

still is and will continue to be until every Canadian is employed the major issue for all Canadians. All of our attention should be directed toward curing that problem and providing the opportunity for every Canadian to work in his or her community.

I know from talking to Canadians that while they are concerned with interest rates and inflation rates, they are of very certain mind that if they can become employed and maintain their employment they will have the opportunity at least to pay their bills, pay for their food, housing and clothing and pay interest rates, however high they are. It is a burden but one that most Canadians can live with.

As I said, and don't mind repeating, the purpose of the exercise is to generate employment and reduce unemployment in Canada. That can only be done by reducing the national debt and allowing the Canadian economy to produce what it cannot produce while it has this financial burden. If a provision in the Income Tax Act assists in any small way to encourage Canadians to consider the national debt and to work toward its reduction, then I think it has merit and I submit it to the House.

● (1720)

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry-Prescott-Russell):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in this debate on this motion. I listened very attentively to the Hon. Member. Like him I am concerned about the deficit and the state of the Canadian economy. I am sure we all share the view that we want to create jobs in this country. Obviously we want more and more of our people to have meaningful employment. I am sure that government Members, members of the Cabinet, wherever they are, if they somehow get to view this on their televisions, will see the opportunity themselves to be informed of these wishes of the Hon. Member for Halifax West (Mr. Crosby). If and when they ever come back to this House, members of the Cabinet will be aware that we are very concerned with this particular kind of issue.

I have a few deficit reducing views of my own. I think the Government should start by reducing the size of the Cabinet by roughly one-third. That would not do much for the Tory employment strategy as it affects Tory Members of this House because they are supposed to be kept busy. A bunch of Tories have just been sent to Russia for a few weeks to try to find something to do. They may come back not having done much, but the fact that this Cabinet is about one-third larger than it should be is very expensive. I see some government back-benchers nodding agreement. That is only because they were not chosen to be in Cabinet. If they were, they might have had a different view. I am glad for the time being that some Members agree with me that this Cabinet is way too large.

We see outside the west door of the House of Commons the used car lot. There are 40 very expensive limousines parked there every day.

**An Hon. Member:** Do you want one?

### *Income Tax Act*

**Mr. Boudria:** These limousines are for members of the Cabinet. Each limousine has a chauffeur who sits in the car waiting for the Minister who may show up sometimes. Then we have the chiefs of staff. There are 40 chiefs of staff. Each Cabinet Minister has a chief of staff. We pay them about \$80,000 each. These \$80,000 chiefs of staff, or political commissars as they are known in a more friendly manner by some of us here, are very expensive to this country. A proposition that I would favour as a cost-cutting deficit reducing measure is that we eliminate those positions right away, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Chartrand:** What about Stornoway?

**Mr. Boudria:** I am glad somebody raised the issue of Stornoway. I hear the Hon. Member across the way heckling. He probably does not know what he is talking about. But let me tell him that it was the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Turner) himself who canned the project on Stornoway because it was too expensive to the taxpayers. If some of the Tories had had that kind of initiative, things would be far better. Now that they know the facts, maybe they can check them out and apologize tomorrow in this House.

We were talking about deficit reduction. I was reading in today's business section of *The Toronto Star*—

**Mr. Jepson:** The Liberal Star.

**Mr. Boudria:**—an article which writes about the changes in the energy policy. The effect of this will be a reduction of \$1 million to the Treasury over the next two years and another \$1.4 billion increase in the deficit in another area. This is a massive increase in the deficit caused by the breaks that have been given to the multi-national oil industries by the present Government.

I have here a copy of the annual report of Imperial Oil Limited. I would like to read some of it for Members on the other side. Imperial Oil, of course, is in dire straits, Mr. Speaker. Maybe with the money Imperial Oil has, that company would contribute to the fund which the Member from Halifax West is suggesting. Let me read to you the summary statement from this annual report, Mr. Speaker. There are just a few lines and in part it reads:

—net income was \$221 million or \$1.38 per share compared with \$57 million or \$0.36 per share a year earlier.

As you can see, Mr. Speaker, the folks in Imperial Oil really needed the breaks given by the Minister of Energy (Miss Carney). I am sure the good voters of Ontario and Quebec and all the consumers in this country, when they pay the increased tax which the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) is shortly to impose on them, as soon as the election in Ontario is out of the way, will realize what has been perpetrated on them by the Minister of Finance. It is no coincidence that the Budget will occur only a few days after the election in Ontario. If some of the Conservative back-benchers we see here today think that this Budget is pure and holy and everything else, why do they not convince the Minister of Finance to introduce the Budget in this House one week before the Ontario election? That is when we should have the Budget. That is when we should see