

Meaning that he has applied these, but perhaps not slavishly. The author goes on:

... has integrated and applied his radical and critical theory in an original and concrete manner to the historical circumstances (the French fact) and political situation (federalism and the length of Liberal party in power in Ottawa) in Canada. If he were ever to submit himself to the iron discipline imposed by an authoritarian party he would, according to his own criteria, lack intellectual integrity.

However, says the writer, and I hope that hon. members opposite will understand this:

... he has no moral right—either human or political—to hide his radicalism behind a Liberal philosophy party and parliament—empty them of their traditional meaning—destroy their direction, and in the process deceive the people...

So when I stated a few moments ago that the Liberal party had sacrificed its principles and ethics—at least the government has—I was not alone in making that statement.

What are some of the examples of this dangerous mix of Marxist philosophy and politics of confrontation at which this Prime Minister is so good? The first thing which must be done is to bring about inflation. Lenin pointed out that nothing disorganizes like inflation. "In order to destroy bourgeois society, you must debauch its money". The Trudeau plan to encourage inflation has succeeded admirably. The spending habits of the government have brought about a situation in which middle class small businessmen, the backbone of the so-called bourgeois society, are in danger of being destroyed completely. I must submit that that is precisely what is being accomplished under the direction of the Prime Minister.

They are taxed at every turn. They are required to fill out endless expensive government forms. They are in competition with big business in the market place, and in general they are being slowly strangled by the government and the Prime Minister, who has no use for personal initiative, the work ethic or free enterprise. In February of 1970, in the midst of the first great inflation crisis brought on by this administration, the Prime Minister stated, "We have no alternative; we must end inflation". Unfortunately, as is so often the case, that statement was merely window dressing. It was uttered in 1970 when government spending for the year was \$13.6 billion. By 1974 that figure had more than doubled, to \$31.3 billion.

This year we have been presented with estimated government expenditures of \$48.5 billion. That works out to an almost 500 per cent increase in the ten years that the Prime Minister has been in office. What is more, the most recent memorable statement of the Prime Minister regarding inflation, the now infamous remark that "we have wrestled inflation to the ground", was uttered in the same year that government spending increased by 28 per cent. That was a real wrestling match!

The Prime Minister blames everyone but himself and the government. He has blamed external forces and said that all the nations of the free world are facing the same problems. He has stated that these are situations that cannot be combatted on the domestic front, and so there have been times when he has said that we have to await certain international changes and changes in the United States before we can effectively deal with the problem of inflation. When the Prime Minister

Financial Administration Act

got tired of using that excuse he said that Canadians were to blame and that they were spending too much money. He said that they would have to tighten their belts, exercise restraint, and realize that they cannot have as much as they had in the past. So the Prime Minister went from external forces to the Canadian people, but in no case did he say that the government was responsible because of its free spending philosophy and because of its uncontrolled expenditures. That was beside the point.

I would say that all the talk about restraint and what the government is doing to exercise restraint and control its expenditures is just that, talk. There has been nothing realistic or concrete taking place because, no matter what figures we look at, we find that the spending continues and, of course, the government and particularly the Prime Minister are basically responsible for this situation.

What has happened to the Canadian dollar? We have heard quite a lot recently about how our dollar has been exploited on international money markets, and I think it is disgraceful for the government to sit back and blame Canadians for being too soft or too fat and unproductive. The fact is that the government has destroyed the confidence of the international community in Canada's economy. It has destroyed the confidence of Canadians. Its unfair tax system has discouraged Canadians from investing in their own country and has forced both Canadian and American risk capital to other, more reliable economies in the world market place.

So now we have "Trudough", a peculiar 88-cents dollar which makes the so-called "Diefendollar" of the 1960's, which the Liberals used to talk about, look like a bargain by comparison. In terms of purchasing power our dollar at the last tabulation was worth less than 60 cents in terms of 1970 purchasing power. When Lenin talked about debauching money, he did not know what a willing servant he would have as head of the Canadian government throughout most of the 1970's.

I should like now to turn to some of the more specific areas of government spending to which the Canadian people are raising strenuous objections. During this last decade of free wheeling spending, a decade which can be likened to the biblical parable about the prodigal son spending his money on riotous living, Canadians have not seen even one major social program put in place. What they have seen is another matter. They have seen the unemployment insurance fund bulge from \$700 million to \$4.5 billion. They have seen the federal Public Service grow from 246,000 people to over 325,000. In spite of the fact that the Prime Minister and spokesmen for the government said there would be a freeze on Public Service hiring, we see an increase of this kind.

The bilingualism program which cost some \$70 million in 1970 has mushroomed to a whopping \$503 million for 1978-79. In addition, in order to pay bonuses to public servants who have been trained at public expense to become bilingual—and they have not become bilingual—it will cost Canadian taxpayers \$35.7 million in 1978-79.