

The Budget—Mr. Kaplan

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[Editor's Note: Table referred to above follows.]

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES AND
CANADA TOTAL EMPLOYEES
as at March 31, 1952-1969

| Year | Number of Federal Employees | Total Number Employed in Canada | Percentage Column 1 of Column 2 |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| | 1 | 2 | |
| 1952..... | 131,646 ¹ | 5,169,000 | 2.5 |
| 1953..... | 163,192 | 5,235,000 | 3.1 |
| 1954..... | 171,366 | 5,243,000 | 3.3 |
| 1955..... | 181,913 | 5,364,000 | 3.4 |
| 1956..... | 182,835 | 5,585,000 | 3.3 |
| 1957..... | 185,271 | 5,731,000 | 3.2 |
| 1958..... | 195,390 | 5,706,000 | 3.4 |
| 1959..... | 197,909 | 5,870,000 | 3.4 |
| 1960..... | 195,630 | 5,965,000 | 3.3 |
| 1961..... | 202,807 | 6,055,000 | 3.3 |
| 1962..... | 205,553 | 6,225,000 | 3.3 |
| 1963..... | 198,821 | 6,375,000 | 3.1 |
| 1964..... | 201,900 | 6,609,000 | 3.1 |
| 1965..... | 203,519 | 6,862,000 | 3.0 |
| 1966..... | 212,646 | 7,152,000 | 3.0 |
| 1967..... | 225,342 | 7,379,000 | 3.1 |
| 1968..... | 235,492 | 7,537,000 | 3.1 |
| 1969..... | 232,862 | 7,780,000 | 3.0 |

¹Data with respect to prevailing rate, ship's officers and crews, and casual employees were not available in 1952, but have been included for subsequent years.

Prepared by:
Federal Governments Section
Governments Division
Dominion Bureau of Statistics
March 3, 1970

Mr. Kaplan: I recognize your feelings in the matter, Mr. Speaker, and I am very grateful to you for inviting the House to permit me this latitude.

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, I want the hon. member to file them, but before his time runs out I want to ask him a question. I was interested in his speech, in which at the outset he said changes were necessary and that he was confident there would be changes to the white paper. I want to ask him what changes he contemplates to the white paper, and what his position will be if those changes are not made.

Mr. Kaplan: Mr. Speaker, I think that is a fair question. I am a member of the finance committee, and as such I feel I have some responsibility to hear the submissions which will be made to us before coming to any final conclusions. However, I have taken the trouble to express my views at great length

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard).]

in material that I have been making available to my constituents. It is not a question that I should like to answer on one foot, so to speak, but I do not want to avoid the question. I wonder whether the hon. member would be satisfied if I sent him the material I have circulated on this question?

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to familiarize myself with it.

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, I, too, welcome the presentation of a budget, if for no other reason than that it enables me to have the opportunity to debate the economic state of our nation. A budget such as the one announced could hardly serve any purpose other than to give us an opportunity to debate. I feel that its total effect will be nil. Certainly, it gave no sense of reassurance, and it revealed nothing.

Last Thursday as I journeyed to and from the chamber and saw the batteries of cameras return to the hallowed halls outside, and as I looked once again and saw the CBC cameras under the glowing lights, it reminded me of the tense moments just before curtain time for a great production. This time I should like to call the production "The great Budget of 1970".

The budget day was a suspense filled duplication of that great day of the white paper on tax reforms, an occasion when for the first time I and other MP's were given the unprecedented thrill of being locked in the railway committee room where we waited with bated breath for the performance, which I would call "I am curious, tax reforms". Instead of bringing in this package of empty endeavour, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) could simply have made a brief statement. In fact, the budget could have been described with two simple words—"nothing new". However, rather than do this the minister chose to re-embark upon a dialogue which is beginning to sound more and more like the theme of the old movie, "For Whom the Bell Tolls".

In his opening remarks, the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) referred to the performance of the minister as "cold turkey". I think it would better be described as a bit of old ham. Historically, the year 1970 will become known as the year of the revival of Robin Hood, but a Robin Hood in reverse. This will be a new type of Robin Hood, one that takes from the poor and gives to the rich. On this occasion the Robin Hood of