

curve showed an increase. This increase began to decline after the Liberal party was returned to power.

The figures which I have are from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. I am informed that these figures have never been requested before in precisely this form. As I have these figures here, I wonder if I might have the consent of hon. members to include the figures from 1952 to 1969 in the text of my remarks this afternoon?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): I must point out to the hon. member that it is not the practice to append lists of figures to a speech.

Mr. Kaplan: Mr. Speaker, I would not ask it if these figures could be obtained by anyone by any other means. As these figures have not been produced in this form before, I think it might be useful for hon. members to have them. I wonder if the consent of the House might be given?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Possibly the hon. member could read the figures into the record.

Mr. Kaplan: I will come back to them if I have time.

Mr. Bell: We are quite generous on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, provided they are not very lengthy, in spite of the fact the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) would not extend the same courtesy to us. We are still good sports. The hon. member can place these figures on the record.

Mr. Orlikow: I do not want to do anything which would interfere with the speech of the hon. member for Don Mills, (Mr. Kaplan). However, this issue was raised several days ago when the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) wanted to put some figures on the record. Mr. Speaker ruled this could not be done. If we are going to have a policy, we ought to have the policy decided upon by the Speaker after proper consideration and not make decisions because some members are not paying attention.

Mr. Kaplan: Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to press the point. If all members do not consent, there is not much point in arguing.

In any event, I have only the figures up to March 31, 1969 and therefore they do not reflect the implementation of the reduction in staff announced in August, 1969 by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). In the Prime Minister's speech of August 13, he referred to a

The Budget—Mr. Kaplan

series of planned staff reduction measures and concluded "taken together, these reductions add up to 25,000 jobs—a 10 per cent decrease from the 1968 authorized size of the public service". When the results of this program are reflected in the statistics I referred to, the curve of decline in the size of the Federal Public Service will be even more steep.

Another measure of the government scale of operations is reflected in what it borrows. Everybody complains about the volume of federal spending and the size of the national debt. Here, this government is turning the tide of past trends. This will be the first year in over ten years in which the national debt is reduced in absolute amount. There has been borrowing this year, there has been debt repaid this year and, on balance, the national debt has been reduced. It has declined for the first time in over ten years. Let us hope this is not the last year in which the national debt declines.

The conclusions that I draw from these facts are that if taxation reflected only federal spending, taxes would be decreasing. Yet we have the constant complaint from the public indicating a feeling that the federal government is moving in the opposite direction. When a situation exists where the facts are precisely opposed to what the public thinks, some explanation is in order. I think two factors are involved in this public misconception.

First, there is the enormous growth of municipal and provincial expenditures which have increased very sharply since 1952, even if the shared-cost programs with which the federal government has burdened them are excluded. The public understanding of the different activities of the different governments is not as clear as it could be. I do not mean to suggest that municipal and provincial programs are indefensible—far from it. What I am insisting, however, is that the federal government is not contributing to this growth and that the government cannot be charged with socialism or empire building of this kind.

There is one area that deserves special attention. The constitutional development of this country has led to much duplication of services. This duplication did not matter at the time when total taxes were lower, but today the taxpayers should be complaining more than they are about this duplication. Why do we have 11 departments of agriculture, health, national resources and trade development complete with foreign services?