

Speaker, and it makes interesting reading. That figure is \$2.8 billion, or 11 per cent above the forecast expenditure for 1974-75.

Since this booklet was printed, according to figures placed on the record by the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien) when he spoke to the House on Tuesday these figures have now escalated to \$35 billion. At the same time as the President of the Treasury Board made this figure available to us, he pleaded in his speech that those on this side give him some suggestions as to how to cut this expenditure. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have been here a long time and I believe the minister was speaking facetiously, because whenever we do make suggestions in the House and in committee as to how certain expenditures can be curtailed or cut down, to my knowledge no action is ever taken. Despite the proposals we make and the criticisms we render of certain policies, eventually these expenditures are made and we end up in the public accounts committee with someone asking why they were made.

I am prepared to give the minister some serious suggestions that I hope he will consider, for only by getting to the root cause of excessive spending can we hope, in my view, to curb inflation. For example, in the estimates of the Secretary of State (Mr. Faulkner) the minister will find a subsidy to the National Arts Centre of \$6,892,000 just to keep the doors open. Apparently in the government's view the show must go on. Give them bread and circuses and let the people pay for it. If you check back, Mr. Speaker, I think you will find that Canadians built the building at a cost of something like \$50 million. In desperate times of economic recession like those we face in Canada today, I believe this centre could well pay its way. If it cannot, I submit it should close its doors until things improve.

To call it a National Arts Centre is a misnomer in any event, because there are many people in my constituency, and perhaps throughout Nova Scotia, who have never even seen the National Arts Centre, much less attended a show. It is really only for the people of Ottawa. There are centres in Montreal and in Toronto, and not too many people come from regional areas to view the productions that are put on in the National Arts Centre. I think this is one area that could well be examined by the government.

I also submit the expenditures of the CBC should be overhauled. In 1957, when I first came to this House, I remember looking at the subsidy provided the CBC, which at that time was \$52 million. I remember making a speech on that item. The Hon. George Nowlan was minister of national revenue responsible to the House for the CBC, and he did not take too kindly to my comments. I criticized the subsidy. I said in a speech I made in the House that it represented \$1 million a week and that I felt it should be looked into.

Now what do we find, Mr. Speaker? This year, in addition to all the money that comes in from other sources, the CBC will be subsidized by the amount of \$352,895,000. That is almost \$1 million a day. Again, the end is nowhere in sight because I understand the amount is supposed to escalate next year on account of the Olympics, when more services from the CBC will be required. Surely, somewhere we must seek a halt. I submit this amount could and should be cut back at least to the 1973 figure, which was

Anti-Inflation Act

\$114 million less than the figure listed for this year's expenditures.

• (1630)

I submit we could cut back on the CBC by curtailing programs, for in fact we have a surfeit of TV programs. I am prepared to stick my neck out and state here in this House that following the CBC news at night we could well terminate our TV for that particular day, and I would like to know just how much of a savings this would amount to in dollars and cents to the Canadian taxpayers. I submit we could make that cut without truly affecting the Canadian lifestyle.

Information Canada is listed this year at \$9,562,000. I say to this House that it could be abolished. The minister ridiculed our proposal along this line in his speech on Tuesday, and said it would only save \$4 million or \$5 million. I submit the minister is wrong in making that statement. I checked the record and it is as I stated, \$9,562,000, or almost \$10 million. I submit this is no small amount. If it is a small amount in the eyes of this cabinet, I would remind the House that I come from an area where shipbuilding, ship operating and fishing operations are paramount. There is a saying in Lunenburg, my home town, that it is the little leaks that sink the ship. I would not call \$10 million a little leak but it, along with some of the other leaks we see in governmental expenditures, is sinking this Liberal ship of state. These leaks are very injurious to Canadians; that is our concern and it should be the concern of all hon. members of this House of Commons. I say Information Canada should be abolished.

There is an increase in running the taxation branch of the Department of National Revenue of \$45 million this year over last. The cost of Customs and Excise is up \$30 million over last year. This should be investigated. There is no rationale, rhyme or reason for there being an increase of \$75 million in this one department in one year. This government has been tossing around million dollar expenditures as though there were no tomorrow; but tomorrow has shown up today, which is why our economy is in this terrible condition. Internal overhead, accommodation, rent and maintenance is up over \$105 million this year over last year. Why is this? Contingencies alone are up \$85 million over last year. Why is that? Surely this can be curtailed.

Consumer and Corporate Affairs, a department which did not even exist prior to the advent of the Prime Minister in 1968, calls for \$52,835,000 this year, up \$16 million over last year. Why is this? I want to make a sincere proposal to the cabinet, and I hope somebody is listening. Why could we not take some of the bureaucrats and personnel who presently exist in the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and utilize them to manage the problems that will accrue to Canadians under Bill C-73? I see a duplication in the requirements as between the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and this bill which should be investigated. This bill states, at page 10, that the Anti-Inflation Board shall:

(a) monitor changes in prices, profits, compensation and dividends in relation to the guidelines and the effectiveness and workability of the guidelines both in general and in their application—

I could read it all, but hon. members can read as well as I can. There is a duplication as between this bill and the