

of the objectives of the Government and the way in which it has pursued them.

[*Translation*]

So, Mr. Speaker, the question is whether the measures introduced last Friday can indeed be called a Budget. My answer is no, Mr. Speaker.

A Budget must include an over-all economic strategy, not only a tax strategy, and that is all we got from the Government.

Mr. Speaker, a Budget in the 80s must set targets in terms of job creation and in terms of unemployment levels acceptable to the Government, which is more than the forecasts we got. Forecasts are useful of course, but regardless of the Government or Party in office the Budget has to give a clear indication of what the Government is aiming for.

That is exactly what is missing in this Budget, Mr. Speaker. There is no reference to employment or to an economic strategy, and of course there can be no such strategy without public support. Obviously that is another missing element of this Budget.

Mr. Speaker, let us take the British Government as an example.

[*English*]

The Thatcher Government, which over the years has had the support of business and the financial community, has driven up the level of unemployment in that sadly afflicted country. At the same time it has not met its fiscal projections.

We should be asking why our Government does not have popular support in the Budget. Obviously the Government is loading the burden on the individual. Individual taxes will increase four times faster than corporate taxes this year. By 1990, those taxes will have increased 10 times over the increase in corporate taxes—\$2.9 billion compared with \$295 million. It is scandalous. The Government is pursuing the Liberal policy of shifting the tax burden from corporations to individuals. In fact, if we include last year's tax changes, individuals will be paying \$7 billion more in personal and sales taxes, while corporations will be paying \$75 million less.

Another reason the Budget will not have the support of the people is that there are no unemployment rate targets, as I have said. The Government is proud of what it believes is its record, a reduction of .8 per cent in the unemployment rate between 1984 and 1985. Frankly, the Budget shows that the Government is taking advantage of the economic recovery and of job creation in the private sector which have little or nothing to do with the measures taken by it. It is relying on the private sector to create jobs and is cynically cutting back in job creation and the types of measures that would lead to a reduction of 2.5 points in unemployment this year, which is what we in the New Democratic Party believe it should be.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) spoke about a developing consensus. Indeed there is a developing consensus. It

is that the tax system is unfair, and nine out of ten Canadians said that in the Gallup poll.

[*Translation*]

So what we have, Mr. Speaker, is indeed a callous Budget. It is a fact that Canadian men and women wanted employment to be a priority. By shifting that responsibility over to the private sector the Government is taking a laissez-faire approach rather than showing leadership. Obviously a 6.5 per cent decrease this year and next year is not good enough. The Budget slashes roughly \$200 million from the Canadian Jobs Strategy program, the very program which the Government was bragging about and advocating as being the solution to unemployment in Canada. What a shame, what a let-down, Mr. Speaker!

[*English*]

What should this great attack on the deficit have done? The deficit was cut in the Budget to \$29.5 billion. Why? It was largely because the voices to whom the Government listened demanded that it should be cut.

I should like to spend a moment or two on the matter of the deficit. While I acknowledge that it is indeed a problem, one which has to be controlled in the long term, it is not a problem which should be solved on the backs of the people of Canada. We know that unemployment insurance is putting a heavy drain on the public purse, but we know as well that it is because the strategies which are being used are not tailored to the objectives. Incidentally, the Government's anti-inflation strategy has produced the highest real interest rates in the history of the country. It is missing the mark, and that is why the deficit is going up.

What should have happened if the Government had been correct in the way it was attacking the deficit and if the deficit was really the prime preoccupation? Of course the financial markets should have manifested their confidence in the leadership of the Government of Canada, with the value of the Canadian dollar rising and with interest rates going down. These are the signs of confidence. Instead, the fact is that the dollar has gone down and the interest rates are staying up. That is happening not only because the international financial community and the Canadian financial community realize that the Government has gone overboard, but because the Government is also basing its Budget on false assumptions. That is a very serious charge, and I would not lay it if I did not believe it. It is a charge to which the Government must put up a defence, not send out its Members in massed ranks with pre-canned speeches for simple regurgitation in front of the House, which does no credit to them or to the House of Commons.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Tell the truth.

**Mr. Parry:** I am telling the truth, and that Hon. Member had better get his place on the list so that he can answer some of these charges. Predicating the oil price \$22.50 per barrel when it is presently sitting in the \$15-\$16 range is misleading the Canadian public. We know that the Budget measures