

Mr. Crouse: Someone opposite says they counted the returns. If I ever heard of anything that smacks of Liberal arrogance, that is certainly it. The Prime Minister continued:

The media, they are adding to the worry and the uneasiness in our country.

He concluded by saying:

It is not a good year.

This certainly does not sound like the man who in the *Chronicle-Herald* of June 29, 1974, promised:

Every action taken and program initiated by the Atlantic Province Liberal candidates and Prime Minister Trudeau will ensure that the complex fabric of our economic, social and cultural life developed over generations in the Atlantic Provinces will be preserved and strengthened for the people of this region. Our efforts must maintain strong rural communities, strengthen and expand local industries, improve family farm operations, revitalize our fisheries and continue and increase social improvement within the Atlantic environment.

● (2020)

Those are fine words but the government and its supporters have a long way to go before any of those fine promises are implemented, especially as they relate to the fishing industry in Atlantic Canada. I would say that the statement made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in Montreal is a serious indictment of the Liberal government and of the party he leads, a party which has been in charge of Canada's affairs since 1963 and which obviously has not led us onward and upward but which rather has led us downward and out.

Whenever we move a motion of this type there are always members on the government benches who accuse us of playing politics. I wonder how desperate economic conditions could become before those who support the government and those who sit on the treasury benches say: "Maybe the opposition has a point; maybe we should listen to them."

In support of our amendment I should like to quote the headline in the *Labour News* put out by the Department of Labour—"Canada's Strike Record one of the world's worst". The text reads:

Figures due to be released by the federal labour department within the next week will show 1974 was Canada's worst year ever for labour relations with the number of man-days lost through strikes rising to 9.5 million—67 per cent higher than in 1973... Canada lost more days through labour disputes than any major industrialized country with the exception of Italy.

That, gentlemen, is something of which I suppose you are proud. We, as Conservatives, certainly do not share that pride. When we read statistics like this we must ask ourselves why so many workers are striking. The answer is that the labouring man cannot get ahead of inflation. High taxes, which contribute to high prices, have caused him to rebel against the system. In effect, he is saying: "The check-off from my pay due to taxes is too high; I need more money to take home so as to provide for my family."

Again, when we move a motion of this type we are sometimes asked: "Where would you like us to make the cuts? Would you like us to reduce pensions for veterans, for example?" We know this is a cynical and facetious response by supporters of the government. Nevertheless

Income Tax

there are areas of government spending in which cuts could be made.

All that members of the cabinet need do is to look at the booklet put out in 1974 by the Treasury Board showing how the tax dollar is spent. If they do so they will find many places in which cuts could be made. I refer the Minister of Finance—I am sorry he is not in his place tonight—to page 27 where the heading "General Government Services" appears. There are at least four items on that page dealing with Information Canada, Justice, National Revenue and correctional services, with respect to which expenditures have gone into orbit. The budget for Information Canada, for example, is \$8 million. We said during the election campaign in 1974 that Information Canada could be abolished in its entirety. We said this could be done without the Canadian public suffering any loss of information. The information bureau in all the departments of government continue to exist. They have not been cut and they are still capable of furnishing whatever information the public requires.

In 1973-74 the Department of National Revenue cost the Canadian people \$275 million. In 1974-75 it is costing \$308.5 million, an increase in one year of \$33.5 million. Does anyone on the government benches ask why there should be an increase of this order in one year? Has the cost of printing income tax forms gone up by so much? This is something I urge the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Basford) to investigate.

The Department of Justice is listed as having cost \$29.6 million in 1973-74. For 1974-75 it is listed at \$43.6 million, an increase of \$14 million. I know the government has increased the salaries of judges but it is surely hard to justify an increase of \$14 million in one year.

The cost of correctional services is listed at \$141 million for 1973-74. For 1974-75 the figure is \$177.3 million, an increase of \$33.2 million in one year. Surely this causes the treasury benches some concern. Have our morals degenerated to such an extent that we are obliged to increase expenditure on correctional services to the tune of \$33 million in one year?

There are further examples on the next page under the item "Internal Overhead Expenses". Here we find the cost of accommodation for government support services, rent, maintenance and new buildings. In 1973-74 the amount listed is \$394.8 million, but for 1974-75 the cost is given as \$436 million, an increase of \$42.1 million in one year. Surely some cuts could be made in this type of expenditure.

There is another interesting item at the top of the page. The heading is "Other Administrative Costs Including Contingencies". The amount arrived at for 1973-74 is \$145.6 million, but for 1974-75 the proposal is \$246 million. This represents an increase of \$100.8 million in one year. Madam Speaker, I ask you: What is this for? I ask the treasury benches: For what? I ask any Member of Parliament who represents 65,000 or more people here: For what? I ask them if, when I am finished, they can get up and tell me why the government needs \$100 million more for "other administrative costs and contingencies". What a kitty, Madam Speaker! What a pork barrel!

An hon. Member: What baloney!