

Again in 1975, he said:

We haven't been able to make it work, the free market system . . . the government is going to have to take a larger role in running institutions. It means there is going to be not less authority in our lives but perhaps more.

In 1976 he said, and I quote again:

We haven't been able to make even a modified free market system work in Canada to prevent the kinds of problems we are now experiencing.

In 1977 the Prime Minister said:

If Canadians don't discipline themselves, we will discipline them.

So it is with that backdrop that we must analyze this budget. On closer examination, it is clearly revealed that this is an interventionist budget, that it will rely very heavily on political decision making, that it will rely very heavily on the bureaucracy. The whole recovery program of tax increases and future deficits starting in 1984 will mean that the Government will have a much greater voice in the economic affairs of this country.

One must ask at the outset why, since Petro-Canada's acquisition of Petrofina is now complete, are we continuing the Canadian ownership charge? This will amass a \$3½ billion slush fund that will probably be used for further intervention in the energy sector and for further nationalization of the oil industry. Because of the political decision making by Cabinet Ministers or their bureaucracies that will take place, we run the risk of creating further division and criticism in the country.

The Certified General Accountants of Alberta have already stated, and I quote from a release of April 19:

Eastern Canadians will reap most benefits from Marc Lalonde's April 19th budget—

The release goes on to say:

The labour intensive provinces of Ontario and Quebec will enjoy a massive immediate shot in the arm from the Finance Minister's \$4.8 billion Special Recovery Program . . . while the effects on the west will be mainly indirect.

Whether that is true or not, that impression prevails in the West. Whenever the Government makes those decisions, it runs the risk of creating that kind of further division and disharmony.

Westerners are now asking about what has happened to the \$4 billion Western Development Fund heralded in the 1980 budget. Well, it was dribbled away by transfers into other programs and has disappeared.

The Mayor of the City of Edmonton sent a wire to the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Gray), the Minister of Public Works (Mr. LeBlanc) and the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Axworthy) with respect to the Capital Works Program. The wire reads:

Today's announcement concerning the federal Gov't's 2.4 billion dlr capital works program made no mention of any projects in Edmonton.

That is the risk that is run when there is a heavy reliance upon the Government and its bureaucracies to make what really amounts to economic decisions.

I suppose when this budget is compared with previous budgets that were generally disastrous, one can say that it is quite likely that this budget will not make matters worse. It is

### *The Budget—Mr. Mazankowski*

questionable, however, whether it will improve things; the jury is still out on it.

**Mr. Breau:** It is a Conservative budget.

**Mr. Mazankowski:** Well, I am glad that the budget contains some elements that are Conservative. That is quite true. It contains some Conservative elements, but there still is the hand of Government that will intervene because the Government does not have faith in the private sector and does not have faith in the average Canadian.

I suppose we can assume that this budget will not do as much harm as did the two previous budgets. In 1980 we had double-tracking and today we will have fast-tracking. That is one positive thing that can be said about the budget.

Mr. Speaker, when one looks at the budget, it can clearly be seen as essentially a budget of tinkering. There are really no new innovative measures that address the real chronic and structural problems that we face today. There are very few measures directed specifically toward creating jobs and thereby generating new wealth in the private sector. The budget contains very, very few innovative measures.

The Hon. Member shakes his head, but if he looks at the budget as a businessman would, I am sure in all honesty he would say: "You may be right". The budget contains a number of initiatives in so far as the public sector is concerned but not really quite that many in so far as initiating a resurgence in the private sector. The budget does not create the kind of positive environment that will generate real new wealth.

The Hon. Member mentions the equities. Yes, I support those. For example, I think the Index Security Investment Plan is a good plan. I am glad that it has been introduced. The treatment of investment tax credits, yes, will provide some new stimulus in the Special Recovery Share-Purchase Tax Credit. Yes, I believe those are all positive measures. I would be irresponsible if I failed to mention those and I do hope they will improve the climate. Perhaps the changes in income averaging is another good measure, although it is because of the Government inflicted recession that we are in the sort of situation that makes it attractive to use that kind of facility.

It appears that the Government cannot bring itself to trust the private sector. It does not have confidence in the private sector. This lack of trust is manifested in the Minister of Finance's reply when asked why there were no tax cuts in the budget. He replied something to the effect that Canadians cannot be trusted with extra money. He said that Canadians cannot be trusted with tax breaks because they would rush out and blow the extra money on imported goodies, or worse, might even use the extra bucks to go on a holiday abroad. With that kind of confidence in the people of Canada, how can the people of Canada in turn have confidence in the Government.

Mr. Speaker, again I say the budget talks a good line about faith and about revitalization of the private sector, but on close