

feeling a pinch and the first place they cut is their employment. It is very obvious that they will start sliding over the jobs. With the 350,000 farms in Canada today, I would wager that every one of them could use one of those people who are unemployed, if the system allowed a means of paying for that help. We would have a better country as a result of it, but as long as the government is sucking tax dollars out of the system the way it is, and not putting anything back into it—not even developing programs which will lay a strong base, but rather weakening the system—then it will become worse and worse.

I think the government should be looking at some of these things. I make these suggestions to the government so that our country will be better. But allowing the bureaucracy to pour out reams and reams of paper so that it costs us more and more to pay our taxes is not the way we should be going. We should be going the other route. It is not only out there that we require extra man-hours; it is right within the department. Therefore, I think it would be in the best interests of all of us if the government were cognizant of these things and realized that in the direction in which we are going there will be disaster in another two, three or four years.

We still have time to turn it around, but time is running out. I trust the minister will take this message to the Prime Minister and remind him that he promised after the election that he would listen to what we had to say.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock-North Delta): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak to the matter before the House. I say that somewhat with tongue in cheek because it is never really a pleasure to talk on a taxation bill. I suppose it is a sure thing, but it is also a disappointment that we must talk about the kind of bill before us. It really does not display any clearcut government policy, unless the policy is makeshift, patch up, or retrench, without any guidance to the economic forces in our country. There really is no pattern in this legislation by which the industrial sector, the business community, can chart its course for the next few years.

● (1650)

I see the Minister of State for Finance (Mr. Bussièrès) is here and I gratefully watched him take notes when the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Towers) was speaking. I hope having made those notes he will show us later on that he will answer some of the questions which have arisen during the course of this debate. There have been serious questions asked regarding the economy in our country and the direction, or lack of it, which the government is giving to our economic forces. It is a sad commentary on our country when only two provinces out of ten show any kind of economic growth. I am fortunate to represent a riding in one of those provinces.

I am glad the people in my province do not face the kind of financial pressures which many of the people in eastern Canada face, at least to the same degree. While we have unemployment in Surrey, which is a matter of distress for those who are unemployed, it does not reach the magnitude of

many other areas in the country. Nevertheless, those people who face unemployment because of the financial policies of the government, are experiencing no comfort from knowing that it does not hurt quite so much in British Columbia as it does in Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and the other provinces. That is of small comfort to them.

One of the things which disturbs me is the subtle directions in which we are headed, not stated, but nevertheless directions in which the government is taking us. I recall reading about a month ago an economic analyst's report in the *Vancouver Province* in which one of the federal government's financial statements was being examined. Apart from the details in the report, what disturbed me most was the direction of the language of the report, the direction in which the government is taking us. It was very clear in the analysis of that statement that the mentality of the government is one that it could have taxed more but that it chose not to exercise all of its taxing powers. It was as though the government was doing the taxpayer a favour.

There was a time, Mr. Speaker, when the citizens of Canada thought that all of their possessions really belonged to them, except for those which they gave to the government to enable it to continue the essential services. But it was clear from this report that we had now turned around the other way, the government now assumed that all the possessions belonged to it except those which it chose to leave to the people to dispose of as they thought fit. Mr. Speaker, that is nothing short of stateism.

Whereas it is only the subtle turn of language which seems now to indicate the direction of the government, as the hon. member for Red Deer just pointed out more and more the drift of the government is in that direction. It is a direction in which the awesome powers of the government can expropriate willy nilly what was once privately owned by an individual or by a corporation standing in the place of an individual. We saw this in Bill C-42. It used to be that the government's taxing policies were determined by the taxes available, or the spending was determined by the taxes available. Now it is the other way around, the taxes are now determined by the spending. At this point that may be a subtle shift, but every month come pay day every taxpayer in Canada knows that the shift has taken place.

Since the spending powers of the government seem to be totally unrestrained, this means that the taxing powers of the central government are more and more unrestrained. The government's policy now is to try to find more places from where it can obtain revenue to satisfy its gargantuan appetite for spending. That is wrong. It violates the principle of ownership in our country. At one time in our land it was thought that a man's home was his castle. The policy which the government is now developing seems to be that a man's home is his castle until the government wants a piece of it.

I recall listening to the hon. member for Broadview-Greenwood (Mr. Rae) at the outset of this debate harking to the Carter commission report of the late 1960s, which ultimately ended up in the 1972 tax legislation. The hon. member for Red