Mr. Mazankowski: —to set up its own mail service through a private mail carrier. I think this is a national disgrace, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Paproski: Back to the pony express.

Mr. Hees: Back to the ox cart days.

Mr. Mazankowski: While suggesting that things were going to get better, and we certainly heard that before, the minister went on to say that we have to take a new look at our situation and decide what policy will best serve our long term interest. In this connection, I feel that the minister failed miserably to come up with an imaginative scheme to meet the challenge he boasts about, providing a job for every able bodied Canadian who seeks employment, particularly on a long term basis. When you analyse this budget carefully, you see that it is nothing more than an ad hoc measure, tarnished with pre-election political taint which the government hopes will get it over the hump.

If the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) wants to make another speech, which I hope will be better than the one he made on the last budget, I would certainly like to hear it, particularly if there is anything constructive and stimulating in it. It is certain that that minister has been unable to cope with the economic problems that face industry in this country. This budget may well backfire. When we strip away the verbiage, all the frills and flowery phrases, there is no evidence of the new fundamental approach about which the minister talked. People no longer trust this government. They are suspicious of their underlying motives.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mazankowski: People are suspicious of the fine print and some of the deliberate omissions. For example, the public was very quick to recognize the fact that effective the first of the year there will be an automatic increase in personal income tax. As the hon. member for Edmonton Centre (Mr. Paproski) says, perhaps the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) cancelled the election because, now that the budget has been analysed, it can be seen that it will not provide the necessary impetus to get this country going. Can we really be sure that the corporate tax measures which have been introduced will be in effect for more than one year? There have been four budgets within the past 12 or 13 months. By simply bringing in another budget, any tax concession or tax increase can be brought into effect.

Also, can we assume that jobs will automatically be generated as a result of these measures? Manufacturing and processing industries need the stimulation provided by tax changes. I do not believe the impact of these proposals will have the immediate effect that we need. The minister alluded to the fact that the impact of the budget will only be felt within the next three or four years.

I ask this question, Mr. Speaker, also; can business generally look forward to less government interference and manipulation, thus allowing the free play of the market, coupled with the wisdom and initiative of management, to respond and foster growth in a reasonable and confident way providing long term growth and stability? We do not have that assurance in this budget. Big government continues to dominate in a very paternalistic way. Are we going to have more legislation introduced which will generate animosity and uncertainty in the business world, as the tax reform amendments, the Competition Act, the Labour code amendments and the foreign ownership question have? Are we going to have this form of government regimentation which will leave business in a state of suspended animation?

It is well known that the business community, particularly small businesses, are overwhelmed by the technical details of the recent changes in the tax law, the proposed legislation related to competitive practices and the law of industrial relations and labour standards. A very high percentage of management time is being absorbed trying to calculate the impact of these proposals to the point where essential business planning is being severely hampered. All these things collectively, which have been created in large part by the government's technocrats and academics, make up the bulk of the difficulties which have crippled the economic vitality of this country. These have affected all businesses, large and small, manufacturing and service industries as well as investment and resource industries. I suggest that if the Minister of Finance wants to create jobs, he would be wise to tackle this area and remove the gross amount of government interference which we have in the business world today.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mazankowski: I sincerely believe this would restore confidence and provide a new sense of determination which would result in renewed planning based on sound objectives. The Minister of Finance could then have introduced a full employment budget with emphasis on more direct employment and investment stimulus, more effective assistance for the labour intensive and export sectors which are placed in an unfair position by recent national and international events. There could be more effective measures to remove the corporate tax discrepancy between Canadian companies and international corporations operating in this country. That would be a worthwhile move. There should be greater across-the-board equity in incentives and tax breaks affecting other sectors such as the service industries, the construction industry, farming, fishing and logging.

I am pleased that the Minister of Finance recognized that growth in jobs comes more effectively from the private sector than the government. I commend him for taking this first step in putting government back into its proper role. While we acknowledge the fact that the corporate tax reduction in the processing and manufacturing sector, plus the added feature of accelerated depreciation on machinery, may provide some stimulus and offset the effects of DISC and the appreciation of the Canadian dollar, it should be recognized that a large part of the machinery in question will be purchased outside this country. This may have a more favourable affect on economies other than Canada's. I believe that more than 50 per cent of the $3 billion spent on machinery and equipment is spent on items imported from other coun-