

The Budget—Mr. Racine

who chipped away the benefits that their more statesmanlike predecessors had sought to confer.

There is no antagonism to anyone in these proposals, but there is enlightened self-interest; an enlightened self-interest this country pursued for many years. I am not content to have Canadian secondary industry sold down the river by administrative chipping away of the clear intent of parliament expressed under a succession of Liberal and Conservative governments from 1904 to 1950. Well, that is precisely what we have had. Under a halo of self-righteousness my hon. friends opposite will no doubt describe this as high protectionism and repudiate all the great Liberals of yesteryear.

One further word. In accordance with the practice initiated, I think, by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Macdonnell), my friend the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River proceeded to try to find a name or description allegedly characterizing the budget. How obviously the hon. gentleman strained, how obviously hard put he was, is evident from the unreality of his characterizations. "Executive suite budget," he exclaimed. How ridiculous. This hardly merits a reply for all hon. members know that the tax changes are designed to put men to work now and in the future, to build and develop Canada for Canadians.

This is no executive suite budget. It is a payroll budget. That is what the hon. member should have styled it. It is a national development budget, a jobs for Canadians in Canada budget. It is a genuine Progressive Conservative budget.

With the right hon. gentleman from Prince Albert as Her Majesty's first minister our country has developed and expanded to the highest peak in its history. This budget so brilliantly presented by the Minister of Finance is a further step in the march of progress, ever onward, ever upward, ever more self-reliant.

Mr. McMillan: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry to say that the hon. parliamentary secretary's time has expired.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): I would have been glad to accept one.

(Translation):

Mr. Jean-Paul Racine (Beauce): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Bell) who just spoke before me, reminded me of a lawyer pleading a hopeless case. To

[Mr. Bell (Carleton).]

good arguments he substituted eloquence, and it is on that score alone that I congratulate him.

I also thank him for thus affording good publicity to last week's Liberal rally. We had been pleased at the good coverage given to it by the press throughout the country, in addition to the points covered by the press we now have those presented by the hon. parliamentary secretary.

My first words, Mr. Speaker, will be to indicate that I wholeheartedly support the amendment moved by my colleague from Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Benidickson). It seems that, under the present government, the problems of unemployment and deficits are inevitable in Canadian life. This is so true that apparently the government failed to give adequate attention to the estimates and prospects of the economic development in Canada during 1960, since the estimated \$12 million surplus forecast by the Minister of Finance will become, according to the new estimates of the minister, a deficit of approximately \$300 million.

In his budget speech of March 31, 1960, the minister stated his belief that the unemployment problem would soon improve. He will have to admit that, again on that point, he was quite wrong.

As for the C.C.F. party, the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam claims that it is wrong for us, Liberals, to draw the attention of the people to the errors of the Minister of Finance in his estimates for 1960. He even goes so far as to agree that the Minister of Finance might have been mistaken or ill-advised. The same hon. member states that the statements made by the Liberals amounted to mere weeping and wailing and yet we find that in the speech he made in this house on December 21, he said that the budget speech of the Minister of Finance is meant for businessmen and offers concessions to corporations and capitalists, but not to widows and orphans.

He also states that people in Canada and in other parts of the world no longer consider the government able to deal with national affairs.

He also says that the average citizen is even more disgusted with the government's failure to act. According to him, there is no reference in the budget speech to the development of domestic and foreign markets for Canadian products.

Further on, he says that he is very concerned over the future of GATT, if present ideas are going to prevail and if the government does not do anything about interest rates.