tion for the Canadian economy and to redress the effects of previous stupid economic policies of the Liberal government, economic policies which have resulted in the highest level of unemployment in this country in a decade.

The proposals before us confirm a recent judgment of the Minister of Finance. I will not reveal its source. It is as follows: "The Minister of Finance is the only man in Canada who has never wavered in his conviction that the rich should be made richer and the poor made poorer."

Mr. Mahoney: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member may have noted the publication from which he was quoting, but I missed it. I would appreciate if he would advise from what document he was quoting.

Mr. Broadbent: The document happens to be my notes. The source from which I got the quotation to put in my notes eludes me at this moment.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

• (4:50 p.m.)

Mr. Mahoney: Perhaps it is The Machinist. The NDP research office.

Mr. Broadbent: As a student of philosophy, I have always taken the view on epistomological questions that in terms of truth or falsity the source of a judgment is not important. What is important, and this is what I stress about the quotation is whether or not it is accurate.

An hon. Member: Get on with it.

Mr. Broadbent: Perhaps I should read it to the hon. member in case the parliamentary secretary missed it. "The Minister of Finance is the only man in Canada, who has never wavered in his conviction that the rich should be made richer and the poor made poorer". I would be glad to send that over to the parliamentary secretary. I believe one of the brighter members opposite wishes to ask a question.

Mr. Gibson: The minister of finance of what province?

Mr. Osler: My question is this. Since we are getting such pearls of wisdom from the pen of this unnamed author, could we not be given the benefit of further pearls of wisdom from the same source? Perhaps we could put the whole thing into a book, edited by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent). Then we might have a book we could sell for charitable purposes, possibly to help widows of Members of Parliament. There have been several examples of successful anonymous authorship in the past. I did not know we were allowed to quote anonymous authors here. But if we do so, we might do so for the benefit of some worthy cause.

Mr. Broadbent: I would be glad to have my speech bound and well illustrated with large print so that the hon. member can comprehend it.

The rest of my speech, if I can get on with it, is intended to show that the present measure is something which only the Liberal party could achieve, a bill which is both unjust and ineffective at the same time. Let me deal with the two most important sections. The first concerns a reduction in income tax by 3 per cent. Let us consider some of the people who will be affected at various income levels. Note with what great generosity the government has treated poor people in Canada. A Canadian worker with a wife and two children earning $4,000 a year will save the grand total of $1.09. That will inject a lot of money into the economy. If a man is earning $5,000 and has two dependents, he will save $4.53. At $6,000 he will receive $8.30; at $7,000, $12.24 and at $9,000, $20.55.

Now, these people are consumers. We are talking about injecting money into the economy. We are talking about increasing demand in order to provide more jobs. It is precisely this category of persons about whom we should be most concerned when we are providing additional spending money. I am thinking of the great bulk of Canadians who earn between $4,000 and $9,000. And it is precisely this group who are getting almost nothing from the bill. However, if you are struggling to get by on $30,000, this across-the-board reduction will net you $152.34, and if you should be eking out an existence on a mere $100,000 you will save $757.70.

The point is clear. In this country, the richer you are the more deeply indebted to the Liberal party you should be, because you will benefit more from tax measures of this kind. It is altogether unjust to apply a 3 per cent tax reduction across-the-board, because it saves the millionaire much more than it saves the poor man.

But leaving equity aside and dealing only with other economic considerations, let us remember that the bill was brought in, according to the Minister of Finance, to stimulate the economy. Who is getting the big share of the money? Is it those who will be spending most of their income or is it those in the upper income group? It is those in the upper income group, precisely the people who, when they get the benefit of their tax reduction, will not go out and spend it. They will not inject money right away into the economy by purchasing more goods and thus helping to create more jobs; they will use this saving of, for example, over $700 for the very rich, for investment purposes. It comes as a wonderful windfall for the rich to get more money to invest and ensure more profits at a later date. The economy is not stimulated at all in the initial period. No increase in consumer demand of any significance is forthcoming from the kind of across-the-board reduction for which the government has provided.

There are, in our view, two alternative approaches which could have been taken. If we were really interested in stimulating a marked early increase in demand we might have provided for a 5 per cent reduction affecting only those with incomes of $9,000 and less. It is these people who spend virtually all their income as they take it in. Another approach would have been to use the money the government proposes to allow the corporations under this bill, $160 million for the fiscal year 1971-72, and give it to everyone in the income bracket between $4,000 and $7,000 by way of a complete tax write-off. I have calculated that this would have required about $108 million for 1971-72. Subtract this sum from the $160 million the government plans to concede to the corporations, and one winds up with a surplus of $52 million for which the government could find some other useful purpose. This would have been effective and meaningful in alleviating poverty. Most families in Canada living on less than $7,000 a year are living in poverty and this would have been very