

government had a windfall, a once in a lifetime advance payment of \$285 million. This time it is going to be \$215 million.

**Mr. Stanfield:** The next step will be that we are asked to pay next year's tax this year.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** We will conjecture on that, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps we will be called upon to prepay our taxes. Rather a case of pay now and work later.

On the basis of what I said the other night, Mr. Speaker, and what I have said this afternoon, although I could spend another hour on the deficiencies of this budget, in the interest of letting others have a go at this rather poor document I should now like to move, seconded by the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Asselin):

That all the words after "that" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

This house regrets that the government has repeatedly deceived this house and the Canadian public as to the extent and gravity of the 1968-69 budgetary deficit and has destroyed its own credibility and that of the 1969-70 budgetary forecasts notwithstanding the heaviest peacetime tax increases and consequently rejects the government's statement of the country's financial position.

**Mr. Max Saltzman (Waterloo):** Mr. Speaker, this budget must stand as a colossal fraud. It is unenterprising and it is unfair. It is a budget for the privileged, not for the vast majority of Canadians.

This government was elected on the promise of bringing in the "just society". Yet its first budget puts the lie to that promise. Rather than moving toward the just society the government has moved to make our world more unjust than before. The Canadian people have a right to expect fairness and intelligence from their government, but instead of fairness and intelligence they have gotten injustice and bird-brained indifference.

This budget must stand condemned on two counts: first, because it asks the poor to pay for the government's errors and mistakes; second, because it completely misses the whole point of what is wrong with the Canadian economy. At this time in Canadian history, a time of slow growth in our economy, the government insists on dragging its feet and pulling the economy down even farther. It is not as though the government has not received opinions on how it should conduct the affairs of the country or what sort of priorities should be established in the management of the nation.

Let us just look at two such opinions, Mr. Speaker. In the 1967 memorandum to the

*The Budget—Mr. Saltzman*

government by the Canadian Labour Congress, the congress pointed out the danger of lagging growth rates and rising unemployment and urged the government to take all necessary steps designed to prevent the economy from seriously slackening off. They repeated this warning in their 1968 memorandum to the government when they said in their statement on economy policy:

● (5:30 p.m.)

—it now seems perfectly clear that our advice was ignored. On numerous occasions in the past year and a half the government in budget after budget has either increased taxes or reduced government expenditures or both. These actions ostensibly aimed at balancing the budget have served only to worsen the situation. There is no special virtue in a balanced budget although it is now apparent that its attainment ranks far higher in the government's list of economic priorities than does the attainment of full employment.

On the other hand, the Canadian Chamber of Commerce has advised the government that it should adopt a tight-fisted approach, despite the prospects of an economic slowdown in 1969. The general manager of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, when speaking in Calgary on September 30, said in his annual business outlook review that our rate of economic growth would slow down early next year. He also predicted that the growth in gross national product, in real terms, would drop to 3 per cent in the first half of 1969. He also predicted a probable increase in unemployment. He said in his statement:

Given this outlook, it might appear logical for the government to move to stimulate business... Serious errors could be made if government policy followed this direction.

Obviously the chamber of commerce does not think that the logical course ought to be followed and neither, apparently, does the government. Clearly, the chamber of commerce is little concerned about unemployment in this country and it is obvious that the government has accepted that particular body's outlook. It is hard to know why the government supports this kind of position since, after all, the chamber of commerce represents but a small segment of the people of Canada. Also, that chamber has almost invariably been wrong in its economic predictions. Almost invariably it has opposed progressive measures in this country such as medicare, the Canada Pension Plan and so on. Its new windmill to tilt at is the Canada development corporation.

Let it be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that this is a chamber of commerce government