

Income Tax Act

would apply only for the years 1969 and 1970. I say, Mr. Speaker, they are an increase in taxes.

When speaking on this matter on March 7, 1968, the then minister of finance, Mr. Sharp, said: "...the measures proposed in this resolution are intended to produce \$390 million in budgetary revenues in the 1968-69 fiscal year." Yet today when this measure was introduced to the House by the hon. member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray), he almost implied that we should pass it quickly—let's get this over in a hurry; it is only a small matter! From the wording of the bill one might suppose it is quite innocuous, that it does not have any great effect on Canada, but we cannot ignore any measure which proposes to take \$390 million out of the Canadian economy and divert it to the government sector. The application of these taxes to the over-all development of Canada demonstrates, in the final analysis, the administrative ability of a government. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the extension of these surtaxes for another year is a frank admission that this government is giving weak and ineffective leadership in its efforts to curb inflation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Crouse: We can only hope that the men who occupy the treasury benches will read the *Financial Post* and the *Financial Times* and learn what is going on in Canada. We have regional desks and I do not know what they are doing, but obviously there is a great space between the grass and the brass because they are not aware of what is happening in this country. We hope they will have such a realization very shortly and will bring in policies that will not create stagnation in our economy but will instead bring over-all growth and development to Canada. It is time this government showed its concern for stability in our economy; it is time this government showed some concern for increasing employment, not unemployment, in our labour force. By that I do not mean, Mr. Speaker, advertisements of the type I saw in the press this week extolling the benefits of being unemployed. That is not the kind of advertisement that built this country, and it is not what we want to see in our press, publicizing the inability of this government and its desire to bring in policies to keep people out of work, emphasizing the benefits of the dole.

[Mr. Crouse.]

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Crouse: Only when we bring back stability and growth to this economy, only when these prime objectives are achieved, can the government hope to attain some of its socialistic dreams. This will not be achieved, Mr. Speaker, by saying one thing and doing another, which was done by a former minister of finance, as reported in *Hansard*. It will not be achieved by making false promises to the people of Canada in an effort to buy time to use as a cover-up for inaction regarding the basic problems facing Canadians.

Inflation is the major problem today. The stability of our economy and the reduction of regional disparities should be the government's major goal. The puck is on the government side, and rather than watch some fancy stick-handling over there by individual players, let us see a team effort to solve our problems. Team effort, Mr. Speaker, is in the final analysis the only effort with any chance of success. For these reasons I am happy to second the motion moved by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert).

[Translation]

Mr. J. A. Mongrain (Trois-Rivières): Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I will infringe for only a second the rules of the house, because of the outright provocation directed to me by the opposition by referring to Three Rivers.

This is not a matter of narrow-mindedness nor of out and out nationalism; it is that there is no such city as Three Rivers. In fact, we still have the English version of the incorporation act of the city of Trois-Rivières, where it is actually called Trois-Rivières.

By the way, I urge all members from other provinces to name cities having incorporation acts written in both languages, dating back to more than a hundred years, as in the case of Trois-Rivières.

For instance, there is in Manitoba a city called Souris and nobody ever thought of translating that into Mouse. The Speaker's name is Lamoureux, yet I never call him Lover.

I have a few words to add concerning Bill C-139, for it would be unthinkable to leave *Hansard* readers under the impression that the wave of curses that has just unfurled on the party in power is justified. There are, after all, obvious principles, even for the opposition members, but they are not in a position to say so, because it would not be cricket.