

Income Tax Act

this government to the needs and aspirations of all Canadians.

In view of the minister's statement of March 7, 1968, the average citizen and the corporations affected had every right to expect that these surtaxes would be dropped at the end of the taxation year 1969-70, and they planned accordingly. But now they find the Minister of Finance still has his hand deep in their pockets, grubbing, grasping and groping for every last dollar in order to finance the extravagant expenditures of this government. In case there is any doubt about this—and some hon. members may not read *Hansard* as closely as they should—only last Tuesday we passed the supplementary estimates.

• (8:30 p.m.)

We were told then, when we voted \$91,206,528, that they were supplementary estimates. Among other things, they showed there was for only one year an increase of approximately \$350,000 in the cost of operating the Prime Minister's office. We were also concerned to discover the sum of \$1,226,000 representing extra expenditures on Senate committees as compared with their cost last year. Has anyone on the other side of the House the audacity to stand up and say the government is not wasting the taxpayers' money in an extravagant fashion? There is no one.

Our thirty-bucks minister, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson), speaking on the white paper during curtain calls on his western road show stated, "If a tax system does not command the public respect, it will not work." Obviously the government has not the respect of Canadians generally, because its anti-inflationary policies are apparently ineffective.

In the last election a strange thing happened in my riding—

An hon. Member: It sure did.

Mr. Crouse: Yes, I was re-elected. I do not like to be vindictive to my friends, some of whom sit on that side of the House, but what I meant, Mr. Speaker, was that the Liberals ran advertisements in the weeklies in my riding saying, "Don't call us Liberals; call us Grits." Many of my supporters—and the tally is there to show how many there were—came to me and asked, "what does it mean, Lloyd?" Of course, Mr. Speaker, I have difficulty at the best of times explaining what Liberals mean, but I know now what they mean. I know that the word "Liberal" means to be

[Mr. Crouse.]

deceitful and I know it means deception, because Canadians cannot believe the Grits even when their words are printed in black and white in *Hansard*.

The government having betrayed the trust of Canadians by not keeping its word on this tax measure, is it any wonder that there are hardly any signs of restraint in the upward rise of wages and prices? Only a few weeks ago the Steel Company of Canada, following a 30 per cent wage increase over a three-year period, announced a 6 per cent increase in the price of their product. This was followed within a week by an increase of almost 25 per cent in the price of nickel, and it was followed by still further increases. We read in the *Financial Times* that the domestic price of copper is at a record high of 57 cents a pound—up 27 per cent since January. We also read:

Tin, the hardening agent in bronze, is also in tight supply. At \$2.05 a pound, the price is the highest since 1965—

Cadmium, a by-product of zinc used largely in electro-plating, posted its fourth increase this year, reaching a record at \$4 (U.S.) a pound.

These metals are used in the manufacture of many products in Canada and their price increases are reflected, in turn, in the increased price of products manufactured from them. This is what is happening in Canada. The much vaunted Prices and Incomes Commission seems powerless to do anything in the face of this rising tide of wages and prices. Perhaps the real reason the Prices and Incomes Commission cannot do anything to turn back the tide of inflation is the fact that the tide was running with irresistible force long before the Commission was appointed. That inflationary tide can only be further strengthened by a bill of this type, for this bill continues to take money away from the private sector, where it would be spent in developing our material resources, and diverts it to the public sector where it will be wasted by government extravagance.

This reaction is evident when we look at the national unemployment figures for October, which show 5.3 per cent of our labour force searching for work. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know how high the national unemployment figure must climb before the Prime Minister and his colleagues shout, "Eureka! We have reached Utopia." What is the figure? Is it 7 per cent? Is it 8 per cent? Is it 10 per cent? It would be interesting to know what it is.

The government's plans as evidenced in this bill call for still higher taxes. This will