

areas to do their buying. Sometimes I think that the reason for this in small cities like my own city of Brantford is that they may sometimes be embarrassed by the amount of money or disposable income they may have to spend.

I am getting rather tired of listening to the age old argument from the reactionaries in this country that transfer payments to those on middle incomes, low incomes and on fix incomes is a bad thing economically. I suggest that governments at all levels—the municipal level, the educational level, the provincial level through sales tax, and the federal level through income taxes and hidden sales taxes—get back almost as much as they put out. In fact I think it might be a good idea if somebody conducted an up to date study. We might even find out that the governments of this country, particularly the federal government, are actually making money out of transfer payments to the needy. I hope some day most of us in this country will come to our senses and realize that this is money in circulation. When I speak of money I am talking about transfer payments to the needy. This is not money which is going down the drain; it is money which stays in circulation, so let us not completely and totally blame the poor or the disadvantaged for the mismanagement of the economy of the country.

Regardless of this the government continues on its hell bent course, eliminating programs which are worth while just because it has become, shall we say, fashionable to knock them. This is best exemplified by the title of this bill: "An act to amend or repeal certain statutes to enable restraint of government expenditures". One is tempted to suggest that the title was probably written by some officer of the Maclaren Advertising Agency in Toronto. I am not suggesting that is true, but this sounds like one of their slick advertising gimmicks.

It is easy to understand why the government has adopted the stance it has vis-à-vis government expenditures. Big government, a catch-all term meaning virtually anything paid for by taxes, has become the whipping boy of western society, not just in Canada but in the United States as well. In virtually every western country the public is blaming big government for anything and everything which goes wrong.

This anti government trend was particularly visible prior to the recent U.S. elections. Both the president elect and the defeated candidate for the Republican Party ran for president on the anti Washington, anti big government platform. Here in this country the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) has done much the same when speaking to business groups and the like. The message seems to be, "Let's get government off our backs". However, as a columnist for one of our national magazines stated recently, this is, and I quote "a little like a temperance man applying for a liquor licence".

This anti big government feeling is not abated when former key officials in government like John Turner and Simon Reisman single out government spending as a chief cause of inflation. It is unfortunate that the former deputy minister does not mention the fact that government expenditures

Restraint of Government Expenditures

increase dramatically when individuals such as himself receive pensions in excess of \$30,000 per year, and which are indexed.

In saying all this I do not mean to suggest that many of the complaints about expenditures are unwarranted. Ploughing through the Auditor General's reports of the last decade one can come up with countless examples of where the government has gone astray in administering public funds.

In addition, if we look at the amount of money expended through deductions—and they are expenditures, let us face it—we find that these deductions cost the government \$6.4 billion in lost revenue for the 1974 fiscal year. These figures were issued recently by the National Council of Welfare, and they have already been put on the record by the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow). It is interesting to note in this context that the very people who want less government—I refer here mainly to the large business community—have profited the most from government involvement in their operations.

As has been stated before during this debate—and I am going to re-emphasize it, and as this debate continues, I hope other hon. members of my party will do likewise—no nation in the world has given the corporate sector a more handsome gift package of subsidies, tax allowances, two year write offs, deductibility of merger costs, cheap loans—and the list goes on—than this one under this government. On the one hand, a few moments ago I mentioned that there is a mood abroad in the land that one of the greatest faults of our country is that too much money is being given to the "poor", but on the other hand, if we look at the facts and figures, we find that this country has been more generous—when I say this country, I am talking about the taxpayers—to the business and corporate sectors than any other country in the industrial western world. Yet if I may quote the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) with reference to banks, they are the ones who do the most bitching.

But still the clamouring continues, from the business community, from many hon. members to my right and, I suspect, even from hon. members across the way. Consequently, instead of implementing some of the Auditor General's recommendations or cutting back on many of the gratuitous tax exemptions for corporations and individuals, the government slashes the amount of money which families desperately require, or eliminates groups like the Company of Young Canadians, which was performing a useful social function before some of the older members of our society stepped in and told the CYC that its members were too young, too radical, too innovative, and wasting money. I gave credit to the Liberal government when it set up the Company of Young Canadians. The concept was an admirable one, and I think if we had let the CYC run the show itself in those days, it probably would have done an even better job.

When we oppose these measures, we in my party are accused by the government of being two faced on the whole issue of government expenditures. The common response from government members is as follows: "You want us to cut expenditures and, when we do, you complain." Lately they have been saying that in order to fight inflation, everyone has