

Unemployment Insurance Act

seen a government jacking up its expenditures by 14 per cent and 15 per cent from one year to the next—that is, never until this government stumbled and fumbled its way into office.

In 1963 the battle cry of the Liberals to the electorate was, elect us and we will get the economy moving again. We knew, and the Liberals knew, that the economy was rolling at that time as a result of the impact of the devalued Canadian dollar in 1962. This statement is now endorsed by history. But despite this fact the Liberal party deliberately implemented policies and programs in an effort to be all things to all people. The result has been a situation in which we have inflation, rising prices, a stagnant economy and rising unemployment, all at the same time.

That is the situation. This government's measures, starting with the tax on building materials, and on through high expenditures, high taxes and the like, have created a situation where the consumer cannot buy with his dollar those things he needs to maintain a reasonable standard of living. It may be difficult to get this across to those whose annual income is in the \$37,000 bracket. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, this is the situation.

My next point, Mr. Speaker, is that this government's policies are taking us along the road to socialism and regimentation. Some people are not worried about socialism any more, because it has become so watered down it is almost respectable. It is a little bit like the rum down in Lunenburg county: It gets watered down sometimes, and it may not be as dangerous. It loses its appeal; but if you take enough of it, even though it is watered down it still packs a wallop.

Regimentation, however, is something of which we must all beware. Regimentation means a loss of initiative and a loss of dignity. There is social regimentation in this country today. This is the kind of regimentation where they give you a card with a number on it, tell you to fill out forms, tell you where you are going to work, how much you are going to get and what you will do with your money. This kind of regimentation is here now, under this government.

Then there is economic regimentation where they allow you to work hard, make a little money and then take it away from you in order to provide for others. We are rapidly coming to that stage under this government. The Minister of Labour in his speech at Kingston last July referred to integration. He

described as a prime example of the need for integration the duplication, even triplication, in unemployment insurance, Canada Pension Plan and federal income tax. He foresaw a time when, through the numbered social security card, an individual would be processed for his Canada Pension Plan, income tax and unemployment insurance. By the time he paid his income tax, no doubt he would be looking for unemployment insurance. This is the kind of national regimentation which Liberalism is bringing upon us. It is socialism by the back door method. This kind of system, so proudly put forward by the Minister of Labour at Kingston, in my view will reduce Canadians to nothing more than a nation of ciphers.

● (4:10 p.m.)

The Liberal party has attempted to lull Canadians into believing that these costly programs do not have to be paid for. We are paying for them now, and we are paying for them in two ways—through higher taxes and through the indirect tax of growing inflation. After all, Mr. Speaker, there is no way of getting something for nothing. The governor of the Bank of Canada, Mr. Louis Rasminsky, put this in words that I should like to paraphrase and which went something like this: There is no way known to man of getting a quart out of a pint jug. You either pay through direct taxes or higher costs and prices. Under this government we are doing both.

The government is committed to an extremely costly medicare program which will add hundreds of thousands of dollars to our annual budget. In his anticipated budget deficit for this year, the finance minister did not even dare include medicare or Expo. Of course, if that sort of budget was the financial statement of a private firm, it would not be passed by any auditor. How a government can put out a budget leaving out two major budgetary items is hard to understand. When the ordinary citizen files an incomplete tax return which does not reveal his true financial picture he goes to jail. But when the minister does this he pats himself on the back as the inventor of a new budgetary technique. It is a technique that in my opinion smacks too much of "Sharp practice".

The President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Benson) says that there will be a balanced budget next year. If he were in his seat I would ask him how he knows. The Minister of Finance will not say when he plans to