

The Budget—Mr. Darling

it would only be a short time before I would be on the street.

I am amazed and appalled, Madam Speaker, that the economic experts on the government payroll have not learned anything from the lessons learned by other countries that have tried socialism, such as Sweden. When any country or individual sets out to prove that people can get by without working, they always make sure that there are enough people who are working and paying heavy taxes so that they can support their outlandish theories. We are well on the way to the point at which those Canadians who choose to work will be paying the same rate of taxes as the Swedes, or possibly even more. As efficient as they are in managing their country, the Swedes find themselves in a dilemma of their own making as they try to stretch their welfare dollars. We in Canada are much worse off because we have a government which is welfare oriented and at the same time shockingly inefficient.

It has been pointed out time and again that our main problem in Canada today is that the government is wasteful, inefficient, and completely out of touch with the people. I can remember vividly that the Liberal Party did not ask for a mandate in 1972, nor in 1974, to destroy the work ethic in Canada and turn our country into a welfare state. And I know just as surely that the Liberal Party was not given such a mandate by the Canadian voters.

The government across the floor has demonstrated beyond a shadow of a doubt that what it really is interested in is power, and it has also demonstrated that it is prepared to do anything that it considers necessary to keep and to increase that power. Up to now it seems to have been successful in buying votes with its heavy spending and its promises of more and more handouts. Now—and this budget is conclusive proof—it is scurrying about trying to find more money for what Premier Davis calls the federal government's voracious appetite for revenue. It could be that even those spendthrifts across the floor are becoming alarmed about the prospect of the gross national debt climbing to the level of our annual gross national product.

And now, Madam Speaker, if I still have an audience, or at least a quorum to speak to, I would like to get into the matter of the tax on gasoline. I think that it has already been pointed out with regard to this scandalous tax grab on gasoline that the federal government is moving into the traditional domain of the provinces, namely, the area of taxation that provides revenue for building and maintaining provincial roads and highways. It is the old principle of raising the cost of roads from those who use them.

● (1650)

My main concern here is that the federal government is raising the tax on gasoline not for the purpose of building better roads, or to build new roads, but simply to swell the coffers of general revenue. It is obvious to everyone in this House, and indeed to people throughout the country by now, that the federal government is running out of new sources of revenue and is putting an even bigger bite on the old ones. I have said over and over again, and I repeat it now for what it is worth, we simply have to stop spending money that we do not have; we must stop talking about restraints in federal spending and start exercising

[Mr. Darling.]

restraints. We cannot talk ourselves out of the economic problems in which we find ourselves, and we cannot spend our way out of them.

What we are actually doing today, with the present government's spending practices, is saddling future generations of Canadians with a debt that is very likely to strangle them. How would any of you here in this House today like to have your children start out in life with a debt of \$2,000, \$3,000 or \$5,000 to pay off without anything to show for that debt? That is what we are doing when we keep escalating public spending and adding billions of dollars annually to the national debt.

Last year I fought the bill that sought to raise the tax on boats and motors by 10 per cent, and I thought then I had made some headway when the Minister of Finance removed the tax on boats but left it on motors. It seems as though we have been on a merry-go-round and we are now back at the same point again. Now we have a 10-cents, and later a 15-cents, increase in gasoline facing the tourist operators, on top of the 10 per cent tax on boats. It would seem—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Order, please. It being 4.55 p.m., it is my duty to interrupt these proceedings and forthwith put every question necessary to dispose of the motion now before the House. The question is on the main motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: On division.

Motion (Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)) agreed to on division.

* * *

WAYS AND MEANS

INCOME TAX ACT

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Finance) moved:

That a ways and means motion to amend the Income Tax Act laid upon the table Monday, June 23, 1975, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton) thereupon moved that Bill C-65, to amend the statute law relating to income tax, (No. 2), be read the first time.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

EXCISE TAX ACT

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Finance) moved:

That a ways and means motion to amend the Excise Tax Act laid upon the table Monday, June 23, 1975, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton) thereupon moved that Bill C-66, to amend the Excise Tax Act, be read the first time.