

undergo the same expenditure but the results would be different.

The third solution is as follows: as I have already said, make appropriate changes to the financing system in the public sector. I have here an article published on December 13, 1974, in *Le Devoir* which is quite to the point. I do not even have time to read it all, but it is relevant. It is entitled:

NOUVEAUX ÉMULES DES ORFÈVRES DU MOYEN-ÂGE

LE POUVOIR EXTRAORDINAIRE DES BANQUIERS DANS LA  
CRISE DE L'INFLATION

It starts off this way, and I quote:

A whole series of causes is to be blamed for world inflation, the increase in interest rate, the lowering of stocks, the decrease in real income in industrialized countries, the bankruptcy of first-level international banks, the instability of foreign exchange markets and the increase in unemployment throughout the world. Moreover, the common source of this situation escapes the influence of the monetary or fiscal policy of any single country.

This is not surprising since in all democratic countries, the financial world manages the governments and gives them orders. The population is led to believe that it is the parliamentarians who direct the destiny of their nation. This is absolutely false; financiers hold the levers, the financial world is in command and gives orders to the bureaucrats on how to prepare the legislation which has been passed by the parliamentarians. They want to give the impression to the population that Parliament is in command when, in fact, the House is in command of nothing. We can talk and make representations, but when the acts are passed, regulations are made. It is not the parliamentarians who make the regulations, it is the senior officials. That is what we see, Mr. Speaker, when we have to deal with the daily application of the Unemployment Insurance Act. We have surprises every day. The regulations are now more important than the act itself, and public servants stick to the regulations they have themselves prepared to apply a legislation which has been voted by members of Parliament. We know of cases of injustice of every kind resulting from the fact that those regulations have never been put before members of this House.

Finally, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner), who is listening very attentively to me, to consider the fact that it is very urgent for him, together with his colleagues in the Cabinet, to bring some amendments to this legislation which is rather voluminous and which will necessarily have to be put into effect, should it be passed as is. But at first it will be necessary to amend it to lighten the tax burden especially for low income Canadians.

● (1530)

[English]

**Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound-Muskoka):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to make a few comments on Bill C-49, the omnibus bill which the geniuses in the government ivory tower whipped up to help the government bite a few more million dollars out of the taxpayer. Speaking of bites, a bill such as this should have been served to us in smaller bites so that we could have examined it in detail before attempting to speak on it. This government has a habit of

*Income Tax*

lumping as many things together as possible: this has resulted in a bill numbering hundreds of pages. We were given two or three days to do justice to the bill in debate. All members know it is not possible, in those circumstances, to debate a measure such as Bill C-49 as completely as we should.

Those in the government benches on their short leashes may not think it is important to debate every aspect of a bill in this House. I think it is important. At least with this type of a bill, those of us who are interested in taking some strips off government ministers can talk on all aspects of government spending. What we are talking about here is raising more money for this government to spend. The present government will go down in history as the spendthrift government. I do not intend to let that happen without getting in my licks.

It was pointed out by at least one hon. member that the government talks about the great tax break it is giving to those in the low and middle-income brackets. However, by some miracle of economic hocus-pocus the government will come out a couple of billion dollars to the good. That is like selling \$10 bills for \$5 each and ending up with a profit. I would like to know more about this magic formula. It might be just what we are looking for to cure all our economic ills. The plain fact is we are taxing the Canadian wage earner to the hilt. We are spending this country into the poorhouse. I say "we", but everyone knows I mean the reckless and irresponsible Diamond Jim Bradys on the other side of the House. They are the big spenders, the people with their hands in the federal till.

I looked through Bill C-49 for some evidence that the government has at least recognized the need for something in the way of a small business development agency or bank. However, as in the past I looked in vain. There is nothing in the bill specifically designed to help the small businessman to cope with the uncertain economic climate in Canada today. There certainly is nothing in the bill to assist resourceful people in launching a small business. The plain fact is that exactly the opposite is the case. I have not seen any recent figures on the failures of small businesses in Canada today. However, if they are anything like the last ones I saw, more businesses are failing than are being started. Perhaps that is just what this government would like to see.

It used to be that when a person decided to start a small business, he or she would first look for a suitable location and then for capable and trustworthy people to staff the business. Today, though, Mr. Speaker, if anyone even got the idea that he would like to go into business he would first have to hire a first-rate tax lawyer. A good tax lawyer would probably earn his fee right off the bat by advising the person not to go into business. A good case in point is the recent 10 per cent increase in the federal tax on boats and motors. People in my riding whose businesses were affected adversely by this tax could not believe their ears when they heard about it. They were faced with unfair competition from foreign boat builders and with annual increases in inflation that is running out of control. Then they got this slap in the face. I must say that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner) relented somewhat and took the extra tax off boat hulls, and I commend him for that, but it is still on motors.