

Income Tax Act

must live on public relief, we are being told about restraint in Canada and in the nation's parliament.

I think we should pursue another policy designed to develop the country rather than proposes austerity or inflationary measures. The government wants to fight inflation but how can they do it when they are themselves responsible for it, when they themselves have brought about the crisis in relation to the cost of building materials by imposing a sales tax on such materials and by raising the interest rate on the C.M.C.H. loans?

And this same government is telling us that they want to fight inflation. This is not serious.

I say the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) knows what the situation is, but he is obliged to tell the house what the financiers, and not the people who elected him, ask him to say. He despises the slogan of the Liberals with regard to a just society. There will never be a just society if austerity measures are adopted, measures that force us to tighten our belts, at a time when we do not know what to do with our surpluses and with our labour, when we speak of social welfare and poverty in Canada.

Mr. Chairman, I did not want to speak too long on this clause, but I find it illogical. First of all, that money will not go into the Consolidated Revenue Fund; instead it will help the rich to grow richer and the poor to grow poorer. In addition, it constitutes a social injustice which clearly runs counter to the slogan according to which the Liberals want to achieve a just society.

As I said in this house during the debate on the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, last year, it will only be a "just for fun" society. Today, we have proof of what I said at that time, as we read the amendments proposed to the Income Tax Act.

How many Canadians could develop the country further! We are however paralyzing those who still have some spunk. We are paralyzing those who have talents, who would like to develop them. Because, through our taxes, we will have to provide for those people who are on welfare, because the government, instead of finding employment for the workers, can only offer the security of social welfare to the poor, we find ourselves in an appalling depression.

How many young talents, how many professionals, architects, engineers, qualified people, students will come out of our universities in a few weeks and, finding nothing on

the labour market, will want to seek employment anywhere in the world? The government has failed to provide an economic development policy. The more austerity there will be, the more the citizens will go abroad to seek—

The Deputy Chairman: Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but I do not think he is restricting himself quite enough to section 27 now before us, which deals with the social development tax. I would ask him to restrict his remarks to that section.

Mr. Rondeau: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Indeed, social development means a lot of things.

It involves all classes of society including the father and mother, the worker, the farmer and all those who are going to be taxed under this legislation.

It means a lot of things and it is very important. That is perhaps the reason why my remarks may seem to have gone beyond the scope of the discussion, but a 2 per cent tax for those who make \$6,000 a year involves quite a number of people and will affect the great majority of our Canadian people who will fail to see, in this legislation, a means towards fulfilment and development. Rather, they will say: "This is a tax-happy government, a pickpocket government; let us go and find a job somewhere else." That is why there are now in Canada so many talented people, people with initiative, who want to fly the country in quest of the social justice and social progress they cannot find in the present bill.

[English]

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member for Trois-Rivières has been quite adequately put in his place by the eloquent speech in the French language to which we have just listened. It may be a little while before the hon. member again raises that old saw about soaking the rich to help the poor which he tried to tag on my colleague, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. It should be obvious to the hon. member for Trois-Rivières that my colleague was not suggesting that anybody in this country be soaked. He was simply suggesting that there should be some reasonable measure of equity in the application of the necessary taxes which the government must levy from time to time to meet necessary public expenditures.

It seems to me that the eloquent speech to which we have just listened and the discussion in which we are now engaged are centred on two or three very short words in this bill. The words to which I am referring are "or