

because the government is taking in surplus revenue which is not required to meet the minister's budgetary or non-budgetary expenses, it should be given back. How much is the government receiving in revenue? Let me refer to the minister's statement of January 31. He said:

For December, budgetary revenues were \$2,199 million, expenditures were \$2,108 million, and there was a surplus of \$91 million.

I put this on the record as an indication of how far this rip-off is going. The release states:

Finance minister John N. Turner released today the regular monthly statement of the government's financial operations for December, 1974, and the first nine months of the current fiscal year.

I have just read the figures, which indicate that there was a surplus of \$91 million. In December, 1973—

● (1640)

**An hon. Member:** Author?

**Mr. Alexander:** Did the hon. member not hear what I said? This comes from the Department of Finance. You Liberals are the authors.

**An hon. Member:** Will you table it?

**Mr. Alexander:** I will table it later today, if that is allowed. In December, 1973, revenues were \$1,728 million, expenditures were \$1,446 million, and there was a surplus of \$282 million. This is all we are talking about. For the first nine months of the current fiscal year, budgetary revenues were \$18,029 million, expenditures were \$17,495 million, and there was a surplus of \$534 million. Mr. Speaker, you will notice the upward acceleration. For the same period last year, revenues were \$13,666 million, expenditures were \$13,370 million, and there was a surplus of \$296 million. What is happening over there? Why can this motion not be recognized as meaningful, in view of the minister's statement?

When I think of the amount of money that has been collected as a surplus, I realize that the taxpayer is not getting a break even though he is entitled to a break. The kind of break we are talking about will not affect one iota the minister's transfer payments, payments with respect to disability, sickness, old age, pensions or unemployment insurance. All these are guaranteed under the minister's taxation policy as it stands now and the budgetary requirements that he has already met. All we are saying is that if the minister is serious with respect to restraint, then because he does not know how to restrain himself and his colleagues we in the House must obviously play that role in determining how it is to be done. We on this side of the House, as well as members on the other side, must play that role because the minister—I say this with all due respect because I love him like a brother, if he will accept that phrase—does not realize that his credibility is being shot down when he talks about restraint, particularly when the restraint should be with regard to government expenditures.

I know he is trying to reach a consensus. He is meeting with labour, industry and other governments. What is he trying to do? Is he trying to play hanky-panky, to pacify the Canadian people, to let it appear as if he were doing something? What has he done? We do not know what he is continuing to do with respect to inflation. That is not out

### *Income Tax*

the window; that is somewhere over there because the budget did nothing to abate it. That is not what the minister means. The minister must give leadership in restraint, and restraint should affect government spending. By removing some of that surplus money from the government's hands, we will apply the adage: If you don't have it, you can't spend it.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Better stay with your script.

**An hon. Member:** What does the note that came to you say? Does it read, "Bring home two loaves of bread"?

**Mr. Alexander:** I will tell you what it reads. It reads, "Can't make ends meet"—spelled m-e-a-t.

**An hon. Member:** Now we are getting down to the problem.

**Mr. Alexander:** Yes, if you don't have it, you can't spend it. Thereby we are creating forced restraint.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** The old Conservative doctrine.

**Mr. Alexander:** When I think of what is happening now, when I think of the adverse effects that touch us all because the income we have does not allow us to cope with the rising cost of prices—you will notice, Mr. Speaker, that I am speaking to the motion—all we are saying is, first, that the Canadian taxpayer is entitled to a break and, second, because the government does not know how to cope we suggest a policy of forced restraint. This is the goal we are trying to reach. I hope hon. members can understand and appreciate the rationalization of the problem which I have brought before them. I say to the government, "Stop being the biggest profiteer in the country, and give the taxpayer a break."

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt):** Mr. Speaker—

**An hon. Member:** Is Sinclair also giving you his speech to read?

**Mr. Rodriguez:** I hardly think I would be looking to my right for somebody to write my speeches. Bill C-49 deals with individual and corporate taxation, but I would like to take a look at the section dealing with corporate taxation, specifically taxation affecting the resource sector. It seems to me that whenever governments, and my only experience since I have been in Canada has been with Liberal government taxation—

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Rodriguez:** Whenever I consider that taxation I am always amazed at the way in which Liberal governments look at the Canadian community as if it were a giant Lazarus with many sores. Whenever one of the sores breaks out, the government places a plaster on it. It seems to be the approach that this government adopts with regard to every single problem that has ever arisen in this country. For example, last winter we suddenly experienced an energy crisis and the government was