

*The Budget—Mr. Gauthier*

economic theory in the area of full employment surplus in attempting to achieve the full potential of the economy. The budget rejects also the Canadian white paper on employment and income of 1945 in which the federal government assumed complete responsibility for the full employment of the labour force and undertakes instead a deliberate policy of forced unemployment in Canada. The budget rejects the general philosophy of the Carter commission on taxation, that the first and most essential purpose of taxation is to share the burdens of the state fairly among all individuals and families.

Canadians are shocked when we say today that the government of this country created unemployment; but the government has created unemployment. I think Canadians should realize what their government has done. This budget rejects the goals of the Economic Council of Canada of full employment, of a high rate of economic growth and of equitable distribution of rising incomes. For these reasons this budget should be rejected by this parliament. I therefore move: seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That the amendment be amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma and by adding immediately thereafter the following words: "and rejects in particular the 2 per cent income tax increase, with its \$120 cut-off, which is an outrageous burden on those in the lower and middle income brackets and adds to the inequity of our tax system."

*[Translation]*

**Mr. C.-A. Gauthier (Roberval):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have my turn this evening to say a few words in order to criticize the budget that was presented to us.

Mr. Speaker, this evening I should have liked to have heard our expert on financial matters, the member for Compton (Mr. Latulippe), who certainly will have the opportunity of analysing the budget and of pointing out its weaknesses, not only for the benefit of the hon. members but especially to acquaint the people of Canada with the work that goes on in this house, and in particular with those things that keep happening every session. I shall therefore limit myself to generalities this evening, leaving it to some of my colleagues to analyse the budget in detail.

Listening to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson), when he brought down his first budget—but not the first one we have had in this year 1968—I realized that the formula was always the same. Much emphasis, but very poor results. At the very beginning of

[Mr. Saltzman.]

his statement, as will be found on page 1677 of *Hansard*, the minister said, and I quote:

The government and its strong parliamentary majority have come into office with many new ideas and a desire to look at our problems with a fresh perspective.

The wish he expresses, Mr. Speaker, every Minister of Finance has expressed before him; indeed, there is no lack of good will in the departments, or on the part of the minister and the government chambers. Further on, the minister tells us what is lacking, and I quote:

However—

—after having expressed that great desire, there is a "but".

—we have, however, many major commitments. These restrict our freedom of innovation and make it necessary for us to work out our new ideas over time.

I feel that those lines are full of meaning for the people of Canada, because the minister admits that he is not free to innovate as he would like to, that he will need time. How much time will he need? One year, two years, the whole period the present government is in power? That is precisely what the whole population is wondering about.

I think that the members who want more information about that budget had better deal directly with the senior officials since the minister is often their obedient tool, their spokesman. I do not see any in the galleries tonight but usually they are there watching. That is what makes the people say that Canada often has an irresponsible government. A democratic government that is not elected by the majority of the people cannot be responsible to the people and that is precisely the present state of our government of bureaucrats. If you add to them the spokesmen who are the ministers elected by the campaign funds of the financiers, who are even less able to represent the voice of the people, you have an idea of our bureaucratic dictatorship which some people still have the nerve to call a monarchist democracy.

It has become customary to get a new minister of finance for each budget, but great care is taken not to tamper with the government machinery. With each budget new actors in new costumes are seen but the director remains always the same. They claim that it is a brand-new play, but we readily realize that the original version goes back to one hundred years. And the Canadian comedy