

Income Tax Act

hon. members opposite which defines their economic policies as they would affect Canada. Backbenchers have used it in their remarks across Canada, and I have excerpts from the newspapers. The Minister of Finance, and his increasingly embarrassed backbenchers, have referred to his economic policy as being one of gradualism. I took it upon myself during the dinner hour to look up what "gradualism" means, and I refer everyone in the House to Roget's new edition of the vocabulary of economic theory. This is what the Minister of Finance is proposing by adopting a policy of gradualism. According to the definition in the dictionary of economic theory the following are similes for gradualism: sluggard, slow-march, mincing steps, dog-trot, slackening, retardation, creeping and slowness. What we have in the bill before the House today is a creeping, slow dog-trot. It is sluggish, and the minister is mincing steps with the people of Canada.

What the minister is saying is that even though he committed himself to fighting to keep the expenses of the government as low as the gross national product—those are his words and those are the words of the Prime Minister—what has happened in reality is that the gross national product in Canada is up only 11.1 per cent. But what has been the growth of the government following the budget and during the short term when the finance minister has been in office? I will remind the minister that the growth of government is up 12.8 per cent.

If the government continues to spend 25 per cent more than it takes in each year, there is only one place from which the government can get the shortfall, that is through taxation. The government uses every means at its disposal to expropriate multinational investments from the free enterprise system in Canada. What happens is that it discourages Canadian investment in Canada and drives oil rigs out of this country. Oil rigs are lining up at the border. Canadian investors are prepared to spend up to \$200,000 to move one oil rig across the border. Oil rigs are crossing the border at the rate of 70, 80 and 90, and the forecasts are that they will exceed 100 in the imminent future. That is costing Canada jobs. Every time we lose a job in Canada and every time a man does not have a paycheque to take home, I say to the finance minister that he is not living up to his responsibility as finance minister, and has failed to force his colleagues in the cabinet, through the budget he introduced, to bring in measures to create employment.

What did the Prime Minister say when he was leader of the opposition? He promised Canadian citizens that he would negotiate a fair price with the western provinces and, through negotiations, keep the price of gas at less than 14 cents. I purchased gas this week and found that it is up 50 cents in one year.

What did the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce promise the Canadian people when he was campaigning to be elected? He said that if he was in the cabinet, he would resign if interest rates rose higher than they were at the time the Conservatives were in power. What has happened? Interest rates have gone up 39 per cent. The Minister of Finance introduced his budget on October 28, two and half short months ago, and what did the Minister of Industry, Trade and

Commerce do about it? Has he resigned? Did he live up to his commitment to the Canadian people that if interest rates rose higher than they were when the Conservatives were in office—it was 14 per cent then—he would resign.

What is the small businessman paying today in interest rates because the finance minister has refused to bring in a tax measure which would encourage businessmen to stay in business and farmers to stay on their farms? He is driving them out of business at the rate of some 2,000. That was the figure for last year in Ontario alone. In the small business sector, there were over 5,000 bankruptcies in Canada. What does the small business sector mean to Canada? What does it mean to this government as it endeavours to raise taxes to meet its excessive spending?

The government absolutely refuses to cut the size of the bureaucracy. When the Conservatives were in government, we took major steps to reduce the size of the civil service. What has happened since this government took over? The Liberals, together with the socialists to my left—these Liberal-democrats—have allowed the civil service to expand through expropriation in the private sector. In reality what they are doing is discouraging free enterprise. They are moving its strength into the public sector, driving entrepreneurs and free enterprise people out of Canada and sending them to other parts of the world where they can make a living unencumbered by government and where the free enterprise system can function.

There is nothing more serious than the erosion of the system we have grown to respect and enjoy in Canada. It disheartened me to see the Liberal backbenchers return to their ridings this past Christmas, look their constituents in the face and say, "You do not need an energy tax credit, you do not need a mortgage interest deduction program, you do not need a property tax deduction, and you do not need any concessions in the energy policy which we introduced so successfully through closure in the House of Commons."

I predict that many members on the benches opposite will not be sitting there after the next federal election. Through their leader they introduced very carefully only four promises during the last federal election campaign, and they broke every promise to the provinces and to the people of Canada. They did not create an industrial strategy, which the Prime Minister said they would do, a strategy which would increase the number of jobs, spur growth and increase Canadian ownership. They are driving Canadian ownership out of existence. They joke about it. They are led by a man who pulls the strings, and the puppets and marionettes to my left stand up and vote in unison "Aye". The Liberal-democratic party of Canada is driving ownership out of this country through the Constitution, through their energy policy, through the budget and now through this income tax measure, which utterly fails to acknowledge the desires of the farming community with regard to the capital gains tax. What about the three generations from grandfather to son to grandson? If the minister does not respond to the needs of the farming community, farmers will lose their farms because they will not be able to afford them. Under this bill they will be forced to sell them to pay