

and surrounding area that is the true symbol of a free enterprise system.

If these citizens of the city of London and the surrounding rural areas are going to continue to progress in the manner that they have in the past and, Mr. Speaker, they are no different from millions of other citizens throughout this great Canada of ours, they must have confidence in a federal government leadership that will give them the incentive that they so desperately need. This, Mr. Speaker, is the background for a few areas that I would like to elaborate on this afternoon. Canadians have the right to expect positive leadership, from their federal government, and not just a group of followers.

To illustrate what I mean, Mr. Speaker, I think we have had the greatest exhibition of kite flying that this country has ever known, during what will be known in history as the Trudeau years. Now, when I mention kite flying I do not mean the recent exhibition on the front lawn of parliament a few weeks ago. I am referring to the time the former Minister of Finance subjected this country to that monstrosity known as the white paper on taxation. I was not a member at that time. I was one of the hundreds of thousands of employers, owner of a small business in particular, who frantically enlisted every means possible to try and convince the then minister of the folly of such legislation as it related to small business.

Mr. Speaker, such kite flying cost this country untold hundreds of thousands of dollars in accountants' and lawyers' fees, and after many months of frustration and expensive anxiety we were informed that the 50 per cent taxation on all business, large or small, would not be implemented as proposed. There were also concessions in other areas, but the point of it all is that when this same Prime Minister and his supercircle of advisers finally realized this tax paper was not acceptable, they simply passed it off with another shrug and said, "We never intended to implement it; we just wanted to see what the people thought about it".

That was my impression of the government of the day, looking in from the outside. Now that I am here, I am sorry to say we seem to be saddled with the same idea of following. Mr. Speaker, the proof of all this was once again displayed by yet another Minister of Finance last Monday evening when he attempted to convince the taxpayers of the soundness of an original tax plan, when in fact he was capitalizing on one of the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Stanfield) own sound proposals in the last campaign.

Small business must have more reasonable assurances of stability in the future, or Canadian small business failures will continue to rise, even at a greater rate than in 1972, which was the highest period. The free enterprise system that encourages individuals to launch their own ideas and optimism, through outlets of their own small businesses, is still alive, even after such negative federal discouragement these past few years, and more particularly from this last budget. The small business concession in this budget does nothing for the man who wants to start up, or is already in production but cannot find reasonable capital to continue. Such people are the embryo of unlimited employment potential if given a chance. But financial institutions today are not interested in taking that

The Budget—Mr. Frank

chance, so I feel it is up to the federal government to provide the necessary confidence.

I know of the frustration of small business. I had the nerve to start one in 1956, with no excess capital but with lots of enthusiasm and energy. It is an agri-business, so you know it was never lucrative to the lending institutions, government or otherwise. But today, from a one-man and my family beginning, this business now maintains over 25 employees, and distributes brand name products, two of them with my own Canadian and United States patents, to all provinces across Canada and much of the United States, and with even a shipment to Japan. I still recognize that same optimism and energy in this Canada of ours, but they need sound financial encouragement if we hope to keep on building a better and more productive society.

I would now like to discuss the budget as it relates to our senior citizens. There is no doubt that they have been given reasonable consideration, but I wonder if the increase will really do much good in the area where it is most needed. I mean the area of supplying their essential drugs. I receive numerous letters from senior citizens, and drug costs are by far the biggest problem to overcome. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that if the minister could see his way clear to let these people have their prescription drug needs compensated in full, he would be supporting the class of senior citizen that is the hardest hit. There must be some way to perform this service systematically for these people. I know many who, with total drug support, could continue to live independently for much longer, and keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, that these are many of the same independent individuals who built this country. They struggled and deprived themselves of what were necessities to them at that time, trusting future generations to stand by them.

The conditions today must be a bitter pill, to be forced down the throats of our senior citizens by a government that has such apparent indifference to society. "Yes," they say, "but that is all over now, that was our other face." They seem to forget the old phrase, "It's a long lane without a turn". You cannot hoodwink the people of Canada indefinitely, and a lot more than just our senior citizens will eventually prove that statement when they come to submit their 1972 tax returns.

The tax-paying public who are recipients of Canadian dividends are virtually asked to sign a return that in effect is a falsehood. It is not only a falsehood but an underhanded way to try and hoodwink these taxpayers into helping to pay for the so-called goodies in this budget, because there is a one-third levy automatically added to their T5 dividend returns which, in effect, shows them stating an income above that which they in actual fact received, even including the 20 per cent tax credit.

I know of several people who have already confronted the local tax departments on this fact, and were virtually given the opinion that it was true. Officials tried to pass it off as too complicated to explain. This puts these civil servants in an embarrassing situation, and sometimes finds them being rude to the inquiring taxpayer because remember, they are human too, and can stand only so much needling for a situation they had no part in bringing into being. So, as it now looks, there will be thousands of