

target and what he feels the true targets of a budget should be?

Mr. de Jong: It is obvious again that the real target of this budget—

Mr. Wise: Which budget are you talking about?

Mr. de Jong: It is true the target of this budget and of previous budgets have been—

Mr. Wise: The debate is on this budget.

Mr. de Jong: —to allow economic growth by giving all sorts of tax deductions and tax loopholes.

The Minister stated that reducing the deficit was a major one. He gave us some figures. He had a few assumptions. He assumed a certain price for the price of oil. He assumed a certain interest rate. From this we have from the Minister a projection that the deficit would be reduced to a shade under \$30 billion. Of course, the Tories must be crossing their fingers that they do not have another Canadian Commercial Bank or a Northland Bank that will throw the projections out by another few billion dollars. These are very shaky figures.

Mr. Wise: Your comments are a bit shaky, too.

Mr. de Jong: Unfortunately, the Minister has not realized that if he can reduce unemployment by 1 per cent he will get an extra \$2 billion. Why does the Minister not have a made-in-Canada interest rate policy, which the Tories talked about when they were in opposition, because every time that interest rates drops by 1 per cent the cost of the deficit gets reduced by \$1 billion? There are definite, different alternate strategies in terms of dealing with the deficit. We violently disagree with the strategy adopted by the Government. The Bishops state that it is an immoral strategy. It is one based on the backs of the poor and the working people while benefiting the rich.

Mr. Wise: That is 1982.

Mr. de Jong: It is still true.

Mr. Mantha: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Hon. Member for Regina East (Mr. de Jong). The New Democrats go around painting good socialist colours all over the place. I have people in my riding who are out of work. They cannot pay their union dues. They are on welfare and they find enough money to pay half the rates, hoping that the unions will get them jobs. The New Democrats take money from these union people to run their campaigns. They are taking money from the very, very poor. Can the Hon. Member answer that question?

Mr. de Jong: Mr. Speaker, concerning contributions, I understand the amount paid for dues is around 5 cents a week. Why did the Royal Bank of Canada not pay any tax in 1982? Take a look at the type of contributions that bank made to the Conservative and the Liberal Parties. I ask the Member to explain to me how the Conservative Party with a budget of

The Budget—Mr. Nielsen

some \$20 million last year raised some \$10 million to \$12 million from the corporate sector. You mean to tell me, Sir, that the \$10 million to \$12 million in contributions to the Hon. Member's Party were just contributions given with no expectations of a continuation in tax breaks? The worker who contributes to the New Democratic Party will have a guarantee that in this House of Commons someone will be standing up on his behalf drawing to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that the primary purpose of this Budget should be to create jobs. He will not be having someone, perhaps the Hon. Member and other Members standing, protecting and defending tax breaks to the Royal Bank of Canada which allow the Bank to earn over \$300 million a year and not pay 1 cent in tax. That is the purpose of contributions, Sir.

Mr. Mantha: Mr. Speaker, I would like the Hon. Member for Regina East to answer whether these people have a choice. Do they have a choice, Sir?

Mr. de Jong: Mr. Speaker, it is a choice made by a majority vote within the local. If the majority within the local decide to affiliate and make a contribution to the New Democratic Party, that decision gets made. Might I ask again, the \$10 million in corporate—

Mr. Mantha: No.

Mr. de Jong: I know he does not want to hear about this but I am going to tell him anyway. The \$10 million in corporate contributions—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member but the time for questions and comments is terminated. The Hon. Minister of National Defence.

Hon. Erik Nielsen (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I rise to participate in this debate in my capacity as Deputy Prime Minister and not as Minister of National Defence. I want to try to set the framework for what I am about to table next week in its global context.

In his budget last week, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) reminded all Members of the House of Commons, indeed, Canadians generally, that our strategy for economic renewal is based upon three fundamental principles. First, the way to create jobs is through private initiative. Second, good government does not mean more Government, it means more efficient government. Third, Canada's prosperity depends upon restoring the health of the nation's finances.

These are not principles the Minister of Finance invented last week. In fact, our Party espoused them throughout the 1984 election campaign, and our new Government reaffirmed them in an Agenda for Economic Renewal which the Minister of Finance tabled in November, 1984.

I want to address my remarks to the second principle, our commitment to more efficient Government and the manner in which that commitment is being realized through the process of program review.