

Income Tax Act

done by this august body, the Government of Canada through the House of Commons. Out of the 40 per cent spent by the federal government, we pay it back to the provinces in the form of cost-sharing programs.

If one looks at the budget of Canada in a similar manner to a housewife looking at her budget, one would indicate that before a dollar is taken in, 40 per cent of income has gone out in the transfer of payments. Very few people on the government or opposition sides would say that 40 per cent should be renegotiated and cut down. Over the years we have seen greater and greater amounts of funds being transferred to the provinces. I have a strange sense of humour, but it gives me a considerable laugh that some of the provinces which are very rapacious in taking and demanding more in the form of transfer of payments, use the federal government as an example of a wasteful child. They use their own healthy, balanced economies as models for the federal government to follow.

If the federal government could decrease its spending overnight by 40 per cent, it would become a model of restraint also. But it would mean the provinces would have 40 per cent of their incomes decreased, which would result in them being in either deficit positions or having to raise their taxes. I am not criticizing the provinces in their financial matters. I bring this up because I do not think the issues concerning where money should be spent and how it should be spent in Canada has been debated adequately. It is no longer good enough to say the government and the federalists are always wrong.

Mr. McKenzie: But that is correct.

Mr. Anderson: It cannot be said any more. One must say what is wrong with the government. Solutions must be proposed, and the provinces and their spending should be taken into account. Anyone who does not do that is being a charlatan, or a person I would not trust too much. It is not enough to indicate that it is necessary to cut down on government spending. One must say where the spending can be cut down.

If the Public Service of Canada is abolished, would there be a large saving to the people of Canada? Would taxes be reduced by several billions of dollars? Would the budget be balanced? Of course not.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): What about cutting down the number of civil servants?

Mr. Anderson: If one civil servant was taken off the payroll, our problem would not be solved. Hon. members are aware of that. Are Canadians willing to have a cut in health and welfare benefits? Should there be a cut in the Department of National Defence? I have not seen many members jumping to their feet and proposing cuts in the Department of National Defence. Where can expenses be reduced?

Mr. Nystrom: The Senate.

Mr. Anderson: The people of Canada have the right to hear from opposition members not only that expenditures should be reduced. It is not enough to indicate that alone. Opposition

[Mr. Anderson.]

members should make proposals which indicate the areas where expenses can be reduced by \$2 billion, \$3 billion, or \$4 billion. The people of Canada should be shown where reductions can be implemented, because they are not as dumb as hon. members opposite think they are. I have heard that story before.

● (1632)

Mr. McKenzie: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I would point out that on February 2 of this year, on our opposition day, we presented a motion calling for a review of every government department and every government program.

An hon. Member: That is not a point of order.

Mr. McKenzie: This was intended to introduce sunset laws, and it was turned down by this Liberal government and the NDP. They are not the least bit interested in reviewing anything.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member will agree, I am sure, that this is a difference of opinion. I notice he has not participated in the debate. He can make these points and even pursue them if he seeks the floor.

Mr. Anderson: Mr. Speaker, I can understand the reason for the hon. member standing to speak. He is right in one respect. He is one of the few members who has come up with a positive suggestion. He said what they would do would be cut off the deputy ministers. He was going to have a purge. The only problem is that the next day his House leader stood up and said that was not the case. I admire the hon. member for his intervention, but I must suggest there is a negative aspect to it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McKenzie: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing the hon. member for the island has proved, it is that he reads absolutely nothing. I would refer him to the May edition of the *Argus Journal* in which he can read what civil servants are saying about the government's policies and all its lay-offs.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I suggest to the hon. member that this is not a point of order but a point of dispute.

Mr. Anderson: Mr. Speaker, I respect the intervention of the hon. member and, as he knows, I respect him. I gave him credit for the fact that he made positive suggestions. The only difficulty we have arises from the fact that his House leader took the hon. member to task and told him to be quiet.

Mr. McKenzie: Obviously you do not read anything.

Mr. Anderson: I have no objection to the hon. member's statements. I am certainly not one who would attempt to increase the number of people in the civil service. However, this is not a simple matter. In the province of British Columbia we have a salmon enhancement program in respect of which the federal government will be spending \$150 million over a