

*The Budget—Mr. Jones*

ly within the next 10 or 12 months—that is, if the pilot, navigator and crew have steered the proper course.

What I am saying is that I sincerely trust that the members of this House realize the terribly fragile condition of the economy and use their best endeavours, despite political or party allegiance, to co-operate with the minister in every way possible in order to share the load and achieve the goal of moderating inflation and, at the same time, sustaining economic growth.

However, I question whether the May budget, so called, was the real issue in the July election, at least in my own constituency anyway. I just want to set the record straight in that regard.

It behooves all of us during this session to be patient with the minister and the government in their alleged efforts to “wrestle inflation to the ground”. But it behooves the minister and the government to inform the House immediately of all the restraints and their results, both good and bad, and if it is necessary to change course at any time, immediately to advise the House. If his theories are wrong, the minister should admit it. Each and every one of us must continue not only to urge government restraint—that is, reduce government waste, duplication, bureaucratic bungling and empire building, red tape and inefficiency, and, at the same time, provide adequate services—but we must urge and promote savings and less waste, not only in government at all levels but also at all levels of the private sector. Quite frankly, it is not so much what is in the budget that should concern this House; it is what is missing from the budget that concerns many, many Canadians.

Much is said in the budget about housing. A number of other items should have been added. First, there should have been an amendment to the Income Tax Act to provide for deduction by home owners of mortgage interest, municipal and provincial property taxes. Mortgage interest under the present act is subject to taxation in the hands of both the mortgagee and the mortgagor. This is double taxation and unfair and unjust. Second, there should have been an amendment to the Income Tax Act to exempt from taxable income interest on municipal bonds. Third, there should have been an appropriate provision for assurance that elimination of sales taxes on building materials and supplies will be credited to the home owner. Fourth, there should have been steps to reduce interest rates immediately on mortgages for home building or home purchase, and reduce interest rates for municipalities for public works by setting up a separate banking authority. I sincerely believe that these items could very well be included in the budget without upsetting the balance, and they certainly comply with the objectives, goals and aims indicated by the Minister of Finance on Monday night last.

The matter of regional disparity is still an important priority in this country. I was happy to hear during this session that government restraint will not cut into programs of regional economic expansion, particularly in the Moncton constituency. This is one program which eventually could make the poor provinces self-sufficient. Regional economic expansion must concern itself not only with secondary industry but also with transportation and pri-

mary industries such as farming, fishing, forestry and mining, along with power development.

Furthermore, a great deal is said about what is being done for our older citizens. Possibly the old age pension should be renamed a citizen's service pension, and on that basis these pensions should commence at age 60 instead of 65, in certain qualified cases, with the basic pension increased substantially.

The budget as presented purports to provide savings by government restraint. There is certainly a need to cut out waste, duplication, red tape and bureaucratic bungling, and to create greater efficiency in government. A little common sense, along with business sense, can create a great deal of savings of both dollars and cents.

One of the quickest and most effective ways to save millions of dollars, yes even billions according to some calculations, and create unity in the long run, is to reassess and improve the method of implementation of bilingualism in this country. Many public servants are just waiting for “doomsday,” the date of their retirement, in the knowledge that their chances of promotion are practically nil. The merit system, in fact, is no longer in effect. Adult language educational programs in the government services and in Crown corporations just are not effective for the amount of money spent thereon. This is a perfect example of government waste.

Problems of this kind usually are solved by educational means, not at the adult level but in the public schools throughout the country. It is time we took an example from other countries where barriers have automatically arisen because of segregation in educational systems. It is my sincere belief that if Canada and Canadians are to be truly bilingual, and if we are to believe in equal rights and opportunities for all, then all youngsters in this country must be educated together. If this country is to be truly bilingual, it is time both English and French were taught in our public schools on an integrated basis. Let all our children be educated together. Let them learn together, play together and work together. Then they will get along together. Then and only then will our children become true Canadians.

If the consent of the provinces is required, or if it should be necessary to amend the British North America Act in order to bring this into effect, then a serious attempt to do so must be started forthwith. We should face the facts. Barriers are a problem in Canada. So often I have found young people unable to obtain employment in their chosen field, both in government and in private business, because they are not bilingual. The ground rules are being changed quickly and easily. Many of our young people are not being given the opportunity to comply with the rules. The barriers are set up at a young age. Let us change the ground rules if need be, but let us make a proper and fair preparation for such changes.

Bill 22 enacted by the legislature of Quebec will not promote unity or harmony. In my opinion it is unconstitutional, and will result in injustices and inequities for Quebecers and other Canadians. The onus is still on the federal government to put a halt immediately to this matter by appropriate steps. Bill 22 conflicts with Canada's Official Languages Act and the New Brunswick offi-