? That is what the deputy minister forecast in his statement to the Senate a week ago last Tuesday.

Does the minister know that the deputy minister is also forecasting that the inflation rate will be higher than our forecast of last December, when for 1980 we forecast an 11 per cent increase in the CPI, and for 1981 a 10.1 per cent or 11.4 per cent, whichever of two scenarios occurred, high price or low price? Now the deputy minister of finance is forecasting increased inflation and that increases in the cost of living will be higher than the forecast of last December. The minister's department is forecasting that unemployment will be higher than 8.3 per cent this year and next. What is the minister doing about that? What is his approach to it?

Having defeated the previous government on a budget six months ago, and with the last budget passed by this House being brought down in December, 1978, the government owes it to the members of this House and to the public to bring in a budget before the summer recess. If they do not, then they are not accepting responsibility for having defeated our approach to the economic and financial problems of Canada.

We did not suggest that we would put the yoke of indexing on the backs, the hearts, the minds, and the pocket books of lower income Canadians, as the Minister of Finance says is probable.

We are not prepared to authorize \$12 billion, \$8 billion or \$6 billion. Well, perhaps \$6 billion or something less, so that we know we will have the minister in the House again before the end of this year. We might go for something like that, but