

in excess of the amount needed to carry on the business of the country.

It is all very well for supporters of the government to get up and point with pride to the tremendous surplus. But I submit, honourable senators, that if there is to be any pointing with pride, it should be in the direction of the Canadian taxpayers, who have made the necessary sacrifice to bring about this surplus. Certainly it is not due to any sacrifice on the part of the government. Last year when the Minister of Finance was trying to find an excuse for having taken \$700 million in taxes more than was required, he said, "But the government needs that for a rainy day." But what about the individual taxpayer in this country? Has he no right to have enough of his earnings left to provide for a rainy day in his household, or for emergencies that may arise? I submit that the people in the low-income brackets in Canada today, through being squeezed between the high cost of living and the excessive income tax, have not enough left to meet emergencies as they arise.

In the Speech from the Throne the unprecedented step was taken of telling what was coming in the budget: a tax reduction was forecast. But from what I hear, the taxpayer simply regards that as a death-bed repentance that was made only because of the pressure of public opinion.

Concerning the question of expenditures, if at the end of the war the government had given any indication of practising the same economy in its national housekeeping as it expected us as individuals to do in our private housekeeping, there would have been fewer complaints. I know that all governments, when asked to reduce expenditures, have given the age-old excuse: "The greater part of the expenditure is uncontrollable, and so cannot be reduced." The Dominion Bureau of Statistics has, unfortunately for the government, rather swept away that excuse. Only yesterday I received a report from the Bureau which reads as follows:

During the first eight months of the current fiscal year, the total ordinary expenditure of the government increased from 847 million dollars to 928·8 million dollars.

In analyzing this, we find that the so-called uncontrollable expenditures were able to reduce themselves from 375·6 millions to 316·2 millions—a saving of 15·5 per cent, while the expenditures over which the government has control jumped from 471·4 millions to 612·6 millions or an increase of 30 per cent.

I do not profess to be an economist; I am just one of the ordinary taxpayers; but it is my opinion that if since the close of the war the government had undertaken a strict economy in controllable expenditures and a corresponding policy of progressive reduction

of the taxes which are now falling so heavily on the lower-income groups, renewed demands for wage increases might have been avoided.

There never was a truer statement made than the one made by the honourable senator from Winnipeg (Hon. Mr. Haig) a few days ago, when he said that men and women who work for wages and salaries are not so much concerned about how much they make as they are about what is in their pay envelopes when they take them home on Friday or Saturday night. The more the government takes, the less the worker has to take home, and the more likely he is to ask for increased wages so that he may have more in his pay envelope. This condition is again reflected in higher prices for manufactured commodities. I believe that by withholding so much more money from the people than was necessary, the government is directly responsible for the continuance of the vicious circle.

With the indulgence of the house I should like to refer briefly to one paragraph in the Speech from the Throne. It has to do with what has come to be known as the "cultural omnibus resolution". As honourable senators may not have the Speech before them, I shall read the paragraph:

It is the view of my ministers that there should be an examination of the activities of agencies of the federal government relating to radio, films, television, the encouragement of arts and sciences, research, the preservation of our national records, a national library, museums, exhibitions, relations in these fields with international organizations, and activities generally which are designed to enrich our national life, and to increase our own consciousness of our national heritage and knowledge of Canada abroad.

Well, it hardly seems enough for one commission! Perhaps, if anyone thinks of something else, it may be added. It sounds to me less like proposed legislation than the confession in the Prayer Book: "We have left undone those things which we ought to have done." No wonder the *Ottawa Journal* in commenting on the proposal very aptly said:

Next in permanence to a senatorial appointment will be membership in this Royal Commission. It ought to be made up of young men in no hurry.

Let me at once say that I am entirely in accord with the objective set out in this recommendation; every part of it is important to our national life, and I am in favour of it; but I am entirely opposed to the method by which it is to be attained. I agree that matters of national importance which are controversial and very difficult of solution,—for example the freight rates question—are fit subjects for investigation by a royal commission; but to put into the hands of a royal commission all the matters contained in the list I have read savours too much of an