

Of course, anybody would feel better with such a mantra. What can I say, yes, it can get worse and if it can, it will, you may be sure. This is an incompetent government. My deputy leader said that I had told them about their incompetence enough times in the past 16 hours and he said that for the two hours to come I should be a little more scholarly and change subjects. I even was so nice, I will let you know, that I offered them a choice as to the subject.

Senator Fairbairn: And they picked Neil Brooks.

Senator Gigantès: Yes, there was Neil Brooks. I also suggested that I could read some more of the thousands of pages of submissions that I have here complaining about the various aspects of the GST. They were not too sure—

Senator Perrault: Please do read it.

Senator Gigantès: Pardon?

Senator Perrault: We want to hear the letters. Can we hear them, please?

Senator Gigantès: Oh, you will hear some of those, yes, absolutely. Of course, I also said that even if they were bored at times with the general theme, they cannot avoid what is going wrong now because, of course, the Tories got involved. Senator Poitras and I agreed on one thing, that the economy is complex. You cannot look at the GST in only one way, and he could think of several ways, and I added a few more, for example, the GST, the effect it will have on the economy, the side effects, how well will it be managed? Can we trust the government in what it says?

What is the track record of the government in terms of credibility and in terms of confidence, which gets us into why are they as they are, and the Tories were saying earlier, when I was answering Senator Cools and Senator Molgat as to why they picked this particular tax, well, they have no choice. It was their manufacturing friends who paid for their election victory who wanted the tax burden taken off their shoulders. Of course, they did not want it replaced by increasing income tax on the rich or on corporate profits.

What options are left? There are several. One would be decreasing interest rates and increasing the corporate taxes to correspond with those of the United States. The rich do not want that. Another option is to do as I have always said, and now the Economic Council is saying, go for full employment. The countries that have no deficit and no debt problems are countries with full employment policies. However, the Tories do not want that.

That inevitably leads one to ask, what is the structure, the origin of Tory thought? I have a whole collection of briefs here from which I intend to read. I suggest that one of the things I could do for senators opposite is read from this excellent book by Dr. Allerback. This was his doctorate thesis at Columbia. Senator Stewart knew him.

Senator Corbin: Who was that?

Senator Gigantès: Dr. Allerback.

Senator Poitras: In what century?

[Senator Gigantès.]

Senator Gigantès: He is quite recent, sir.

Senator Corbin: In your century, I think.

Senator Cools: Well, Senator Poitras, it has to be this century.

Senator Corbin: Senator Gigantès, are you now leaving the realm, the field of federal-provincial relations or will there still be an opportunity for me to put a question to you? I notice the great interest that Senator Simard had in at least the latest exchange. I was not here all day. I was here last night when you started speaking. I wish to congratulate you on an excellent job. In fact, at 3 o'clock today you made the CBC national news with your unique performance. I extend to you my warmest congratulations, you are fighting a good cause and it is being recognized right across Canada.

• (1600)

On the subject of federal-provincial relations, I am going to read a few quotes and afterwards I would like you to comment on the current state of federal-provincial relations. I do not expect you to relate at length to the Meech Lake exercise. You did so very well earlier this day in the wee hours of the morning. I thought you did quite a thorough and professional job of setting the record straight. That is not the type of federal-provincial relations I would like you to address at this time.

I should like to talk about fiscal matters. I have in my hand an extract from the Synoptic Reports of the Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of New Brunswick, Volume 2, session of 1972. Guess who was Minister of Finance in New Brunswick in 1972? The Honourable Jean-Maurice Simard. I am going to say very nice things about him, so I would ask him not to get excited. What I have to say is highly positive and highly constructive. I have always had respect for Senator Simard, except during the election period when he would not stay in his court and mind his business. However, that is a thing of the past.

Nevertheless, we are talking about federal-provincial relations. In the course of the presentation of his budget on April 5, 1972, the then Honourable Jean-Maurice Simard, Minister of Finance for New Brunswick said this:

The past 12 months have seen a great deal of activity in the field of federal-provincial relations. From the point of view of the general public, the most evident item of business has probably been the federal-provincial discussions on changes in the income tax system.

This is very relevant to the current debate. He goes on to say:

Two years after the introduction of the White Paper on Income Tax Reform, the federal government presented to parliament its revised tax legislation, which was passed late in December. During the year many discussions took place between the federal and provincial governments on the shape of the tax changes, with some concessions . . .

I presume this next comment is an editorial comment on the part of Senator Simard. He could not be perceived as coope-